



CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/8/29
1 February 2006

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Eighth meeting

Curitiba, Brazil, 20-31 March 2006

Item 27.1 of the provisional agenda*

REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PROTECTED AREAS FOR THE PERIOD 2004-2006

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its seventh meeting, the Conference of the Parties in decision VII/28 adopted a programme of work on protected areas. In paragraph 28 of this decision the Conference of the Parties decided to assess at each of its meetings until 2010, progress in the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas, and to determine the need for more effective measures and additional financial and technical support to reach the 2010 target. In paragraph 25 of the same decision, the Conference of the Parties decided to establish an Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas to support and review implementation of the programme of work and report to the Conference of the Parties. In paragraph 26 of the same decision, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to make arrangements to hold at least one meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group before its eighth meeting. In pursuance of this request, the Executive Secretary convened the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group in Montecatini, Italy, from 13 to 17 June 2005 with generous support from the Government of Italy. The Conference of the Parties, at its eighth meeting will consider the recommendations of the first meeting of the Working Group on Protected Areas. In its first meeting, the working group agreed to review implementation of the programme of work on protected areas at its second meeting. However, due to lack of timely financial resources, the second meeting could not be organized prior to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

2. Pursuant to recommendation 1/4, paragraph 5 of the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas, the Executive Secretary sent out a notification (No. 2005-084, dated 12 July 2005) to Parties, other relevant organizations, and indigenous and local communities inviting them to submit information on implementation of the programme of work. As of 5 January 2006, only 15 submissions from Parties (Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, the European Community, Germany, India, Poland, Singapore, Thailand, and Turkey), eight submissions from organizations and four submissions from indigenous and local communities had been received. This information is supplemented with the information received through the third national reports.

* UNEP/CBD/COP/8/1.

3. The format for the third national report contains nine questions related to the programme of work on protected areas mainly incorporating those activities that have a timeline of 2006. The notification sent to Parties pursuant to recommendation 1/4 of the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas contains five additional questions, which have a later time line than 2006, but whose initiation is required during 2004-2006. As of 5 January 2006, 50 Parties (Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Bahamas, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Chile, China, Comoros, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Denmark, European Community, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Hungary, Israel, India, Indonesia, Japan, Latvia, Lesotho, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, Niue, Niger, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Slovenia, Sweden, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, United Kingdom, and Zimbabwe) had submitted their third national reports. Ten out of the 15 Parties who submitted information pursuant to recommendation 1/4 of the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas (see paragraph 2 above) also submitted their third national reports (i.e., with the exception of Belarus, Costa Rica, Cuba, Singapore and Turkey).

4. The Executive Secretary prepared this note synthesizing the information to facilitate the review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas by the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting. Section II contains a synthesis of information provided by Parties, other organizations and indigenous and local communities. Sections III and IV contain conclusions and suggested recommendations, respectively.

II. PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING ACTIVITIES OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR THE PERIOD 2004-2006

Activity 1.1.1: Establish suitable time -bound and measurable national and regional level protected area targets and indicators (time line 2006)

Parties

5. 36 Parties reported adoption of targets for protected areas. In 10 other reporting countries the process of establishing targets for protected areas is under way. However, only a few countries provided additional information to supplement their answer to this question. Countries that are part of the European Union are linking protected area targets to the Natura 2000 network process under the Wild Birds and Habitats Directives. ^{1/} In other countries, area-based protected area targets have been articulated in relevant environmental policies, national strategies for sustainable development, national biodiversity strategies, national wildlife action plans and sectoral policies and programmes. In Canada and Indonesia targets for marine protected areas have also been established. Some reporting countries specified time-bound targets for implementation of management action plans (Denmark), nature objective plans (Belgium), finalization of legal requirements (Estonia), and species- based conservation plans (China and Hungary) for protected areas. The area-based protected area targets ranged from 5.74% to 25% of the total geographical area of countries by 2010, 2015 or 2050. Some examples of targets for protected areas, as reported by responding countries, are given in table 1, below.

Table 1: Some examples of protected area targets

Party	Time – bound and measurable national level target
Australia	At least 80% of the number of extant regional ecosystems in each bioregion to be represented in protected areas by 2010-2015. At least 80% of the number of extant regional ecosystems in each sub-region to be represented in

^{1/} Birds Directive 1979 and its amending acts aim at providing long-term protection and conservation of all bird species naturally living in the wild within the European territory of the Member States.

<http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/1vb/l28046>

Habitats Directive [Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora](#)

Party	Time – bound and measurable national level target
	protected areas by 2010-2020.
Bangladesh	Increase protected area coverage to 10% of the geographical area of the country by 2015.
Belgium	Elaborate Nature Objective Plans for the designated Natura 2000 sites by 2008.
Canada	Establish 10 new national parks and five new national marine conservation areas by 2007.
China	Increase protected area coverage to 10% and 18% of the geographical area of the country by 2010 and 2050, respectively. Establish 200 <i>in situ</i> conservation sites for wild agricultural plants and protect 80-100 important wild agricultural species by 2020.
Denmark	Elaborate management plans for Natura 2000 sites by 2009.
Estonia	Enact new legislation for protected areas by 2007.
Hungary	Decrease number of endangered animal and plant species by 10% by 2008.
Indonesia	Establish 10 million hectares of marine protected areas by 2010.
Thailand	Increase protected area coverage to 25% of the geographical area of the country by 2010.
UK	Bring 95% of all Sites of Special Scientific Importance into favourable condition by 2010.

Organizations

6. Major international conservation non-governmental organizations such as The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Conservation International (CI), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), WWF, and IUCN, and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity are assisting Parties to implement the programme of work including the activities due for review in 2006.

7. WCS is assisting Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Colombia, Guatemala, Lao Peoples Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Madagascar, Myanmar, Peru, Rwanda, and Uganda to implement the programme of work including activity 1.1.1. While maintaining a strong site-based protected area focus, WCS has sought to amplify its technical and financial assistance through stronger collaborations and national partnerships to permit the broader application of lessons learned at the system-wide scale in Africa, Asia and Pacific, and Latin America, working in all programme elements of the programme of work.

8. Conservation International has been active in providing direct and indirect support for the implementation of the programme of work in several countries, including, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, and Papua New Guinea, closely working with government agencies and partner NGOs to develop partnerships. These partnerships take different forms and involve different types of collaborations to support country achievement of their commitments including development of targets under the programme of work.

9. TNC has signed formal partnership agreements, known as National Implementation Support Partnerships (NISPs) in 19 countries (Bahamas, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Grenada, Indonesia, Jamaica, Mexico, Palau, Panama, Peru, Papua New Guinea, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) since the programme of work was adopted. These formal agreements, signed by coalitions of government agencies and NGOs, provide a mechanism for collaborative action to implement the programme of work at the national level. Most of these agreements focus on early actions required under the programme of work including development of targets. TNC created an Early Action

Grants Fund to support coordinators housed in government offices or technical consultancies contributing to completing “Master Plans” for the national system of protected areas.

10. WWF is involved in national level partnerships with the Government and NGOs in Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, and Peru to implement the programme of work. WWF is organizing ecoregional workshops with key government and non-government stakeholders in five ecoregions (Altai-Sayan, Caucasus, Dinaric Arc, Carpathians and the West Africa marine ecoregion) to elaborate a six-year programme for the implementation of the programme of work.

11. The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, in collaboration with the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (IUCN-WCPA) and The Nature Conservancy, published a user guide titled “*Towards Effective Protected Area Systems: An Action Guide to Implement the Convention on Biological Diversity*” (CBD Technical Series No.18). The guide was presented at the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Protected Areas in Montecatini. This guide explains possible steps for implementation of the activities of the programme of work, with case studies, available tools and resources. The Secretariat also published a special edition of the CBD News titled “*Protected areas for achieving biodiversity targets*” to enhance awareness about the role of protected areas in achieving the 2010 biodiversity target.

Activity 1.1.2: Establish or expand protected areas in any large, intact or relatively unfragmented or highly irreplaceable natural areas, or areas under high threat, as well as areas securing the most threatened species, and taking into consideration the conservation needs of migratory species (time line 2006)

Parties

12. Forty-nine countries reported that they have already established new protected areas or have plans to expand existing protected areas. However, only a few countries provided detailed information regarding whether those areas cover large, intact or unfragmented natural areas, or areas under high threat, as well as areas securing the most threatened species. While the primary criterion for expanding existing areas or establishing new areas is the consideration of ecological parameters, some countries reported consideration of social and cultural criteria also. An analysis of reports reveals that establishing/expanding protected areas *inter alia* covered:

(a) Various biomes and high priority areas: Plateau wetlands, cold meadows, moorlands, high mountain forests, bogs, salt marshes, coastal meadows, and centres of species richness or endemism;

(b) Threatened species: Tibetan antelope, wild yak, and wild ass

13. Some examples of protected areas being established or expanded are given in table 2 below..

Table 2: Examples of protected areas being established or expanded

Party	Protected areas being established or expanded
Bangladesh	Establishment of three new wildlife sanctuaries (Hazarikhi, Rampahar-Sitapahar and Hail Haor) and a national park in Shatachari, all covering threatened species.
Belgium	Establishment of five new marine areas under the Birds and Habitats Directives.
Canada	Addition of 24 million hectares to various systems of protected areas since 1992 covering large, intact or unfragmented natural areas, or areas under high threat, as well as areas securing the most threatened species.
Chile	Expansion of Altos del Loa national reserve and Parque Marino fransisco national park to cover intact natural areas.

Party	Protected areas being established or expanded
China	Establishment of 21 nature reserves with area above one million hectares each, 20 of which are distributed in unfragmented western regions.
Estonia	Establishment of 451 new sites and expansion of some existing protected areas since 2004, to cover habitat types listed in annexes to the Birds and Habitats Directives.
Germany	Establishment of 10 new marine protected areas in the EEZ of the North Sea and Baltic sea in 2004.
Ghana	Establishment of Atiwa, Bawjiase, Bobri and Kyabobo national parks to cover intact natural areas and threatened species.
Indonesia	Establishment of corridors between Tesso Nilo, and Bukit Tiagaouluh national parks and other reserves to cover the habitat range of Sumatran tigers and elephants, the two important species .

Organizations

14. Since the adoption of the programme of work, WWF supported the gazettment of 17,506,491 hectares of new forest protected areas, in 13 countries. WWF in partnership with the World Bank, WB/WWF Alliance has helped to establish, new Protected Areas in Brazil, Indonesia and Russia, and in the Congo Basin. Protected areas have been created not only on relatively intact ecosystems, but also smaller areas in size, but that are equally important for biodiversity conservation in highly fragmented areas such as the Atlantic Forests in Brazil, Madagascar, and the Mediterranean.

15. The Eighth World Wilderness Congress was held from 30 September to 6 October 2005 with the theme of “Wilderness, Wildlands and People: A partnership for the Planet”. The Congress announced:

- (a) The designation of two new protected areas i.e., El Carmen Wilderness Area in northern Mexico (4 million ha) and the Bonobo Peace Forest Initiative in the Democratic Republic of Congo (2 million ha);
- (b) A new wild planet fund;
- (c) New wilderness legislation in Mexico;
- (d) New and improved inventories and definitions to address marine and freshwater wilderness systems; and
- (e) Formation of professional and organizational networks for wilderness conservation.

Activity 1.1.3: Address the under-representation of marine and inland water ecosystems, taking into account marine ecosystems beyond areas of national jurisdiction, and transboundary inland water ecosystems (time line 2006 for terrestrial and 2008 for marine)

Parties

16. Implementation of this activity by coastal countries resulted in a modest increase in the marine area protected globally. Thirty-five countries reported undertaking action to increase representation of marine and inland ecosystems in protected areas, many of them have plans to increase the extent of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (MCPAs) covering the habitat of rare and endangered marine species, as well as to include marine territories of importance as wintering, nesting and resting sites of migratory species in existing terrestrial protected areas. Some reporting coastal countries have already declared and gazetted some MCPAs. In accordance with the programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity under the Convention on Biological Diversity (decision VII/5), national systems or networks of MCPAs are also becoming more common. Fifteen of the reporting coastal countries have such a system or network under development, while seven countries already have one network in place. According to the Global MPA Database (<http://www.mpaglobal.org/index.php?action=search>), the

current percentage of protection of the world's oceans has risen from less than 0.5% to approximately 0.6%, comprising a total area of 2.2 million km² in 2005. The vast majority of marine and coastal protected areas are located along the coasts, with approximately 6% of the world's territorial seas now protected. While marine protection has increased over the last century at a rate of approximately 3-5% per year, marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction remain virtually unprotected. ^{2/}

17. The major source of information on inland water, and coastal aquatic, protected areas is the Ramsar Convention, which maintains a database on sites of international importance (Ramsar Sites) and undertakes a periodic review of trends and needs for protected areas more broadly. National reporting through the Convention on Biological Diversity will likely continue on the basis of protected areas information being generated more efficiently through the Ramsar Convention reporting system. Difficulties arise in estimating the percentage of protected area cover for inland waters because accurate estimates of total ecosystem area are difficult to obtain. It is known, however, that a relatively high proportion is under protection (probably about 10% globally, but this figure is based on underestimates of total area). However, there is under-representation of several wetland types and geographic regions.

Organizations

18. WCS supported the establishment of coastal and marine protected areas in Argentina and Belize, and the establishment and management of marine protected areas in Indonesia, Papua New Guinea and Fiji.

19. CI provided technical and design support for the creation of marine protected areas in Ecuador, Peru and Colombia.

20. TNC earmarked US\$ 2 million from its Early Action Grants Fund to support marine protected area systems, primarily in small island developing States.

21. WWF supported the gazetting of at least 14,000,000 hectares of new marine protected areas, in over 12 countries. ^{3/} WWF has entered into a partnership with UNEP WCMC and the University of British Columbia on the expansion and refinement of marine components of the World Database on Protected Areas. WWF co-hosted an event called "Islands, Reefs and Communities: Committing to the Future" at the SIDS meeting in Mauritius in Jan 2005.

Activity 1.1.4: Conduct national-level review of potential forms of conservation and their suitability for achieving biodiversity conservation goals (time line 2006)

Parties

22. Six reporting countries indicated conducting a review of potential forms of conservation and their suitability for achieving biodiversity conservation goals. However, only Australia provided detailed information, mentioning references and websites for policy documents. Australia indicated that non-governmental organizations such as the National Trust and the Trust for Nature have explored and successfully implemented new forms of conservation that make a significant contribution to national biodiversity conservation goals. ^{4/} In addition, Australia reported on the development of "Directions for the National Reserve System – A Partnership Approach" in 2005, which provides an important review of appropriate reservation tenures included in the national reserve system, and has facilitated discussions within the State and territory governments on the potential role of non-governmental organizations, and indigenous and local communities in the development and management of the national reserve system. Australia further reported that it has investigated economic issues relating to the role of private sector

^{2/} L. Wood, L. Fish, J. Laughren, and D. Pauly (2005) A global review of marine protected areas. Presented at the First International Marine Protected Areas Congress, Geelong, Australia, 23-28 October 2005.

^{3/} However, note that the rezoning of the Great Barrier Reef alone accounts for 11 million ha.

^{4/} See: <http://www.deh.gov.au/biodiversity/publications/fact-sheets/incentives.htm>

involvement in biodiversity conservation ^{5/} and has implemented economic incentives for private sector conservation measures by amending tax laws.

Activity 1.1.5: Conduct protected area gap analysis taking into account Annex 1 of the Convention and other criteria such as irreplaceability, minimum effective size and viability requirements, integrity, and ecological processes (time line 2006)

Parties

23. Only eight reporting countries indicated that they had conducted protected-area gap analysis, and in another six countries some limited action is under way. In EC Member States the criteria stipulated in the Birds and Habitat Directives for designating “Special Protection Areas” and “Sites of Community Importance” under the Natura 2000 network largely take into account Annex I of CBD and other scientific criteria and the Member States apply it while establishing these sites. In Canada provincial governments have undertaken protected area gap analysis. Australia established the National Reserve System Programme, under the Natural Heritage Trust, for creating a comprehensive, adequate and representative system of protected areas and funded many projects to review information deficiencies and gap analysis in the reserve systems at State and territory scales. In Turkey, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry has undertaken gap analysis under the scope of different projects and in India gap analysis of protected area coverage has been conducted by a specialized agency, the Wildlife Institute of India, using various criteria.

Organizations

24. CI is assisting Madagascar in gap analyses to ensure that the new protected areas cover the ensemble of Malagasy biodiversity. CI is also supporting Bolivia, Ecuador, Cambodia, and Peru, with the completion of gap analyses.

25. TNC is providing technical assistance to Bahamas, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Grenada, Indonesia, Jamaica, Mexico, Palau, Panama, Peru, Papua New Guinea, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines to conduct national ecological gap assessments.

26. Extending and completing the representation of national and regional systems of protected areas is a core element of WWF’s global programme. To focus its global conservation action, WWF uses the concept of “Ecoregions”. In order to identify and prioritise areas for the establishment of new protected areas, WWF carried out gap analyses and threat assessments in 31 terrestrial (mostly forest) and 19 marine/coastal ecoregion complexes throughout the globe.

27. The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, in collaboration with The Nature Conservancy and Equilibrium Consultants, have prepared a guide on gap analysis for creating ecologically representative protected area systems to be published in the CBD Technical Series in the first quarter of 2006.

Activity 1.2.1: Identify and implement practical steps for improving the integration of protected areas into broader land and seascapes (time line 2008)

Parties

28. Only 13 responding countries reported identification of actions for integrating protected areas into broader land and seascapes. Of these, only six countries provided additional information in this regard. In countries such as EC member States, and Australia regulations or regional development plans require management of protected areas in the broader context to make sure that the activities in the areas adjacent to protected areas will not have negative impacts on protected areas (e.g., the “beyond sites” requirement of the EC Bird and Habitat Directives; Australia’s “Directions for the National Reserve System”). In Austria, Botswana, Canada, Denmark, and Finland, protected areas are integrated into surrounding areas

^{5/} See: <http://www.deh.gov.au/parks/commonwealth/index.html>

through a formal approach consisting of establishing ecological corridors, core areas, buffer zones and Biosphere Reserves. In Canada, a less formal approach consisting of collaboration in regional planning exercises, joint research, and participation by protected-area staff in the environmental review of projects in adjacent regions, is also being used. Canada published best practices, case-studies and examples of managing protected areas in a broader landscape. In Thailand, the ecosystem approach is being applied for management of protected areas and integrating them with the wider landscape.

29. There has been less effort in integrating marine and coastal protected areas into the surrounding seascape. According to the marine and coastal section of the third national report, only 15 responding countries reported complementing their national system of marine protected areas with sustainable management practices over the wider marine and coastal environment. Development of a comprehensive oceans policy was being considered in another 10 responding coastal countries, with some existing policies, such as the Pacific Islands Regional Oceans Policy, the Australian Oceans Policy and the Canadian Oceans Strategy, providing examples of a comprehensive strategy for managing coasts and oceans.

Organizations

30. The Seville Strategy and Statutory Framework of the World Network of Biosphere Reserves of the Man and the Biosphere of the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO-MAB) programme proposes means by which protected areas can be integrated into the broader landscape. The Seville strategy incorporates a zonation system, a multifunctional approach combining conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and an appropriate governance structure. There are now 482 biosphere reserves in 102 countries and the lessons learned in these areas would be useful for implementing the programme of work. UNESCO-MAB is preparing a Handbook on Biosphere Reserves to provide practical guidance to implement the Seville Strategy.

31. Conservation International (CI) in collaboration with partners supporting the long-term conservation planning, management, and financing of the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape project, in Panama, Costa Rica, Colombia, and Ecuador. In these countries CI is also working in the creation of a marine corridor. In Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia and Venezuela, CI is working on planning and support of trans-frontier protected areas, and in the Congo Basin CI is working extensively with partners to maintain connectivity of protected areas.

32. In order to ensure maintenance or restoration of connectivity, natural resource management and livelihood improvements in areas of high biodiversity, WWF is working on 59 selected landscapes and 15 seascapes, within priority ecoregions in four continents. WWF is currently developing a monitoring tool for tracking progress at the landscape level. The certification of timber production in production forests near protected areas complexes; the establishment of river basin commissions in key watersheds; the certification of artisanal fisheries in and around marine protected areas are some examples of such tracking tools.

33. The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity commissioned a review of the development of ecological networks, buffer zones and corridors in each of the five United Nations regions. This review is being published in the CBD Technical Series in the first quarter of 2006.

Activity 1.4.5: Integrate climate change adaptation measures in protected area planning (time line 2010)

Parties

34. Only Australia, Canada, Cuba, the Czech Republic, Germany and Poland provided information on this issue. Considering the limited ability to predict future ecological conditions in protected areas by current climate change models, many of the reporting countries indicated commissioning research projects for that purpose. Australia reported that its national biodiversity and climate change action plan identifies the potential impact of climate change on the national reserve system as one of the issues. Canada reported that climate change scenarios are being developed for each biogeographic region and national park, and that climate change indicators have been introduced as part of a suite of indicators that

are used to monitor the ecological integrity of the park system. Cuba reported on its participation in an IUCN/UNEP/GEF project on Ecosystem, Peoples and Parks. The Czech Republic reported the completion of a research project on the growth of coniferous forests in the changed atmosphere. Germany reported planning a research and development project on climate change and protected areas and consideration of climate change aspects in management planning in some nature conservation projects. Additionally, in a separately submitted case-study, the Republic of Palau reported ongoing activities to build resilience into the nationwide network of marine protected areas by protecting, with the assistance of predictive coral bleaching models, coral communities that are resistant or resilient to coral bleaching.

Organizations

35. Using Climate-Integrated Conservation Strategies (CLICS), CI is assisting South Africa, Madagascar, and Brazil in the planning and design of protected area systems for climate change adaptation. In Colombia, CI has begun a long-term project in cooperation with local partners to analyse opportunities for climate change mitigation measures in high mountain and island ecosystems (in and outside of protected areas) through measures such as mainstreaming climate-change information into ecosystem planning and management for maintenance of ecosystem services; reduction of climate-change impacts on water regulation; creation of an adaptive land-use planning model; and ecological improvement of productive agro-ecosystems. CI is planning to expand its climate change adaptation work to the protected-area systems of Ecuador, Madagascar, and Mexico in the near future.

Activity 1.5.1: Apply environmental impact assessment guidelines to projects for evaluating effects on protected areas (time line 2008)

Parties

36. With the exception of two countries, the majority (48 countries) indicated enactment of relevant policy and legislative framework on environmental impact assessment and their mandatory application to biodiversity and protected areas. Australia reported that the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act requires assessment of all proposals that are likely to have a significant impact on World Heritage Properties, Ramsar sites, nationally threatened species and ecological communities, migratory species and marine areas. Some countries (e.g., Bosnia and Herzegovina) reported that such rules are being developed under environmental protection law. In Canada at the federal level, environmental considerations are integrated into new policies, programmes and plans through the strategic environmental assessment process.

Activity 1.5.5: Assess key threats and develop and implement strategies to prevent or mitigate such threats (time line 2008)

Parties

37. Almost all responding countries reported having undertaken assessment of threats to protected areas. In general, threats to protected areas are identified as part of the preparation of the management plan for individual protected areas. Some countries (Australia and Canada) reported different degrees of assessment of threats by different jurisdictions, with some of them having more detailed assessments and some others in planning and preparatory phase. Only Canada mentioned threats to marine protected areas. Member States of the European Community are required to report the threats while submitting the proposals for Sites of Community Importance under the Habitat Directive and proposals for Special Protection Areas under the Birds Directive. The member States are also obliged to report on measures to prevent negative impact of threats in the national reports. Although the identified threats to protected areas vary from country to country because of different national circumstances, there are a number of common threats including, *inter alia*: habitat fragmentation, conflicting adjoining land use, invasive alien species, mining and oil drilling, pollution, altered fire and hydrological regimes, visitor impacts, hunting, farming practices and climate change.

Organizations

38. CI, in all the countries where it works, assesses key threats to protected areas (both direct and indirect).

39. WWF is involved in reducing major threats in the marine realm which have significant impacts on marine protected areas. Activities include reducing negative subsidies to the fishing sector around the world to reduce over-exploitation, banning destructive fishing practices in highly sensitive areas, and reducing waste with a major focus on by-catch. WWF is also working on reducing threats from shipping, oil and gas exploration, insensitive tourism practices, and adaptive management to climate change impacts.

Activity 2.1.2: Promote broad set of protected area governance types (time line 2008)*Parties*

40. Eleven reporting countries indicated having identified and promoted various governance types. However, details of such governance types have not been provided. Australia indicated that all states and territories have enabling legislation related to conservation covenants on the title of private lands. The Australian Government's Bush Care Programme focuses on the establishment of covenants on private lands and revolving funds to protect biodiversity. Canada reported that in addition to federal, provincial and territorial protected area programmes, aboriginal land claim settlements, especially in Northern Canada, are an increasing means of establishing and managing protected areas. The EC indicated that the directives of the Natura 2000 network, do not prescribe a specific governance type, although they require favourable conservation status of the species and the habitats in the network, and leave the modalities to member States. EC further mentioned that Natura 2000 network sites are not limited to public lands but also include areas privately owned by individual farmers, and conservation and land management trusts. In Germany and India, communities, NGOs and foundations manage protected areas privately. In Singapore, all protected areas are public lands, but enabling actions are under way to involve NGOs and public interest groups in the management and operation of certain protected areas.

Organizations

41. UNESCO-MAB encourages the creation of innovative governance structures for biosphere reserves and that a research team in Humboldt University (Germany) is currently carrying out a study on the institutional mechanisms in biosphere reserves in selected countries.

42. WCS has helped to enhance local governance at protected area sites in Brazil, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Guatemala, Madagascar, Peru, Republic of Congo, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, and Zambia. With support from the Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund and the participation of many local partners, WCS has sought to create a broad-based local management structure for protected areas in southern Sumatra, Indonesia. In addition, WCS activities promoted and supported traditional and local management of marine protected areas in Papua New Guinea, Indonesia and Kenya.

43. WWF has supported the creation of many Community Conserved Areas and Extractive reserves in Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico and Peru. WWF has also been working in Colombia and Central Africa to develop access and benefit-sharing legislation which includes the regulation of access to protected areas and the sharing of benefits with indigenous and local communities.

Activities 2.2.1, 2.2.2 & 2.2.3: Undertake measures for participatory planning and involvement of indigenous and local communities and other stakeholders in protected area (time line 2008)*Parties*

44. Almost all-reporting countries indicated involving relevant stakeholders in the processes of establishing and managing protected areas. Australia, Belarus, Canada, Cuba, EC member States, India, Poland, and Thailand reported that their relevant laws and policies incorporate a clear requirement for the participation of stakeholders in the planning, establishment and management of protected areas. A few

countries also reported that a process of public consultation particularly with the local communities is undertaken at national or local levels before protected areas are established. In Poland, different authorities at 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. The EC indicated that it had developed tool kits and good practice guidelines for stakeholder involvement through the LIFE-Nature fund. Some examples of key stakeholder inputs in the EC include: the campaign for corridors; influencing site selection through biogeographical seminars and bilateral consultations between the Commission and Member States; and evaluating site delineation.

Organizations

45. CI is supporting the indigenous Wai Wai community in Guyana to develop a management plan for their lands. In Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela, CI is supporting the elaboration of participatory management plans in protected areas and supporting the creation and functioning of management committees and stakeholder participation schemes.

46. WWF has led successful initiatives in Senegal, Indonesia and Fiji toward designating marine protected areas and MPA networks with full and central participation of local communities.

47. The Cameroon-based Centre for Environment and Development (CED) and United Kingdom-based Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) have assisted the Baka community in Western Dja reserve, Cameroon with training and technology to promote their participation in planning discussions with the Government on reserve areas. The Ogiek Cultural Initiative Program (OCIP) based in Mau Forest in Kenya's Rift Valley province has helped the Ogiek and other indigenous communities in their efforts to ensure their involvement in the planning and management of protected areas on their traditional lands.

Activity 3.1.1: Identify legislative and institutional gaps and barriers that impede effective establishment and management of protected areas (time line 2006)

Parties

48. Forty of the 50 reporting countries indicated identifying gaps and barriers that impede effective establishment and management of protected areas. From the information provided, some of the common constraints are: limited financial resources; lack of trained personnel; competing needs on land for agriculture and recreation; lack of intersectoral coordination; compensation issues and land tenure rights. Many countries, including developed countries noted an inadequacy in investments for protected areas. Canada, EC Member States, India, and Zimbabwe have already put in place legislation for protected areas while China is in the process of developing new legislation for protected areas, and the United Kingdom is developing a new marine bill.

Activity 3.2.1: Undertake national capacity-building needs assessment and establish capacity building programmes (time line 2006)

Parties

49. In Australia, China, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Lithuania and Slovenia an assessment of capacity needs and establishing capacity-building programmes have already been undertaken. In Canada, Costa Rica, Chile, Cuba, India, Poland and Thailand some basic assessments have been undertaken. Australia indicated that it has a number of forums amongst jurisdictions to share experiences, including capacity-building programmes and it is now working on ways and means for building capacity for non-government protected area managers. Canada indicated undertaking initial steps to develop curricula for training staff and managers of protected areas. China prepared a "Guide on Assessment of Management of Nature Reserves of National Level" for enhancing the management of nature reserves. The EC is in the process of conducting the Natura Network Initiative for capacity building-through sharing of management best practice in Natura 2000 sites.

Organizations

50. TNC is assisting Bahamas, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Grenada, Indonesia, Jamaica, Mexico, Palau, Panama, Peru, Papua New Guinea, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines in national capacity-building programmes.

51. WCS is implementing capacity-building projects in the Republic of Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Madagascar, Rwanda, Uganda, Zambia, Peru, Colombia, Brazil, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Papua New Guinea.

52. CI in collaboration with other partners is supporting capacity-building programmes for national park authorities and local communities in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Madagascar and Gabon.

Activity 3.4.2: Implement country-level sustainable financing plans that support national systems of protected areas (time line 2008)

Parties

53. Thirty responding countries indicated that the major source of funding for protected areas is national and provincial budgets. With only a few exceptions, a majority of reporting countries, including developed countries, find resources limited or very limited for establishment and management of protected areas. Very few countries reported on level of protected area funding and estimated expenditure for implementing the programme of work on protected areas. ^{6/} Some developing countries indicated supplementing the national budgetary allocations to protected areas with bilateral and multilateral funding from donors. Very few countries indicated the nature of supplementary funding mechanisms. None of the responding countries provided any detailed information about the sustainability of financing plans. Some of the supplementary funding measures reported by countries are trust funds (Indonesia, Palau, Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Peru, Panama), appropriation from tax revenues (Canada), user fee and visitor services (Botswana, Canada, Namibia), environmental taxes (Estonia), community funds (EC), income from the sale of State-owned lands (Finland) and agri-environment measures under rural development programmes (United Kingdom).

Organizations

54. Since its inception in 1992 the Global Environment Facility (GEF) had provided nearly US\$ 1.2 billion for about 200 biodiversity projects with protected-area components. The portfolio included more than 1,000 protected areas, covering about 279 million hectares. This direct contribution helped leverage about US \$3.1 billion in co-financing from project partners. Other GEF initiatives, such as the Small Grants Programme and the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, have also contributed significantly to protected areas. With a total replenishment of US\$ 3.2 million under GEF-3 (2002-2006), the biodiversity focal area received US\$ 880 million. There are four strategic priorities in the biodiversity focal area, and allocations to protected areas were around US\$ 400 million in response to guidance provided in decision VII/20 by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Given the recent studies on the global trends of biodiversity, in particular the results of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, it is expected that GEF-4 allocations to biodiversity would stay at the level of \$800 million and would go up to US\$ 1,000 million if there were a 25 per cent increase in resources in the GEF-4 replenishment.

55. As part of the GEF response to guidance on protected areas from the Conference of the Parties, UNDP has developed a project to assist GEF-eligible countries to take country-driven early actions with a fast, flexible and transparent mechanism at the level of \$10 million from GEF. The activities would be implemented over four years with up to \$250,000 per country for about 40 countries, particularly among the least developed countries and small island developing States. It was envisaged that the project would have a competitive grant-making process, simple application procedures,

^{6/} See document UNEP/CBD/COP/8/INF/6.

user-friendly guidance materials, but would not provide technical support or financial assistance to prepare applications. Applicants would need to show how proposed activities complemented all other planned biodiversity programmes and projects. The project is expected to be launched at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

56. The World Bank has supported over 240 protected-area projects since 1988 in an amount of more than US\$ 4 billion, with one third financing from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association, one-third from the Global Environment Facility, and one third from other grants and co-financing sources. The World Bank is implementing carbon finance, payment for environmental services and conservation trust funds as new financing mechanisms for protected areas. Over the past decade the World Bank assisted creation of more than 23 environment trust funds and the experience was very positive. The World Bank Group is committed to maintaining support for protected areas but increasingly is seeking opportunities to link such support to sectoral development programmes and biodiversity activities in the wider landscape, linking conservation to economic growth and poverty reduction.

57. TNC created an Early Action Grants Fund of US\$ 4 million to support early actions in the programme of work on protected areas, and to date, has made 13 grants to 11 countries (totalling US\$ 2 million), for priority actions jointly agreed by TNC and the Government. In addition, TNC is providing significant technical input, related to the financial needs assessments and sustainable finance strategies in 19 countries. In addition TNC has set aside \$180,000 to support a set of regional workshops in 2006 designed to bring together governments to discuss concrete issues and challenges related to implementation of the early action targets in the programme of work.

58. CI, in collaboration with other partners, is supporting the Governments of Madagascar, Suriname, and Guyana in the establishment of national trust funds and other sustainable financing mechanisms to ensure the long-term financial viability of protected area systems. CI is also actively working with donor countries to the Global Environmental Facility to ensure adequate funding and assistance to support the programme of work on protected areas and working to raise the overall pool of public donor assistance for protected areas in developing countries. In Peru and Ecuador, CI is working with private and public organizations to assess and elaborate financial strategies for protected areas, and in Cambodia it has supported financial needs assessments and financing plans.

59. WCS has collaborated on the development of sustainable finance business plans for multiple protected areas in Madagascar, the Republic of Congo, Rwanda, Gabon (through the UNDP-led sustainable finance pilot project), Uganda, Bolivia, Brazil, and Indonesia. WCS helped securing US\$ 28 million for the national parks in Central African countries Gabon, Republic of Congo and the Democratic Republic of Congo.

60. WWF is supporting Parties in the development of various initiatives on sustainable funding; including payments of environmental services, and trust funds. WWF supported development of sustainable financing mechanisms for marine protected areas in Philippines, Belize, and Indonesia.

61. In pursuance of activity 3.4.7 of the programme of work on protected areas, the Secretariat convened a meeting of the donor agencies and other relevant organizations to discuss options for mobilizing new and additional funding for developing countries for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas in Montecatini, Italy, on 20 and 21 June 2005. This meeting recognized some possible/potential options for mobilizing new and additional funding for developing countries for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas. The report of this meeting will be submitted as an information document for the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Activity 4.2.1: Implement appropriate methods, standards, criteria and indicators for evaluating the effectiveness of protected areas management and governance

Parties

62. Twenty reporting countries indicated that some standards, criteria and indicators are in use for evaluating the effectiveness of their protected areas management. Periods of review assessments of

effectiveness of protected areas management vary from country to country. Some countries evaluate protected areas every five or six years (EC member States), while others review their protected areas management effectiveness when the management plans for protected areas have to be revised. In Canada protected area agencies focus on measurable objectives and performance indicators for management planning, using “Ecological integrity” as an indicator. Canada has developed guidelines to evaluate effectiveness of protected areas management consistent with IUCN best-practice guidelines. China has developed “Guide on Assessment of Management of Nature Reserves” and “Technical Guidelines on Management of Oceanic Nature Reserves”. China is in the process of revising classification standards of nature reserves and drawing up the supervision and management rules of nature reserves. In EC efforts are underway for establishing a coherent monitoring activity focussing on a defined set of headline environment indicators by 2006. EC requested the European Environment Agency to develop biodiversity indicators for designated Natura 2000 sites. In Finland, Metsähallitus, the authority responsible for managing protected areas organized a comprehensive international evaluation of the management effectiveness of Finland’s protected areas.^{7/} In Indonesia “Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management” and in Thailand “Warranty of Performance Responsibility” are being used for evaluating effectiveness. In the United Kingdom the statutory conservation agencies carry out site assessment in accordance with common standards produced by the Joint Nature Conservation Committee.

Organizations

63. CI is working with the Suriname Government to develop management plans and biological monitoring plans for several national reserves. In Cambodia, CI supported the development of a management plan for the Central Cardamom's protected forest and supported development and integration of biological monitoring, community engagement and park protection activities. CI is supporting the development of integrated biological and socio-economic monitoring frameworks to evaluate protected area effectiveness in Ecuador, Mozambique, Costa Rica and Peru and have plans to extend this work in Honduras, Baja California, Cambodia, Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Papua New Guinea, in the coming years. CI has also been active in supporting local and national governments to strengthen enforcement of environmental crimes including illegal logging, poaching and fishing in countries such as Brazil, Papua New Guinea, Indonesia, and the Philippines.

64. WCS has assisted Zambia in developing comprehensive monitoring systems for community-based conservation. In the Democratic Republic of Congo, WCS is coordinating a collaborative biological monitoring programme across five World Heritage Sites. Through its collaboration with the Conservation Toolkit, the Conservation Measures Partnership, and continuing research within its Living Landscapes Programme, WCS has ongoing efforts to develop, improve and implement best practices for monitoring protected areas at the level of sites and systems.

65. WWF has been working with the IUCN/WCPA, the World Bank and other partners to update the IUCN Framework for management effectiveness evaluations. WWF has also developed and consistently applied a number of specific methodologies designed to assess protected areas management effectiveness, including a simple “Tracking Tool”, that the GEF has adopted for all its protected areas portfolio. A tool has also been developed for specific marine sites. WWF has developed the Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Areas Management (RAPPAM). WWF has provided support to the Parties to apply RAPPAM in 27 countries. IUCN/WCPA, the World Bank, TNC and WWF are supporting a study that will look into the state of the art of all protected areas management effectiveness assessments to date.

66. The University of Klagenfurt, Austria launched a Master of Science programme in Management of Protected Areas, with the objective of generating a cadre of Interdisciplinary managers for effective management of protected areas. The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity is one of the active cooperating partners of the programme and contributing to the development of curriculum taking into account the programme of work on protected areas.

^{7/} Report can be accessed at <http://www.mets.fi/mee>.

III. CONCLUSIONS

67. The period 2004-2006 constitutes the first phase of the implementation of the programme of work. This phase involves development/reviewing of “master plans” for protected areas elaborating strategies for filling ecological gaps; securing financial resources, building capacity; promoting governance arrangements; and addressing policy, legislative and institutional barriers. From the above synthesis of information the following conclusions may be drawn:

(a) The reports received indicate that progress has been made in the implementation of each of the activities of the programme of work for review by the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

(b) During the period of review, the widely implemented activities are 1.1.1 (protected area targets); 1.1.2 (expansion of existing ones and establishment of new protected areas); 1.5.1 (application of impact assessment guidelines); 1.5.5 (assessment of key threats) and 3.1.1 (identification of institutional gaps and barriers);

(c) The NGO consortium partners, especially The Nature Conservancy, Conservation International, Wildlife Conservation Society and WWF are supporting implementation of the programme of work in various regions, providing technical as well as financial support;

(d) One of the major impediments for effective implementation of the programme of work is lack of adequate financial resources. Developing countries, as well as some developed countries, cited inadequate investments in protected areas;

(e) Among the various activities, the synthesis of information on implementation of activities 1.1.5 (gap analysis), 1.2.1 (integrating protected areas into wider landscapes and seascapes), 3.4.2 (country level sustainable financing strategies), and 4.2.1 (evaluating the management effectiveness of protected areas), clearly indicated the need for capacity-building in developing countries. Undertaking a gap analysis is a significant challenge for most developing countries. Except for a few developed countries and some developing countries with technical expertise/assistance, most of the developing countries have not reported undertaking this task. There is a need to upscale the technical assistance to developing countries and to organize training workshops for capacity-building at the regional level to assist developing country Parties to effectively implement these activities;

(f) In the case of activity 3.4.2 (country-level sustainable financing plans), in addition to training workshops, there is also an urgent need to initiate some pilot projects to test some of the available financial strategies in different country situations to gain confidence for their replication in other countries;

(g) Dissemination of lessons learned and best-practice guidelines hold the key for other activities, such as 1.1.4 (potential forms of conservation), 1.4.5 (climate change considerations), 2.1.2 (governance types), 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 (participatory planning and management), and 3.2.1 (capacity-building needs assessments and programmes).

(h) Building strong institutional arrangements for implementing the programme of work is essential. Other biodiversity conventions, institutions, and Governments need to create synergy and partnerships with international non-governmental organizations, facilitating implementation of the programme of work.

IV SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS

The Conference of the Parties may wish to consider adopting a decision along the following lines:

Recognizing the need for adequate technical, institutional and financial capacities for the implementation of the programme of work, and

Emphasizing the importance of continuing to strengthen collaboration with relevant partners, in particular the partners and other collaborators listed in appendix to decision VII/28,

1. *Notes* the progress made in the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas, as reported in the note by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/COP/8/29);
2. *Notes* also the significant contribution of NGO consortium partners, especially The Nature Conservancy, Conservation International, Wildlife Conservation Society and WWF to the implementation of the programme of work in various regions in terms of technical and financial support;
3. *Recognizes* that a major shortcoming in the current review has been the limited availability of detailed information on activities of the programme of work, including the insufficient number of reports submitted by the time of this review;
4. *Recognizes* the need for the systematic collection of information on implementation of the programme of work on protected areas to facilitate the assessment of progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target and other global goals, *encourages* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to provide timely and quality information on the implementation of the programme of work;
5. *Adopts* recommendation 1/2 of the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas on options for mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work by developing countries, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition ;
6. Also *adopts* the Montecatini financial considerations for protected areas recognized by the meeting of donor agencies and other relevant organizations held in Montecatini, Italy, on 20 and 21 June 2005, contained in an information document;
7. *Recognizing* that the review of the implementation of the programme of work for the period 2004-2006 identified capacity-building constraints for developing countries especially for activities 1.1.5 (gap analysis), 1.2.1 (integrating protected areas into wider landscapes and seascapes), 3.4.2 (country- level sustainable financing strategies), and 4.2.1 (evaluating the effectiveness of protected areas management), *requests* the Executive Secretary to organize, subject to availability of necessary funds, training and information-exchange regional workshops to build capacity and accordingly *encourages* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to support and implement such capacity-building activities;
8. *Urges* Parties and other Governments to increase the effective protection of marine and inland water ecosystems, paying particular attention to (i) integrating marine protected areas into the wider seascape; and (ii) increasing collaborative activities to protect priority ecosystems in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, in the context of international law, including the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, and based on scientific information;
9. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to continue developing and strengthening collaboration with other organizations, institutions and conventions as a way to promote synergy and avoid unnecessary duplication and facilitate effective implementation of the programme of work on protected areas, including compiling and disseminating through the clearing-house mechanism, best-practice guidelines, lessons learned and success stories on protected areas;
10. *Urges* international non-governmental organizations and IUCN/World Commission on Protected Areas to further consolidate their efforts and come out with a coordinated action plan for supporting the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas and report to the Conference of the Parties at its ninth meeting.
