UNEP

CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE
    CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
Eighth meeting
Curtiba, Brazil, 20-31 March 2006
Item 27.1 of the provisional agenda*

REPORT OF THE EXPERT WORKSHOP ON PROTECTED AREAS
Curitiba, 17-18 March 2006

I.   INTRODUCTION

1.   The Executive Secretary convened this expert workshop on protected areas on 17 and 18 March 2006 in Curitiba, Brazil, with financial support from the European Union, in response to the request contained in paragraph 8 (d) of recommendation 1/4 of the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Protected Areas, held in Montecatini, Italy, in June 2005. The purpose of the workshop was to pre-view the implementation of activities/elements of the programme of work on protected areas, to facilitate an informed review by the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and to review the evaluation matrix contained in annex II to recommendation 1/4, pursuant to paragraph 8 (b) of the same recommendation.

2.   The workshop was attended by Government-nominated experts from Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, El Salvador, Estonia, the European Community, Finland, India, Kiribati, Liberia, Madagascar, Mexico, Romania, Russian Federation, Thailand and Uganda, a representative of the indigenous and local communities, and representatives of the UNDP, IUCN-World Commission on Protected Areas, BirdLife International-Brazil, Conservation International, The Nature Conservancy, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, and the Wildlife Conservation Society . A number of observers were also present.

3.   A list of the selected experts is attached as annex III below.

ITEM 1.   OPENING OF THE MEETING

4.   The workshop was opened by Dr. Ahmed Djoghlaf, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity at 9:30 a.m. on Friday, 17 March 2006. In his opening remarks, he welcomed the participants and underscored the importance of protected areas and the effective implementation of the programme of work on protected areas for achieving the 2010 biodiversity target. After thanking the European Union for the financial support for the workshop and all the Governments and organizations that had sent representatives, he invited Ms Adriana Sader Tescari from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brazil, to chair the meeting. In conclusion, he noted the progress made by the first meeting of the Open-

_____
        *   UNEP/CBD/COP/8/1.

ended Ad Hoc Working Group on Protected Areas and called for financial support for the organization of second meeting of the Group.

5.   A representative of the Secretariat of the Convention described the context of the workshop in the process from the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties, when the programme of work was adopted, to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, when the first assessment of implementation of the programme of work would take place. He explained the objectives and expected outcomes of the workshop.

ITEM 2.   ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

6.   After a brief self-introduction of the participants, the workshop adopted the agenda as contained in document UNEP/CBD/EWS.PA/1/1. The participants agreed to consider all the items in plenary as suggested in the annotated provisional agenda in document UNEP/CBD/EWS.PA/1/1Add.1.

ITEM 3   PREVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES/ELEMENTS OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PROTECTED AREAS (PARAGRAPH 8 (d) OF RECOMMENDATION 1/4 OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON PROTECTED AREAS)

7.   Participants considered the note by the Executive Secretary on review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas for the period 2004-2006 (UNEP/CBD/COP/8/29) and the summary report of the current status of the global marine protected area network, and of progress monitoring capabilities (UNEP/CBD/COP/8/INF/4). They noted the limited number of reports submitted pursuant to paragraph 28 of decision VII/28 and paragraph 5 of recommendation 1/4 of the first meeting of the open-ended working group on protected areas. They agreed to first review the evaluation matrix (item 4) before considering the possible reasons for the limited submissions of reports on protected areas, and any recommendations to enhance reporting on implementation of the programme of work. The resulting recommendations are contained in annex I.

ITEM 4.   REVIEW OF THE EVALUATION MATRIX (PARAGRAPH 8 (B) OF RECOMMENDATION 1/4 OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON PROTECTED AREAS)

8.   The workshop considered the matrix contained in the note by the Executive Secretary prepared for the meeting (UNEP/CBD/EWS.PA/1/1/2), which was a revised version of the matrix contained in the report of the first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas, taking into account the views of Governments and organizations that responded to the request of the Executive Secretary. The participants agreed to highlight key questions that Parties could be invited to consider when they are preparing their report for the assessment to be carried out by the Conference of the Parties at each of its meetings, pursuant to paragraph 28 of decision VII/28. The purpose of this matrix is to provide for a strategic assessment of progress made, challenges/obstacles, and capacity-building needs. They also agreed to formulate some questions that Parties could consider to provide additional information on their implementation of the programme of work. The revised matrix is contained in annex II below. The workshop invites the Conference of the Parties to consider the matrix.

ITEM 5.   OTHER MATTERS

9.   Under this item, two forthcoming meetings on protected areas were announced:

        (a)   The second Mesoamerican Congress on Protected Areas to be held from 24 to 28 April 2006 in Panama; and

        (b)   International Workshop on Introduction of the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas for Advanced Management to be held from 24 to 27 October 2006 on the Island Jeju, Republic of Korea.

ITEM 6. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

10.   This report of the workshop was adopted on Saturday, 18 March 2006.

ITEM 7. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

11.   Following a short statement by the Executive Secretary and the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair of the workshop, Ms Adriana Sader Tescari declared the workshop closed at 6 p.m on Saturday, 18 March 2006.

Annex I

REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION

The participants in the workshop concluded that the current report does not provide sufficient information for an effective and comprehensive review of the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas. The Expert Group invites the Conference of the Parties to consider a number of ways through which reporting could be improved, including:

- Reporting should concentrate on outputs rather than processes (using tools, such as the matrix proposed in annex II below). It is important to gain an understanding of the overall progress towards targets, and reporting should focus on this, rather than on individual activities. In summary, reporting should be more output oriented rather than activity-oriented.

- The method of information gathering could also be improved. National focal points receive a large number of notifications to which they have to respond. There may be more effective ways to provide the required information. Regional workshops may be an effective way to collect and synthesize comprehensive information for reporting purposes.

- In the reporting process, it is important to identify the most significant obstacles and challenges, assigning priorities rather than providing long lists. This will provide for better understanding of fundamental implementation challenges. In the same way, it would be more important for countries to focus on questions that are most important to them, rather than attempting to answer every question.

- In addition, the reporting should highlight success stories.

- National reporting under the Convention requires coordination with a large number of agencies and organizations, making it more challenging. Since protected areas are considered to be a cross-cutting issue under the Convention, reporting on protected areas could help reporting under a number of thematic areas, and could serve to streamline reporting.

- There should be coordination, filtering and synthesis of the information provided to the Secretariat. Country progress reports should be provided to the Secretariat directly by Parties. However, international and regional organizations and NGOs might have an important role in working with countries to compile diverse sources of information into a concise report, which the Secretariat can synthesize for the Conference of the Parties. Regional discussions and workshops can be helpful in facilitating this.

- There is a need to support development of national clearing-house mechanisms for each Party. This effort can improve information management and dissemination nationally, which in turn will facilitate national reporting.

- Communication between national focal points and national institutions in charge of protected areas could be improved. This would ensure that relevant information requests are efficiently forwarded to the protected areas agencies for reply.

- Cooperation between neighbouring countries is useful for facilitating reporting and for sharing of experiences.

- Capacity building is essential to improve implementation of the programme of work on protected areas and for reporting progress in this regard.

- Web-based communication and databases can help countries share experiences.

- Databases, such as the World Database on Protected Areas, need to be used for reporting progress under the Convention.

- The work of this Expert Group has been useful, and the Group should be reconvened in the future to continue its work.

Annex II

DRAFT REVISED EVALUATION MATRIX FOR THE REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PROTECTED AREAS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this matrix is to provide for a strategic assessment of progress made, challenges/obstacles, and capacity-building needs. The matrix is intended to assist:

- Parties to identify individual priorities for the programme of work on protected areas, in order to support the implementation of their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans
- The Secretariat in collecting and synthesizing relevant information for the Conference of the Parties
- The Conference of the Parties in reporting on progress achieved globally in the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas and in identifying strategic priorities for implementation
- International organizations and donor agencies for information on capacity building needs in relation to the programme of work on protected areas

Effective use of this framework should be promoted to assist Parties in reporting on the progress towards the goals and targets of the programme of work on protected areas.

Note: Key evaluation questions for review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas are indicated in bold. All Parties are encouraged to answer these questions. The other questions provide underlying guidance to assess evaluation, and Parties are encourages to answer them to the extent that they are applicable to their national circumstances.

Goal,& Target	Goal, &target	Deadline	Key evaluation questions and national considerations	Description of progress	Obstacles/ challenges and needs
Number	*Description*				

1.1	Goal: To establish and strengthen national and regional systems of protected areas integrated into a global network as a contribution to globally agreed goals.
	
	Target: Establish a global network of comprehensive, representative and effectively managed national and regional protected area systems.
		2010 Terrestrial
		
		2012 Marine
			• **Is the existing national protected area system comprehensive, ecologically representative and effectively managed (provide number of existing protected areas, total area covered, and type and percentage of biomes covered)?**
			   o What are the definitions of "comprehensive", "ecologically representative" and "effectively managed" in your country?
			   o What is the progress made in quantitative and qualitative terms against the national targets relating to "comprehensiveness", "ecological representation", and "effective management"?
			   o What biomes are adequately represented?
			   o What biomes are underrepresented or not represented?
			   o What IUCN categories of protected areas are included?
			
			Note: For questions relating to management effectiveness, please refer to goal 4.2
			
			• **Do new protected areas established since COP-7 cover underrepresented ecosystems and biomes (number of new protected areas since COP-7, area covered by them, type and percentage of biomes covered by them)?**
			
			• **Are there plans for the establishment of additional protected areas by the year 2010 (terrestrial) and 2012 (marine)?**
			   o Have plans or actions for protected area system (incorporating elements for filling ecological gaps, securing financial resources, capacity-building, addressing policy, legislative and institutional barriers) been developed?		

Goal,& Target		Goal, &target	Deadline	Key evaluation questions and national considerations	Description of progress	Obstacles/ challenges and needs
Number	*Description*					
1.2		Goal: To integrate protected areas into broader land- and seascapes and sectors so as to maintain ecological structure and function. Target: All protected areas and protected area systems are integrated into the wider land- and seascape, and relevant sectors, by applying the ecosystem approach and taking into account ecological connectivity and the concept, where appropriate, of ecological networks	2015	• **What measures haven been taken for developing enabling environment (legislation, policies, tools) for integrating protected areas into broader land and seascapes and sectoral interests (i.e. agriculture, infrastructure, energy)?** o Are the needs of protected areas taken into account in the wider land and seascape to address the need for connectivity, including ecological networks? o Has the concept of the "ecosystem approach" been applied while developing protected area system?		
1.3		Goal: To establish and strengthen regional networks, transboundary protected areas (TBPAs) and collaboration between neighbouring protected areas across national boundaries. Target: Establish and strengthen by transboundary protected areas, other forms of collaboration between neighbouring protected areas across national boundaries and regional networks, to enhance the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, implementing the ecosystem approach, and improving international cooperation.	2010/12	• **What collaboration across national boundaries has been implemented in relation to protected areas?** o Has any consultation process been established to identify potential transboundary, including marine, protected areas? o How many protected areas feature in regional networks and how many of these are transboundary? o Has the potential for regional cooperation under relevant conventions been utilised for the establishment of migratory corridors?		

Goal,& Target	Goal, &target	Deadline	Key evaluation questions and national considerations	Description of progress	Obstacles/ challenges and needs
Number	*Description*				

1.4	Goal: To substantially improve site-based protected area planning and management.
	
	Target: All protected areas have effective management using participatory and science-based site planning processes that incorporate clear biodiversity objectives, targets, management strategies and monitoring programmes, drawing upon existing methodologies and a long-term management plan with active stakeholder involvement.
		2012	• **What percentage of protected areas (area and number) have up-to-date science-based management plans that**
			   a) **Are under development?**
			   b) **Are under effective implementation?**
			
			   o Have consultation been undertaken involving protected area functionaries, local stakeholders and researchers to identify science-based biodiversity conservation targets?		

1.5	Goal: To prevent and mitigate the negative impacts of key threats to protected areas. Target: Effective mechanisms for identifying and preventing, and/or mitigating the negative impacts of key threats to protected areas are in place.	2008	• **What measures have been put in place to identify, prevent and/or mitigate the negative impacts of threats?** o What measures have been taken to restore and rehabilitate the ecological integrity of protected areas?		

Goal,& Target		Deadline	Key evaluation questions and national considerations	Description of progress	Obstacles/ challenges and needs
Number	*Description*				
2.1	Goal: To promote equity and benefit sharing.

Target: Establish mechanisms for the equitable sharing of both costs and benefits arising from the establishment and management of protected areas. | 2008 | • **What legislative or policy frameworks are in place to establish frameworks for the equitable sharing of costs and benefits arising from the establishment and management of protected areas?**

    o Have assessments been made of the economic and socio-cultural costs and benefits of protected areas, particularly for indigenous and local communities?
    o What measures have been taken to avoid and mitigate negative impacts on indigenous and local communities?
    o What mechanisms have been put in place to identify and recognize community conserved areas and how many such areas have been integrated into the national protected areas system? | | |
| 2.2 | Goal: To enhance and secure involvement of indigenous and local communities, and relevant stakeholders.

Target: Full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, in full respect of their rights and recognition of their responsibilities, consistent with national law and applicable international obligations, and the participation of relevant stakeholders, in the management of existing, and the establishment and management of new, protected areas | 2008 | • **What mechanisms have been implemented to ensure full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, in full respect of their rights and recognition of their responsibilities, consistent with national law and applicable international obligations, in the management of existing, and the establishment and management of new, protected areas?**
    o What measures have been taken to support areas conserved by indigenous and local communities?

• **What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure the participation of relevant stakeholders, in the management of existing, and the establishment and management of new, protected areas?** | | |

Goal,& Target	Goal, &target	Deadline	Key evaluation questions and national considerations	Description of progress	Obstacles/ challenges and needs
Number	*Description*				
3.1	Goal: To provide an enabling policy, institutional and socio-economic environment for protected areas. Target: By 2008 review and revise policies as appropriate, including use of social and economic valuation and incentives, to provide a supportive enabling environment for more effective establishment and management of protected areas and protected area systems.	2008	• **Are the appropriate policy, institutional and socio-economic frameworks in place to value goods and services and enable more effective establishment and management of protected areas?** • **What kind of social and economic valuation methods and incentives for more effective establishment and management of protected areas are developed and incorporated into national policies, institutional and socio-economic structures?** o What are the main impediments to effective establishment and management of protected areas? Have measures been taken to overcome these?		
3.2	Goal: To build capacity for the planning, establishment and management of protected areas. Target: comprehensive capacity-building programmes and initiatives are implemented to develop knowledge and skills at individual, community and institutional levels, and raise professional standards.	2010	• **Has a comprehensive capacity-needs assessment for protected areas management been carried out?** • **What capacity-building programmes have been undertaken or are being undertaken. How successful have the completed programmes been?** o Does your country consider a multidisciplinary approach to protected areas management?		

Goal,& Target		Deadline	Key evaluation questions and national considerations	Description of progress	Obstacles/ challenges and needs
Number	*Description*				
3.3	Goal: To develop, apply and transfer appropriate technologies for protected areas. Target: development, validation, and transfer of appropriate technologies and innovative approaches for the effective management of protected areas is substantially improved, taking into account decisions of the Conference of the Parties on technology transfer and cooperation.	2010	• **What new innovative approaches and technologies have been identified, developed and implemented for protected areas establishment and management on the national and regional level?** o Has there been collaboration within the country and/or with other countries to share information and technologies?		

3.4	Goal: To ensure financial sustainability of protected areas, and national and regional systems of protected areas.
	
	Target: Sufficient financial, technical and other resources to meet the costs to effectively implement and manage national and regional systems of protected areas are secured, including both from national and international sources, particularly to support the needs of developing countries and countries with economies in transition and small island developing States.
		2008	• **Have financial needs been identified? What are the results of this needs assessment (quantitative and qualitative)?**
			• **What strategies are in place to meet these needs, and in particular to secure long-term funding for the national protected areas system?**
			   o What financial support has been given to developing countries and countries with economies in transition and small island developing States?
			   o What proportion of the budget is dedicated to supporting the national protected areas system (What proportion of the total funding for the national protected areas comes from private and public funding sources, and how much from the state budget?)
			   o Have studies been made on the efficient use of the resources in contribution to financial sustainability of protected areas?		

Goal,& Target		Goal, &target	Deadline	Key evaluation questions and national considerations	Description of progress	Obstacles/ challenges and needs
Number	*Description*					
3.5		Goal: To strengthen communication, education and public awareness. Target: Public awareness, understanding and appreciation of the importance and benefits of protected areas is significantly increased.	2008	• **Is there a review mechanism for public education programmes to measure if they have been effective in communicating the basic biodiversity values of protected areas?** o What education measures and programmes have been developed and implemented regarding protected areas, including for raising public awareness?		
4.1		Goal: To develop and adopt minimum standards and best practices for national and regional protected area systems. Target: Standards, criteria, and best practices for planning, selecting, establishing, managing and governance of national and regional systems of protected areas are developed and adopted.	2008	• **Have standards, criteria and best practices for a) site selection, b) management, c) governance, and d) long-term monitoring of outcomes been applied and documented? (Please provide a reference).**		
4.2		Goal: To evaluate and improve the effectiveness of protected area management. Target: Frameworks for monitoring, evaluating and reporting protected areas management effectiveness at sites, national and regional systems, and transboundary protected area levels adopted and implemented by Parties.	2010	1. **Has your country evaluated management effectiveness of protected areas in a systematic way? If yes,** **(a) What percentage of national protected area system surface area has been evaluated?** **(b) What are the conclusions for the national protected areas system, and to what extent were results incorporated into management plans and strategies?**		

Annex III

LIST OF EXPERTS

Africa:
Mr. Guy Suzon Ramangason, Madagascar
Mr. Theophilus Varney Freeman, Liberia
Mr. Aggrey Rwetsiba, Uganda

Asia and the Pacific:
Mr.V.B. Mathur, India
Mr.Anuwat Nateewatahnna,, Thailand
Ms. Ratita Bebe, Kiribati

Central and Eastern Europe (CEE):
Mrs. Kaja Lotman, Estonia
Mr. Iurie Virgil Maxim, Romania
Mr. Alexander Shestakov, Russian Federation

Latin America and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC):
Ms. Julia Miranda Londono, Colombia
Mrs. Zulima Ricard de Mendoza, El Salvador
Mr. Enrique Higinio Hernandez Hernandez, Cuba
Ms. Adriana Sader Tescari, Brazil
Mr. Mauricio Mercadante, Brazil
Mr. David Gutierrez Carbonnel, Mexico

Western Europe and Others Group (WEOG):
Ms. Annemarie Watt, Australia
Mr. Marc Johnson, Canada
Mr. Rauno Väisänen, Finland

NGOs and other organizations:
Mr. John Hough, UNDP-GEF
Mr. Nikita Lopoukhine, Chair IUCN-WCPA
Ms. Jacqueline M.Goerck, BirdLife International- Brazil
Mr. Aaron Bruner, Conservation International
Mr. Tarsicio Granizo, The Nature Conservancy
Ms. Joy Hyvarinen, The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Ms. Linda Krueger. Wildlife Conservation Society

INDIGENOUS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES:
Arias Arias Onel

RESOURCE PERSON
Mr. Stefan Leiner, EC