



CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/7/INF/8
10 December 2003

ENGLISH ONLY

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Seventh meeting

Kuala Lumpur, 9-20 and 27 February 2003

Item 24 of the provisional agenda*

PROTECTED AREAS

*Synthesis of information in thematic reports on protected areas***

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its fourth meeting, the Conference of the Parties agreed that protected areas would be one of the items for in-depth consideration at its seventh meeting (decision IV/16, annex II).
2. At its sixth meeting, in decision VI/25, the Conference of the Parties adopted the guidelines and format for a thematic report on protected areas, which were prepared by the Executive Secretary following a request by the Inter-Sessional Meeting on the Strategic Plan, National Reports and the Implementation of the Convention, held in Montreal from 19 to 21 November 2001.
3. Also in decision VI/25, the Conference of the Parties invited the Parties to submit their thematic reports on protected areas by 30 March 2003. At the time the present note was prepared, the Secretariat had received a total of 33 reports from 33 Parties (Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Barbados, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Eritrea, Finland, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Palau, Poland, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Tonga, United Kingdom, Uzbekistan), and one from non-Party (Thailand). Among them, there is one interim report (Honduras). Twelve more reports (Australia, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Estonia, El Salvador, Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Japan, Peru, Portugal, Slovenia) were subsequently received but could not be reflected in the present synthesis. All the reports can be found at www.biodiv.org/world/reports.asp?t=pa.
4. The present note has been prepared pursuant to paragraph 4 of decision VI/25 of the Conference of the Parties, which provided that thematic reports should, among other things, aim to support the work of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA). Section II below

* UNEP/CBD/COP/7/1 and Corr.1

** Previously circulated for SBSTTA under the symbol UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/9/INF/2.

/...

briefly outlines the limitations for substantive analysis of the information received so far; section III contains a statistical presentation and section IV provides a synthesis of the information received. For ease of reference, the questionnaire for a thematic report on protected areas is attached as annex to this document.

II. ANALYSIS LIMITATIONS OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE THEMATIC REPORTS RECEIVED

5. It should be noted that the following analysis is based on 34 reports only, which constitutes about 18% of the total number of Parties.

6. Obviously, the small number of thematic reports received makes it very difficult to develop any general conclusions about the status and trends of protected areas, as well as the actions taken at the national, regional and global levels. In addition, the thematic reports received on this subject vary in size and content. A few countries provided detailed additional information in addition to answers to the questions contained in the format. Some countries provided very little detailed information even some requests were made for such information. It is therefore more appropriate to present a summary synthesis rather than a substantive analysis of the information provided.

III. STATISTICAL PRESENTATION OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE THEMATIC REPORTS

Prioritization

7. Most of the respondents give a high priority to the development and implementation of a national system of protected areas. Four countries accord medium priority and one country attaches low priority to it. In response to this question, Canada indicates that there is no national system of protected areas in Canada, and the provinces and territories surveyed attach different levels of priority to the development of a system of protected areas. Austria also indicates that it attaches a high priority particularly to the establishment of the NATURA 2000 sites, but a medium priority in general.

System of protected areas

8. A little less than a half of the reporting countries (14, Austria and Canada not included) indicate that they have put in place a systematic planning process for development and implementation of a national system of protected areas. Again Austria and Canada report that there are some planning processes going on at the provincial level. The rest of the reporting countries except two are in either early or advanced stages of establishing such a planning process. Two countries report that they have not yet established a planning process for this purpose.

9. Again a somewhat less than a half of reporting countries (15, Austria and Canada not included) have made an assessment of the extent to which the existing network of protected areas covers all the areas identified as being important for conservation of biodiversity. Austria and Canada report that some assessments are being undertaken in some provinces and some assessments have been completed in some provinces, and a few provinces are planning this assessment. Nine countries report that they are undertaking this assessment and six other countries indicate that this assessment is being planned. Only one country reports that there is no assessment in this regard.

Regulatory framework

10. Most reporting countries have developed or established a policy framework and/or enabling legislation for establishment and management of protected areas. Five countries are in advanced stages of

developing such policies and/or legislation and only one country is in early stages of policy and/or legislative development in this regard.

11. Twenty reporting countries, including Austria and Canada, report that they have adopted some guidelines, criteria and targets to support the selection, establishment and management of protected areas. In case of Canada, 85% of the park jurisdictions have adopted such guidelines. Austria also reports that some provinces have developed such guidelines or are applying relevant guidelines developed by IUCN or those developed for the 2000 NATURA Network. Ten countries indicate that they are in early or advanced stages of developing relevant guidelines and criteria. And two countries report on no action in this regard.

12. A majority of reporting countries (26), including Canada, report that they have implemented some incentive measures for some protected areas. In case of Canada, 23% of park jurisdictions do not use incentive measures, and the rest use various measures, which are considered as “incentives”. Only one country indicates that it has enforced incentive measures for all the protected areas under its jurisdiction. Six other countries report that no incentive measures are adopted so far for their protected areas.

Management approach

13. In regard to the assessment of principal threats to protected areas and the biodiversity they contain, 20 reporting countries, including Austria, Canada and Germany, have completed the assessments. In cases of Austria, Canada and Germany, the situation is that some assessments are being planned for some protected areas, some assessments being undertaken for some protected areas and some assessments completed for some protected areas. It should be noted that 14 of the above countries (some of them selected both answers (d) and (e) and some chose answer (e) only) have put in place some policies and programmes to deal with the threats identified. It is understood that some of them (that did not explicitly indicate whether they have made the assessment or not.) have developed these policies and programmes based on the assessments they had made. Six countries report that the assessment is under way. Three countries indicate that they plan to undertake such assessments in the upcoming years. Four countries have not yet undertaken any assessment in this regard.

14. Most reporting countries (26), including Canada, manage some of their protected areas in the context of the wider region in which they are located. Only four countries manage all protected areas in this way. Three countries have not adopted this approach of management. In Canada, a few park jurisdictions adopted this approach in all protected areas. In Ireland, this approach is sometimes adopted at local levels of management.

15. Most reporting countries (26), including Canada, report that their protected areas vary in nature. In case of Canada, only a few park jurisdictions indicate that the protected areas are established for similar objectives. Six countries report that many of their protected areas are established for similar objectives and under similar management regimes, with a few exceptions. One country did not respond to this question.

16. A half of reporting countries (17) have involved relevant stakeholders in the establishment and management of some but not all protected areas. Thirteen countries have always involved relevant stakeholders in these processes. And three countries report that there is no stakeholder involvement in the establishment and management of their protected areas.

17. Thirteen countries, including Canada, report that the protected areas established and managed by non-governmental organizations, citizen groups, private sector and individuals exist in their countries and are formally recognized. A few park jurisdictions in Canada report that some protected areas established by private sector, non-governmental organizations or individuals exist but are not officially recognized.

Nine countries indicate that such protected areas do exist in their countries but they are not formally recognized. It should be noted that two of the above countries have selected answers (b) and (c). It is certain that such protected areas do exist, but it is not clear whether they are formally recognized or not. The rest of reporting countries report that such protected areas do not exist.

Available resources

18. A majority of reporting countries, including developed countries, find human, institutional and financial resources limiting (22) or very limiting (9) for the full implementation of the protected areas networks as well as the management of individual protected areas. Only two reporting countries find resources adequate or good for the actions in this regard.

19. Out of 22 countries eligible for funding by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), 15 countries have received some funds from GEF; four countries are requesting such funds and three countries have not received any funds from GEF for establishment and management of protected areas. One non-Party has not received any funds from GEF because of ineligibility.

Assessment

20. Twenty-two reporting countries have undertaken an assessment of the constraints to implementation and management of protected areas. Six countries have taken action to deal with those constraints identified in the assessment. Four countries have not undertaken an assessment of the constraints in this regard. One country did not respond to this question.

21. Fifteen reporting countries are developing a programme to assess on a regular basis the effectiveness of protected areas management. Eight countries have put in place such a programme. Among them, a number of countries indicate that such a programme is in place for some protected areas but under development for some protected areas. Ten countries report that they have not yet developed such a programme.

22. Ten reporting countries have undertaken an assessment of the value of the material and non-material benefits and services that protected areas provide. In contrast, thirteen countries have not made any assessment in this regard. Five countries report that such an assessment is ongoing and three countries indicate that this assessment is being planned. One country did not respond to this question.

Regional and international cooperation

23. Twenty-four reporting countries are collaborating with their neighbouring countries in the establishment and/or management of transboundary protected areas. In Canada, 46% of park jurisdictions are not working on transboundary protected areas, but Parks Canada is engaged with the United States National Park Service and with state governments in some international parks. Nine countries are not cooperating with their neighbouring countries in this field.

24. Thirteen countries report that their key protected areas professionals are members of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA). Fifteen countries indicate that their protected areas professionals are not members of IUCN WCPA. Four countries say that they do not have such information and one country did not respond to this question.

25. Twenty-three reporting countries, including Canada, have provided information on their protected areas to UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) for a scientific assessment of the status of the world's protected areas. In Canada, around 60% of park jurisdictions have provided such information to UNEP WCMC. Nine countries have not submitted such information. One country did not respond to this question.

26. A majority of reporting countries (27) consider that their experience in protected areas will be of direct value to other Parties. Only six countries do not hold such a view. In addition, a considerable number of reporting countries have provided summaries of the reports on those protected areas or other sites in their countries that have been recognized or designated under an international or regional convention or programme, such as World Heritage sites and Ramsar sites.

IV. SYNTHESIS OF INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THEMATIC REPORTS

A. System of protected areas

1. Planning process for development of a national system of protected areas

27. As indicated above, less than a half of reporting countries have established a planning process for establishment of a network of protected areas. Only a few of them provided additional information in this regard. Some countries have established protected areas following the provisions of relevant national legislation and/or relevant directives established at the regional level, such as European Community habitats and bird directives. Some countries established different protected areas for different objectives or functions under different regulations or laws. For example, in Finland, national parks and strict nature reserves were established under the Nature Conservation Act, wilderness areas established under the Act on Wilderness Reserves, landscapes of shorelines protected under the Land Use and Building Act and forest sites protected by the Forest Act.

28. A number of countries have established protected areas according to the criteria specific to the types of protected areas designated. In selecting sites, different guidelines are used for different areas for different objectives or functions. While primary consideration is given to the fragility and naturalness of sites and the rarity of species or habitats they support, some countries also take into account the socio-economic, cultural, scientific and other values of biological diversity that these protected areas harbour. In terms of approaches, a few countries recognize the importance of the ecosystem approach while planning for the establishment of protected areas. Some countries even consider the possibility of establishing ecological corridors. The United Kingdom approach is to mix protected areas with appropriate conservation measures undertaken through policies addressed at the "wider environment", which is considered more effective for conservation of biological diversity. Institutionally, some countries report that they have planned to establish a national system of protected areas, which are composed of protected areas managed at national, provincial and local levels. Some countries have established protected areas to fulfil their obligations under the international agreements or as a part of regional networks of protected areas, such as Ramsar sites and the NATURA 2000 sites in Europe.

29. From the limited additional information, a few countries undertake some assessments or feasibility studies in the planning process for establishing protected areas. Some of them undertake consultation with relevant stakeholders, particularly those affected by the establishment of protected areas and possibly involved in the management of protected areas.

2. Assessment of existing networks of protected areas

30. Again, less than a half of reporting countries have undertaken an assessment of the existing network of protected areas to see whether it has covered all areas identified as being important for the conservation of biological diversity. Only a few of them provided a little detailed information concerning the assessments they have made. A few countries indicated that the assessments they have made in this regard have been made available through national clearing-house mechanisms. A few countries indicated that it has been their regular practice to assess the situation of protected areas and identify gaps in order to develop more programmes to fill in the gaps. In addition, some of these countries have made proposals for improving the establishment and management of protected areas in light of new concepts and practices introduced to this field, such as ecosystem approach and ecological corridors. Some countries have also

undertaken an assessment of the protected areas for a particular sector such as forest to see whether the size of existing protected areas is adequate enough to accommodate conservation needs. In Poland, as a result of the assessment, criteria for verification of protected areas and procedures for their expansion have been developed. The assessment undertaken by the Netherlands in this regard has helped identify the status of protection of some species within its national ecological networks.

B. Regulatory framework

1. Policy framework and/or enabling legislation for establishment and management of protected areas

31. Most reporting countries have developed and enacted a policy framework and/or legislation for establishment and management of protected areas. A number of countries provided detailed information in this regard. First, in terms of a policy framework, some countries indicated that relevant requirements for nature conservation through establishment of protected areas have been articulated in relevant environmental policies, national strategies for sustainable development, national biodiversity strategies and action plans and sectoral policies and programmes.

32. Secondly, a considerable number of reporting countries indicated that they had established protected areas under relevant national or sectoral legislation, some of which were enacted long before the entry into force of the Convention. As indicated above, some countries established protected areas or sites for different objectives or functions under different national or sectoral regulations or acts. Some countries, such as Albania, have developed legislation particularly for the establishment and management of protected areas in their jurisdictions. In Poland, relevant laws give governments of different levels the authority to designate protected areas established at different levels or for different objectives or functions.

33. Thirdly, some European countries, including in Central and Eastern Europe, indicated that they had established some special protected areas or special areas of conservation following relevant European Community directives like the European Community bird and habitats directives or building a regional network of nature conservation like the NATURA 2000. Some countries report that they have established some protected areas or sites as a part of their activities to fulfil their obligations under some international or regional conventions, such as the Ramsar Convention and the Alpine Convention in Europe.

2. Guidelines, criteria and targets adopted to support selection, establishment and management of protected areas

34. A number of reporting countries have adopted some guidelines, criteria and targets to support selection, establishment and management of protected areas. From the additional information, most of these countries employ a range of guidelines and criteria for protected areas established for different objectives or functions. A few countries report that they have developed national guidelines, criteria and targets for some of their protected areas. Examples of this are Algeria, Norway and the United Kingdom. While developing guidelines or criteria, which are usually specific to the types of protected areas, consideration is given to the fragility of sites and the rarity of species or habitats they support as well as threats identified to these species. The relevant legislation, plans and policies of some countries have incorporated the guidelines, criteria and targets for selection, establishment and management.

35. Some European countries report that while establishing specially protected areas (SPAs) and special areas of conservation (SACs), they use the guidelines and criteria provided in the European Community birds and habitats directives. The NATURA 2000 programme also provides some guidelines and criteria for some European countries to establish protected areas as a part of this regional network. Some countries are using relevant guidelines formulated by IUCN. Some countries report that they are following relevant guidelines formulated by the decision-making bodies of some international

conventions and organizations, such as those for establishing Ramsar sites and the UNESCO protocol and guidelines for establishing the World Heritage sites.

36. As indicated above, having recognized that criteria are specific to the types of protected areas, some countries, particularly some European countries, are using a variety of guidelines in this regard, national, regional and international. For example, in the Netherlands, the National Structure Plan for Rural Development includes guidelines, criteria and targets for the National Ecological Network. The Nature Conservation Act 1967 contains guidelines and targets for selecting state nature reserves and protected nature reserves. The IUCN guidelines are followed for selecting, establishing and managing national parks. The guidelines contained in the NATURA 2000 programme are employed for selecting and establishing the NATURA 2000 sites. And the protocols and guidelines of UNSECO are followed for selection, establishment and management of World Heritage sites in the Netherlands.

3. Use of incentive measures in management of protected areas

37. A number of reporting countries provided additional information about various incentives or incentive measures or mechanisms they have adopted or used for the management of protected areas. Some countries report that their protected areas or national parks collect entrance fees from visitors or on-site researchers. In some countries, these fees are kept by the management of protected areas or national parks to offset some of their operational and management costs. In addition, some countries allow their national park managing bodies and local communities to earn money through providing some recreational activities and guided tours and/or selling gifts to tourists.

38. A number of reporting countries provide incentives to the management of protected areas through some benefit-sharing arrangements. For example, in Canada, some benefit-sharing mechanisms are introduced to allow indigenous communities to benefit from tourism and other activities undertaken in the protected areas or national parks established in the indigenous communities. Some countries provide incentives to the management of protected areas through encouraging their partnerships with tour operators or establishing a licensing system for tourism in the protected areas.

39. A few countries have put in place compensational mechanisms for establishing protected areas. A few countries tried to create employment opportunities for local communities where protected areas are established. In a few countries, tax benefits are provided to the local communities, the management of protected areas and the private sector or individuals involved in the establishment and management of protected areas. In a few countries, financial assistance is provided by the central or federal government to the establishment and management of protected areas. A case in point here may be some incentive schemes introduced in the United Kingdom. One of them is the English Nature's Wildlife Enhancement Scheme, which supports positive site management by using simple agreements and standard payments for annual management and capital works. An integral part of this scheme is to promote active partnerships by linking the local knowledge and practical skills of owners and occupiers with the expertise of English Nature. It gives further financial support to land managers who agree to manage their sites of special scientific interests in specific wildlife-friendly ways.

C. Management approach

1. Assessment of threats to protected areas and programmes to deal with threats

40. Although a considerable number of reporting countries have undertaken an assessment of threats to protected areas, only a few countries provided detailed information in this regard. In addition, some countries had made an assessment of the threats to some, not all protected areas established in their jurisdictions. From the additional information provided, the threats identified by different countries to protected areas vary due to their different national circumstances. However, there are a number of common threats identified by a few countries, including

- (a) Climate change;
- (b) Urbanization;
- (c) Development projects in protected areas or sites or the areas adjacent to them;
- (d) Mining and oil prospecting and drilling (particularly in marine protected areas);
- (e) Deforestation;
- (f) Human disturbance (e.g. tourism, hunting);
- (g) Land use for agricultural activities;
- (h) Alien species;
- (i) Various pollution sources (air, water, solid wastes);
- (j) Forest fires;
- (k) Poverty;
- (l) Low level of awareness and support of local communities.

41. A few countries provided the sources of information where the results of the assessments they had undertaken can be found. A few countries indicated that they had made such assessments in the process of preparing their management plans or national reports on protected areas or generally reports on the state of environment. There are also a few countries reporting that they have assessed the threats to their protected areas and incorporated them in relevant Red Data Books.

42. A number of reporting countries report that they have put in place some programmes or actions to address the threats identified. A few countries have incorporated some provisions in their relevant legislations stipulating measures to minimize negative impacts of various activities on protected areas or national parks. Some countries have formulated the strategies or action plans to cope with those threats identified.

2. *Establishment and management of protected areas in context of wider region*

43. A considerable number of reporting countries indicate that they have adopted a wider-regional approach in establishing and managing some of their protected areas or national parks or sites established under relevant regional directives or international conventions. Only a few countries provided additional information in this regard. From there, a few countries take into consideration this approach in the planning stage of the establishment of protected areas. Relevant sectors and stakeholders and local communities are involved or consulted in the planning, establishment and management of some protected areas or national parks. In some countries, their relevant regulations or regional development plans require management of protected areas or national parks in the broader context to make sure that the activities in the areas adjacent to protected areas or national parks will not have negative impacts on the protected areas. In some countries, agreements or memorandums of understanding are signed with relevant stakeholders to make sure that they will collaborate with the management bodies of protected areas in the management of protected areas. Some countries have established protected areas involving different provinces or regions and adopted an inter-regional or inter-provincial management approach. In some countries, such as Argentina and Canada, the authority of management of some protected areas lies in the provinces where these protected areas or national parks are established, but there is also an authority or agency established at the central or federal government level to coordinate the management

of protected areas covering different provinces or regions. A few Central American countries report that they have adopted even broader approaches through establishment and management of protected areas at the bilateral, trilateral or regional levels.

3. Types of protected areas established for different objectives

44. Most reporting countries have established protected areas of different nature for different management objectives. Protected areas are used in many countries as a general term that refers to the areas or sites designated to protect certain species, habitats, natural or cultural heritages, etc. As a matter of fact, various names are used to refer to an area or site of this kind. To list them here briefly, there are national parks, nature reserves, forest reserves, wetland or Ramsar sites, sites of special scientific interests, wildlife sanctuaries, biosphere reserves and landscape reserves. Actually, these protected areas so named are sometimes indicative of the objectives for which they are established and managed. A number of countries indicate that they have adopted the IUCN system of classification of protected areas when designating and categorizing protected areas at the national or local levels.

45. Some countries report that their protected areas have been established through local, regional, national and international mechanisms and managed through different management regimes. As indicated above, some countries have established protected areas as required by relevant national legislations or strategies. Some countries have established protected areas following relevant regional directives such as the European Community birds and habitats directives or fulfilling the obligations under international agreements like the Ramsar Convention. In terms of management regimes, in some countries, protected areas are designated by one central authority but managed at different levels. In some countries, protected areas are managed by those provinces or regions where they are located, but in some cases, are coordinated by one agency at the central or federal level.

4. Stakeholder involvement in establishment and management of protected areas

46. A number of reporting countries involve relevant stakeholders in the processes of establishing and managing some protected areas. Some countries indicate that there is a clear requirement in their relevant laws and policies for the participation of stakeholders in the planning, establishment and management of protected areas. A few countries have adopted participatory approaches to the management of protected areas. A few countries report that relevant stakeholders are involved in the formulation and implementation of the management plans for some protected areas. A few countries also report that a process of public consultation is undertaken at national or local levels before some protected areas are established, particularly with those local communities where these protected areas are established. A few countries have put in place some institutional arrangements to ensure that relevant stakeholders are involved in the planning, establishment and management of some protected areas. In Lebanon, committees for protected areas are established for relevant stakeholders to get involved in the processes of planning, establishing and managing protected areas. In Poland, even different authorities of different levels designate different categories of protected areas, but a mechanism is put in place for coordination among different authorities as well as the affected communities.

47. There are some differences among the reporting countries in the scope of stakeholder involvement in the establishment and management of protected probably due to different requirements in their relevant regulations or policies. Some reporting countries provided detailed information concerning which group of stakeholders are consulted in the process of establishment and management of protected areas, including local communities, indigenous communities, industry groups, local conservation groups. One country indicates that only the landowners are consulted for establishing some protected areas. Another reports that there is a mechanism to coordinate among different authorities of different levels, but the general public is not really involved in the process.

5. *Protected areas established and managed by non-governmental organizations, citizen groups, the private sector and individuals*

48. A number of reporting countries indicate that protected areas established and managed by non-governmental organizations, citizen groups, private sector and individuals do exist and are officially recognized in their countries. In some countries, their relevant laws or policies clearly encourage the establishment and management of protected areas by non-governmental organizations, the private sector and individuals. One country indicates that nearly all of its protected areas are privately owned. In some countries, individuals could request the government to establish protected areas in the land they own and are involved in the management of protected areas. Some private companies could even buy the land and request protected areas to be established there. In some countries, the protected areas are established by the government but managed by the private sector, non-governmental organizations or individuals, through licensing or certification systems in some countries. In some cases, protected areas are jointly established and managed by the government and the private sector, non-governmental organizations or individuals. In some countries, local nature reserves are established by the local authorities but managed by committees composed of members from local communities. In the United Kingdom, English Nature runs a grant scheme called "Wildspace" to encourage local community involvement in the management and enhancement of their local greenspaces and nature reserves. A few countries report that they have specific rules as to which categories of protected areas can be established and managed by the private sector, non-governmental organizations or individuals. For example, in Hungary, individuals are not allowed to manage protected areas with national importance.

49. A few countries indicate that protected areas established and managed by non-governmental organizations, the private sector and individuals do exist, but are not formally recognized. Some of them have recognized this fact and are in the stage of developing relevant regulations or policies. A few countries indicate that, although even they have not officially recognized such protected areas, their relevant regulations or policies in fact encourage the private sector, non-governmental organizations and individuals to get involved in the establishment and management of protected areas.

D. Available resources

1. *Human, financial and institutional resources for implementation of protected areas network*

50. With only a few exceptions, a majority of reporting countries, including developed countries, find resources limited or very limited for the establishment and management of protected areas. In terms of human resources, most reporting countries are suffering a serious shortage of human resources in relation to actual demands or needs for management of protected areas. Many developing countries even feel that in addition to the shortage in number, their current management staff needs further training in order to cope with the magnitude and complexity of work in management. A few countries indicate that the number of qualified management staff cannot keep pace with the increase in the number of protected areas established. This is particularly true with the management staff at local levels. A number of countries report that even they have established protected areas, they do not have adequate personnel to undertake an inventory of species protected or collect relevant information for management purposes. As far as financial resources are concerned, a great majority of reporting countries are experiencing a shortage of financial resources. Due to this, some countries find their investment inadequate in equipment or infrastructure needed for management of protected areas or maintenance of some facilities in the protected areas. This also leads to the decrease in the management team and the low level of effectiveness of management of protected areas. Institutionally, a number of countries have established relevant institutions for management of protected areas at different levels. However, in some countries, due to inadequate human and financial resources, these institutions cannot function effectively as required by the management of protected areas. In addition, in some countries, such institutions have not been established yet due to lack of legal or administrative requirements in this regard.

2. *Funding by the Global Environment Facility or other international sources for establishment and management of protected areas*

51. A number of reporting countries eligible for funding of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) report that they have received some funds to support the establishment and management of some protected areas, particularly those with international importance or established to fulfil their international obligations. Some European countries indicate that they have received some funds from relevant European Community programmes to support the establishment and management of some protected areas of the NATURA 2000 established under the birds and habitats directives, such as the LIFE (The Financial Instrument for the Environment) programme in the European Community.

E. Assessment

1. *Assessment of constraints to implementation and management of system of protected areas*

52. A considerable number of reporting countries indicate that they have undertaken an assessment of the constraints to implementation and management of an adequate system of protected areas. A few countries assessed and identified these constraints when they developed relevant legislation, strategies or policies. Some countries assessed these constraints and incorporated them into the management plans of some protected areas. On the basis of these assessments, proper measures have been proposed in the management plans to address these constraints. A few countries made assessments of these constraints on a case-by-case basis. Different constraints were identified for the establishment and management of different categories of protected areas. Some countries made such an assessment by getting involved relevant stakeholders or worked or consulted with some partners at different levels to undertake such an assessment.

53. Only a few countries provided detailed information about the constraints they have identified. A few countries provided sources of information where these constraints already identified can be found, including reports on management of protected areas and management plans for some protected areas. From the detailed information provided by a few countries, one common constraint is the inadequacy of financial and human resources. A few countries, including developed countries, indicate that they are short of investment or financial resources to procure land from land-owners to establish protected areas there. Some countries lack financial resources to invest in equipment and facilities for management of protected areas. A few countries do not have adequate financial resources to provide compensation for those local communities where protected areas are established or prevent or repair any damages done to protected areas. A few countries report that they do not have an adequate number of qualified staff for management of protected areas. There are other various constraints identified by some countries. For example, one constraint is the conflicting interests of different stakeholders involved in the establishment and management of protected areas. Another is the difficulty in coordination among different departments taking different responsibilities for designating different categories of protected areas or playing different roles in the process of establishing and managing protected areas.

54. A number of reporting countries have put in place some measures or programmes to address these constraints identified. Some countries incorporated these measures or programmes into the management plans of some protected areas. Some countries reviewed relevant legislations and policies on the basis of the constraints identified and amended them accordingly. The action plan for protected areas formulated by some countries have clearly addressed these constraints identified through assessments. One country reported that a workshop had been held to identify these constraints and propose relevant measures to address them. It should be noted here that very few countries provided detailed information about what action or measures they have taken or are taking to address these constraints.

2. *Programme to assess regularly effectiveness of protected areas management*

55. Less than a half of reporting countries have put in place some programmes to monitor or assess on a regular basis the effectiveness of protected areas management. And a few countries are developing such a system of monitoring and assessment. According to the additional information provided, periods of such a review or assessment vary from country to country. Some countries undertake such a review or assessment of national protected areas or national parks every five or seven years. Some countries review the effectiveness of protected areas management every year or at an interval when the management plans of some protected areas have to be revised. Some countries indicate that they undertake such an assessment on a periodic basis, without specifying periods or intervals of undertaking this assessment or review. Some countries make this assessment when they review relevant legislation, strategies or policies and incorporate the results of the assessment in revising these legislations, strategies and policies. Some countries have established a regular monitoring system to assess the effectiveness of protected areas management.

56. The institutions undertaking this review or assessment vary as well. In some countries, this review or assessment is undertaken by the national-level agency responsible for protected areas. In some countries, the managing bodies of protected areas are required to assess the effectiveness on the site and submit reports to the authorities responsible for protected areas. The relevant legislations or policies of some countries have stipulated which agency or institution will undertake such a review or assessment. For example, in Hungary, the governmental assessment in this regard is undertaken by the State Audit Office. In some countries where provinces or territories are given the authority to own and manage protected areas, this review or assessment is undertaken by the responsible provincial agency.

57. A few countries report that different systems or requirements are in place for monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of different categories of protected areas. For example, in the Netherlands, the Ramsar sites as well as the NATURA 2000 sites are evaluated every three years. The World Heritage sites are evaluated by UNESCO every ten years. The management plans for protected nature reserves are evaluated every three years. For national parks, a quality evaluation system has been developed for periodical evaluation of the state of national parks. This system has to be applied each time the management plan of a park is revised. A specific evaluation procedure is being developed for protected small-scale habitats. In the United Kingdom, a routine review or assessment is made of statutory sites designated at national level as a part of monitoring programme by the statutory conservation agencies. But there is no comprehensive monitoring procedure for the non-statutory protected areas. In Austria, for some national parks with the European Diploma (awarded to sites of European importance from the point of view of fauna, flora and landscape and which are particularly well protected), an annual report has to be produced every year, and for others, this assessment can be made every five years.

58. A few countries have developed some indicators for a review or assessment of the effectiveness of protected areas management. Some countries indicate that they are undertaking such an assessment within the framework provided by IUCN. A few countries have developed indicators for this purpose based on their own experience or drawing on the experience or approaches of other countries or working with some international non-governmental organizations in this field such as WWF. It should be noted here that no countries provided detailed information concerning the indicators they use for a review or assessment of the effectiveness of protected areas management, but a few countries report that their indicators cover social, economic, geographical, cultural, ecological aspects of management of protected areas.

3. *Assessment of the value of material and non-material benefits and services provided by protected areas*

59. A number of reporting countries indicate that they have undertaken some assessments of the values of material or non-material benefits and services provided by protected areas. However, it should

be noted that very few countries have undertaken comprehensive assessments covering these aspects for all of their protected areas. Only one or two countries have undertaken an economic evaluation of biodiversity. Some countries indicate that such assessments, though not regularly undertaken, is a part of their programmes to implement their legislation on environment impact assessment. A few countries undertake some assessments in this regard when they prepare and review the management plans for some protected areas. In some countries, this assessment is made before their national biodiversity strategies or action plans are formulated. A few countries report that such an assessment is made while undertaking some research activities in protected areas. For example, in Guatemala, an assessment was made of the values of forest in mitigating emissions of greenhouse gases. A few countries include this assessment as a part of their programmes to participate in some assessments undertaken at regional or global level, such as Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Some countries make this assessment when they prepare case studies for some protected areas. One or two countries report that they are trying to develop the guidelines for incorporating the economic values of nature in economic decisions and the best applicable technique for such an evaluation.

F. Regional and international cooperation

1. Collaboration or communication with neighbouring countries in establishment and/or management of transboundary protected areas

60. Many reporting countries have undertaken or are undertaking various forms of collaboration with their neighbouring countries in the establishment and/or management of transboundary protected areas. Some countries undertake this collaboration through concluding formal agreements or memorandum of understanding with their neighbouring countries. Some countries collaborate in undertaking joint activities or developing joint management guidelines. A few countries indicate that some mechanisms have been put in place for facilitating or undertaking consultation among their neighbouring countries in matters related to transboundary protected areas.

61. There are a number of cases of regional collaboration in this regard. A number of reports submitted by Latin American countries indicate that many countries in this region are involved in the establishment and management of transboundary protected areas established at regional level. Some countries in this region have also established ecological corridors and transboundary biosphere reserves. According to the reports submitted by some European countries, there are many examples of collaboration among relevant countries in establishing and/or managing transboundary protected areas. According to the Norwegian report, there has been extensive cooperation in this field among Nordic countries for a long time. In addition, the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy was adopted in 1991, and the implementation of its programme for conservation of Arctic flora and fauna has involved Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Canada, the United States of America and the Russian Federation. Another example is some agreements concluded between Canada and the United States for transboundary responsibilities for biodiversity conservation and some large corridor initiatives under way, such as Yukon to Yellowstone Initiative (Y2Y).

2. Membership of key protected areas professionals in the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas

62. Since no request was made under question 18 for additional information, so little detailed information was provided even if some countries report that their key protected areas professionals are members of the IUCN WCPA. One or two countries indicate that some non-governmental organizations managing some protected areas in their countries are members of IUCN but not members of the IUCN WCPA. One country reports that its members of IUCN WCPA are selected from both government agencies and non-governmental organizations. The United Kingdom reports that its statutory agencies contribute to the work of IUCN WCPA, including a grant aid to support the development of an effective European programme in preparation for the World Parks Congress in 2003. It should be noted that a

number of reporting countries indicate that their key protected areas professionals are not members of IUCN WCPA and a few countries do not have such information available because of lack of exchange of information with IUCN.

3. *Information provided to UNEP-WCMC on protected areas for a scientific assessment of status of protected areas*

63. Again, for the reasons given above, little detailed information was submitted even a number of reporting countries indicate that they have provided relevant information to UNEP WCMC or other relevant organizations. From the limited additional information, there are a few different channels of information submission. A few countries indicate that their relevant information was provided to UNEP-WCMC in the framework of revising and updating the IUCN list of protected areas. The United Kingdom submitted its relevant information to the European Environment Agency (EEA) to be included in the Common Database for Designated Areas, which is a collaborative project between EEA, UNEP-WCMC and the European Council. Some countries submitted information on some of their protected areas to other relevant organizations. For example, Argentina reports that it has submitted its information concerning biosphere reserves to UNESCO and that concerning Ramsar sites to the Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention. It should be noted that a number of reporting countries have not submitted such information to UNEP WCMC.

4. *Protected areas or sites recognized or designated under international conventions or programmes*

64. Many reporting countries indicate that some of their protected areas or other sites have been recognized or designated under international or regional conventions or programmes. For sites recognized or designated under international convention or programme, a number of countries report that their protected areas, sites or reserves have been recognized as Ramsar sites under the Ramsar Convention, Biosphere Reserves under UNESCO Man and Biosphere programme and World Heritage sites under the World Heritage Convention. For sites recognized or designated under regional convention or programme, some European countries cite the NATURA 2000 sites established under EU Bird and Habitats Directives, biogenetic sites established under the European Berne Convention, sites with the Diploma of the European Council. In addition, Norway mentioned a circumpolar network of protected areas established under the Arctic Council. Thailand has established two ASEAN Heritage Parks and Tonga has established a few South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme (SPBCP) sites.

5. *Value of experience in protected areas to other Parties*

65. Many reporting countries indicate that they have some experience in the field of protected areas that they consider useful or valuable for other countries. Rather than giving a synthesis of the responses, as has been the case in the rest of this note, it is more useful to summarize the experience of some countries individually, given that these experiences are specific to the circumstances of the countries concerned, as follows:

- *Austria*: National park management; establishment and implementation of the NATURA 2000 and experience with stakeholder involvement;
- *Argentina*: Capacity-building for conservation staff; environmental interpretation; work with indigenous communities in areas of mitigation, legislation, impact assessment, environmental interpretation, planning and resources management;
- *Canada*: Expertise with oil, gas, mining and forestry sectors; planning protected-areas systems and individual protected areas; governance; land claims and aboriginal policy; fire management; innovative governance arrangements and consultation;

- *Colombia*: Policy change to focus on social participation in conservation; establishing buffer zones involving a system of sustainable production;
- *Finland*: Significant experience on transboundary parks between countries with different political and cultural conditions; experience on running visitor facilities (such as customer service chain, modern visitor counting techniques); developing learning communities and best practices; experience in assessment of threatened species, compiling red data books and using the revised IUCN Species Survival Commission criteria;
- *Guatemala*: Concession from forest communities for establishment of some reserves; implementation of policy for co-management of protected areas; implementation of a system of land division in protected areas;
- *Honduras*: Implementation of a monitoring system for biodiversity; priority given to establishment of Mesoamerican biological corridors; capacity building for protected areas managers;
- *Hungary*: Use of the general national habitat classification system that enables definition, classification and mapping of any habitat type in Hungary and on the basis of which the Hungarian biodiversity monitoring system monitors ecosystem diversity and its changes at landscape level by mapping at a scale of 1:25000; experience in large-scale rehabilitation of wetlands;
- *Lebanon*: Involving local non-governmental organizations and all other stakeholders in the management of protected areas; involving private sector in developing and promoting ecotourism activities in protected areas;
- *Mexico*: Management of protected areas; ecotourism; development of management programmes; legislation; financial capacity; social participation; biological monitoring; indicators; geographical information systems; development of regional sustainable development programmes to reduce poverty and marginalization of rural and indigenous communities in protected areas;
- *Monaco*: Transboundary cooperation;
- *Morocco*: Scientific studies on inventory of biodiversity at species level and ecosystem level, which are useful for ecological evaluation, particularly for humid zones;
- *Netherlands*: Believing in “manipulability” of nature as a significant basis for Netherlands nature policy; putting much emphasis on restoring and “developing” nature as well as on subsidized nature management in agricultural areas; the Netherlands network approach is typical in three aspects: (i) financial assistance provided by the central government and areas of private ground purposefully purchased to enable the completion of a designed target network of areas; (ii) areas of private ground purchased with the financial assistance by the central government and the ownership of the ground transferred to semi-public and private nature management organizations; (iii) the areas purchased transferred into nature areas and constitute a part of the ecological network; transboundary collaboration;
- *Norway*: Development of a general tool for management of protected areas; establishment of Norwegian Nature Inspectorate to coordinate and improve nature inspection in Norway, with a head office in Trondheim and local offices spread throughout the country;
- *Poland*: Cooperation and coordination with local communities in the establishment and management of protected areas;

- *Spain*: Development of many tools for management and coordination of national parks that can be used in an integrated network of protected areas; establishing cooperation agreements with Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and other relevant conventions and international agreements, including transfer of technology and information, capacity building, evaluation of research and planning; experience in management of Mediterranean protected areas;
- *Thailand*: Development of community-based tourism;
- *United Kingdom*: A globally important role of United Kingdom taxonomic institutions in biodiversity conservation through capacity building projects and data repatriation in connection with protected areas in developing countries; establishment of the Darwin Initiative to provide small grants to less developed countries to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of resources; implementing conservation through partnerships as an integral part of the United Kingdom approach; experience in establishing marine protected areas.

Annex

**QUESTIONNAIRE INCLUDED IN THE FORMAT FOR A THEMATIC REPORT ON
PROTECTED AREAS OR AREAS WHERE SPECIAL MEASURES NEED TO BE
TAKEN TO CONSERVE BIODIVERSITY**

System of protected areas

1. What is the relative priority afforded to development and implementation of a national system of protected areas in the context of other obligations arising from the Convention and COP Decisions?					
a) High		b) Medium		c) Low	
2. Is there a systematic planning process for development and implementation of a national system of protected areas?					
a) no					
b) in early stages of development					
c) in advanced stages of development					
d) yes, please provide copies of relevant documents describing the process					
3. Is there an assessment of the extent to which the existing network of protected areas covers all areas that are identified as being important for the conservation of biological diversity?					
a) no					
b) an assessment is being planned for					
c) an assessment is being undertaken					
d) yes, please provide copies of the assessments made					

Regulatory framework

4. Is there a policy framework and/or enabling legislation in place for the establishment and management of protected areas?	
a) no	
b) in early stages of development	
c) in advanced stages of development	
d) yes, please provide copies of relevant documents	
5. Have guidelines, criteria and targets been adopted to support selection, establishment and management of protected areas?	
a) no	
b) in early stages of development	
c) in advanced stages of development	
d) yes, please provide copies of guidelines, criteria and targets	

6. Does the management of protected areas involve the use of incentive measures, for instance, of entrance fees for park visitors, or of benefit-sharing arrangements with adjacent communities and other relevant stakeholders?	
a) no	
b) yes, incentive measures implemented for some protected areas (please provide some examples)	
c) yes, incentive measures implemented for all protected areas (please provide some examples)	

Management approach

7. Have the principal threats to protected areas and the biodiversity that they contain been assessed, so that programmes can be put in place to deal with the threats, their effects and to influence the key drivers?	
a) no	
b) an assessment is being planned for	
c) an assessment is in process	
d) yes, an assessment has been completed	
e) programmes and policies to deal with threats are in place (please provide basic information on threats and actions taken)	
8. Are protected areas established and managed in the context of the wider region in which they are located, taking account of and contributing to other sectoral strategies?	
a) no	
b) yes, in some areas	
c) yes, in all areas (please provide details)	
9. Do protected areas vary in their nature, meeting a range of different management objectives and/or being operated through differing management regimes?	
a) no, most areas are established for similar objectives and are under similar management regimes	
b) many areas have similar objectives/management regimes, but there are also some exceptions	
c) yes, protected areas vary in nature (please provide details)	
10. Is there wide stakeholder involvement in the establishment and management of protected areas?	
a) no	
b) with some, but not all protected areas	
c) yes, always (please provide details of experience)	

11. Do protected areas established and managed by non-government bodies, citizen groups, private sector and individuals exist in your country, and are they recognized in any formal manner?	
a) no, they do not exist	
b) yes, they exist, however are not formally recognized	
c) yes, they exist and are formally recognized (please provide further information)	

Available resources

12. Are the human, institutional and financial resources available adequate for full implementation of the protected areas network, including for management of individual protected areas?	
a) no, they are severely limiting (please provide basic information on needs and shortfalls)	
b) no, they are limiting (please provide basic information on needs and shortfalls)	
c) Available resources are adequate (please provide basic information on needs and shortfalls)	
d) yes, good resources are available	
13. Has your country requested/received financial assistance from the Global Environment Facility or other international sources for establishment/management of protected areas?	
a) no	
b) funding has been requested, but not received	
c) funding is currently being requested	
d) yes, funding has been received (please provide copies of appropriate documents)	

Assessment

14. Have constraints to implementation and management of an adequate system of protected areas been assessed so that actions can be initiated to deal with these constraints?	
a) no	
b) yes, constraints have been assessed (please provide further information)	
c) yes, actions to deal with constraints are in place (please provide further information)	
15. Is a programme in place or in development to regularly assess the effectiveness of protected areas management and to act on this information?	
a) no	
b) yes, a programme is under development (please provide further information)	
c) yes, a programme is in place (please provide further information)	
16. Has any assessment been made of the value of the material and non-material benefits and services that protected areas provide?	

a) no	
b) an assessment is planned	
c) an assessment is in process	
d) yes, an assessment has been made (please provide further information)	

Regional and international cooperation

17. Is your country collaborating/communicating with neighbouring countries in the establishment and/or management of transboundary protected areas?	
a) no	
b) yes (please provide details)	
18. Are key protected areas professionals in your country members of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, thereby helping to foster the sharing of information and experience?	
a) no	
b) yes	
c) information is not available	
19. Has your country provided information on its protected areas to the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre in order to allow for a scientific assessment of the status of the world's protected areas?	
a) no	
b) yes	
20. If your country has protected areas or other sites recognised or designated under an international convention or programme (including regional conventions and programmes), please provide copies of reports submitted to those programmes or summaries of them.	
21. Do you think that there are some activities on protected areas that your country has significant experience that will be of direct value to other Contracting Parties?	
a) no	
b) yes (please provide details)	
