



CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/6
20 June 2005

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING
GROUP ON PROTECTED AREAS
First meeting
Montecatini, Italy, 13-17 June 2005

REPORT OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON PROTECTED AREAS

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION	3
ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING.....	4
1.1. Welcome addresses by the Mayor of Montecatini, the Minister of the Environment of Italy, and the Director General of the Directorate of Nature Protection of the Government of Italy.....	4
1.2. Opening statement by the Chair on behalf of the President of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity	5
1.3. Opening statement by Mr. Hamdallah Zedan, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity	5
1.4. Statements by the representatives of convention secretariats	6
1.5. Statements by representatives of regional groups	7
1.6. Statements by the representatives of indigenous and local communities and non-governmental organizations	8
1.7. Keynote presentations	9
ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS.....	9
2.1. Election of officers.....	9

/...

2.2.	Adoption of the agenda	10
2.3.	Organization of work	10
ITEM 3.	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	11
3.1.	Options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.....	11
3.2.	Options for mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas by developing countries, particularly in the least developed and the small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition.....	16
3.3.	Further development of “tool kits” for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas.....	18
ITEM 4.	CONSIDERATION OF THE PROCESS FOR THE REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK.....	20
ITEM 5.	PREPARATION FOR THE SECOND MEETING OF THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON PROTECTED AREAS	21
5.1.	Draft provisional agenda	21
5.2.	Date and venue.....	21
ITEM 6.	OTHER MATTERS	21
ITEM 7.	ADOPTION OF THE REPORT	22
ITEM 8.	CLOSURE OF THE MEETING	23

Annexes

I.	RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON PROTECTED AREAS AT ITS FIRST MEETING	24
II.	PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE SECOND MEETING OF THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON PROTECTED AREAS.....	48

INTRODUCTION

1. At its seventh meeting, held in Kuala Lumpur in February 2004, the Conference of the Parties adopted in its decision VII/28 a programme of work on protected areas. In paragraph 25 of that decision, the Conference of the Parties decided to establish an Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas to support and review the 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, subject to the availability of voluntary contributions.
2. In response to that request, the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas was held from 13 to 17 June 2005 in Montecatini, Italy, with generous financial support from the Government of Italy, as announced at the final plenary session of the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties (see UNEP/CBD/COP/7/21, para. 493).
3. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following Parties to the Convention and other Governments: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, European Community, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Palau, Panama, Peru, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia.
4. Observers from the following United Nations bodies, specialized agencies, convention secretariats and other bodies also attended: Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), International Maritime Organization (IMO), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, UNEP Caribbean Environment Programme.
5. The following were also represented by observers: `Ilio`ulaokalani Coalition, ACTIONAID, Asamblea Nacional Indígena Plural por la Autonomía-Umbral Axochiatl, Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact, Asociación Ixacavaa De Desarrollo e Información Indígena, Association des Femmes Peuples Autochtones du Tchad, Association Sahel Solidarité, Autorità di Bacino del Fiume Arno, BirdLife International/Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, CARE International, Centre for Indigenous Fisheries, Conservation International, Conservation International Madagascar, Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF), CUTGANA - University of Catania, E.C.O. Institute for Ecology, Egyptian-Italian Environmental Cooperation Program, Environmental Liason Centre International, Equilibrium, European Academy of Bolzano, European Bureau for Conservation Development, European Centre for Nature Conservation, European Parks Observatory / Legambiente Ligure, Federación de comunidades Nativas Fronterizas del Putumayo, Federazione Italiana dei Parchi e delle Riserve Naturali, FEDERPARCHI, Forest Peoples Programme, Fundación para la Promoción del Conocimiento Indígena, Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF), Greenpeace, Guyra Paraguay, Humboldt University - Berlin, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, International Institute for Environment and Development, International Network for Tourism Against Poverty, International Ranger Federation,

Islands Protected Areas Task Force, Istituto Centrale per la Ricerca Scientifica e Tecnologica Applicata al Mare, Istituto PANGAEA - ONLUS, Italian Federation of Parks and Natural Resources, Italian National Agency on New Technology, Energy and the Environment, IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation, IUCN—The World Conservation Union, IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, Kalpavriksh, Karen Network for Culture and Environment, KFW Development Bank, Lega Italiana Protezione Uccelli, Legambiente O.N. L.U.S., Madagascar Foundation for Protected Areas and Biodiversity, Ministerial Conference on Forest Protection in Europe, Ministero delle Comunicazioni, Ministry for the Environment and Territory, Netherlands Center for Indigenous Peoples, Ngarameliwei Inc., Nordic Saami Institute, Ocean Mammal Institute, Ole Siosiomaga society (OLSSI), Organization of Concerned Loacan Indigenous People's for Peace, Justice and Development, OSILIGI - OIPA, Pacific Indigenous Peoples Environment Coalition, Parbatya Chattagram Jana-Samhati Samiti, Parco Nazionale del Gran Sasso e Monti della Laga, Parco Regionale Della Maremma, Partners of Community Organizations, Pastoralist Integrated Support Programme/WAMIP, Politiche Agricole e Forestali, Provincia di Perugia, Quechua-Aymara Association for Sustainable Livelihoods, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, Regione Toscana, Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON), The Danish 92 Group, The Nature Conservancy, Twin Dolphins Inc., Università di Macerata, Università di Pisa, Università di Roma, University of British Columbia, University of Padova, University of Rome - La Sapienza, Whale Nursery (Hawaii, USA), Wildlife Conservation Society, WWF—World Wide Fund for Nature.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

6. The meeting was opened at 11 a.m. on Monday, 13 June 2005.

1.1. Welcome addresses by the Mayor of Montecatini, the Minister of the Environment of Italy, and the Director General of the Directorate of Nature Protection of the Government of Italy

7. At the opening plenary session of the meeting, Mr. Ettore Severi, Mayor of Montecatini, welcomed participants to Montecatini Terme, which was honoured to be hosting the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group. He said that the issues to be discussed ensured that the meeting would mark a decisive point in the process of evaluating, comparing and developing ways of protecting the environment and coordinating its management for the benefit of future generations. He concluded by expressing the hope that the meeting would be a fruitful one and that Montecatini would have the opportunity to host another such meeting in the future.

8. The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group also heard welcome addresses by H.E. Mr. Altero Matteoli, Minister of the Environment of Italy and Mr. Aldo Cosentino, Director General, Directorate of Nature Protection of Italy.

9. Mr. Matteoli recalled that the Millennium Declaration had highlighted the themes and commitments that would contribute to sustainable development. The Millennium Development Goals had been defined through a process of concertation and consultation among the major international organizations and had marked the first step in implementing the Millennium Declaration. The international conventions drawn up under the auspices of the United Nations Environment Programme, in particular, the Convention on Biological Diversity represented the operational instruments for achieving common objectives. The current meeting was an important event in the history of the Convention inasmuch as it underlined the indissoluble link that existed between the conservation of biological diversity and protected areas. In Italy, following the efforts made in recent years, which had involved all stakeholders, protected areas represented some 20 per cent of the country. In addition, Italy was rich in biodiversity at all levels. In the international sphere, in collaboration with France and Monaco, it had established the Pelagos Sanctuary for cetaceans, 50 per cent of which was in international waters. As part of the Pan-European initiative “Countdown 2010”, a monitoring process was under way to evaluate the

effectiveness of protected areas in terms of conservation of biological diversity by using indicators. Regarding the identification of integrated and sectoral strategies, the critical aspects emerging from the confrontation between environmental issues and those in other areas such as agriculture, health, the economy, development, public awareness and community participation, were being identified so that an innovative series of actions and instruments could be developed as an effective contribution to achieving the objectives of the programme of work on protected areas.

10. Mr. Cosentino said that the environmental policy of the Italian Government focused on the essential link between the protection of biodiversity and the management of protected areas. The Convention on Biological Diversity mandated protected areas with a key role in the preservation of natural resources, living organisms and ecosystems. In Italy, the exigencies and opportunities represented by protected areas were adapted to the development of local communities, while maintaining their history, tradition and culture. The management of protected areas was a dynamic process: it encouraged use of local resources and initiatives for human and social development, while ensuring that the natural resources were safeguarded for subsequent generations. The participation of local communities in that endeavour was essential, as was the involvement of other sectors. Although many human activities had a negative impact on the sea, no specific international legal instrument existed to protect the biodiversity in such zones. A major challenge for the Working Group would be to ensure that the benefits conferred by protected areas stretched beyond their boundaries and beyond nations. Biodiversity was an international treasure that must be protected by all Governments, by common actions towards shared objectives. The proposed “tool kits” for implementation of the programme of work represented an important step in that direction.

1.2. *Opening statement by the Chair on behalf of the President of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity*

11. Mr. Letchumanan Ramatha (Malaysia), Chair of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group, speaking on behalf of Dato' Sothinathan Sinna Goundar, President of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, thanked the Government of Italy for generously hosting the meeting and extended his thanks to the people of Montecatini for their excellent hospitality. He said that the meeting highlighted the invaluable role of protected areas in implementing the Convention. A well-managed, representative system of protected areas was one of the best tools available for reaching the target of achieving by 2010 a significant reduction in the current rate of biodiversity loss. As a first step, there was a need to increase the coverage of the current protected-area systems. Particular attention needed to be paid to those ecosystem types that were currently under-represented, including different types of inland water ecosystems, temperate grassland ecosystems, and marine and coastal ecosystems. In particular, the time had come to focus on protecting marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. There was also a need to consider ways to increase the benefits of protected areas to local people. Thought had to be given to ways of financing new protected areas and making existing protected areas sustainable in the long term. Noting that many countries had put in place successful and well-managed protected-area systems, he expressed the hope that the experience gained and the tools developed would be shared and applied widely so that the Convention's programme of work on protected areas could be implemented as effectively as possible.

1.3. *Opening statement by Mr. Hamdallah Zedan, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity*

12. At the opening plenary session of the meeting, Mr. Hamdallah Zedan, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, welcomed participants and expressed his appreciation to the Government and people of Italy and to the city of Montecatini for hosting the meeting. He thanked the Government of Germany for the funding they had contributed to enable the participation of representatives from developing countries and countries with economies in transition. He also expressed

his gratitude to the Government of Italy for their support for the participation of indigenous and local communities and other Governments and organizations for supporting their representatives.

13. Outlining the tasks before the Working Group, he said that the first was to consider options for establishing protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. Less than 0.5 per cent of the marine environment was protected and that low coverage was a matter of concern, especially at a time when marine biodiversity was continuing to decline rapidly. If that decline was to be halted, appropriate protection had to be afforded to the 64 per cent of the oceans located in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. The second matter before the Working Group was the mobilization of financial resources. A recent study had estimated that an effective terrestrial and marine protected area system at the global level would cost more than \$25 billion per year, compared with a current total global expenditure estimate of less than \$7 billion. Options that might help to generate additional funding included: the rationalization of taxation and subsidy systems; fees and payment for environmental-service schemes; partnership initiatives with the private sector; increased international assistance; and sustainable financing plans through building diverse funding portfolios. The third substantive item before the Working Group was the further development of tool kits for protected areas. Although an impressive range of tool kits had already been developed, they did not address all the needs of the programme of work. In order to decide which tools might need to be further developed as a priority, the Working Group was invited to consider the existing tool kits and examine whether they meet the relevant requirements of the programme of work.

14. The final item on the agenda was the review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas. The Conference of the Parties had requested the Working Group to consider reports from the Parties and others on progress made in that respect. However, because the third national reports to be submitted under the Convention were not yet available, the Working Group was invited to consider at the current meeting the process for undertaking the review of implementation. The actual review could then be taken up at the next meeting, by which time it would be possible to draw on the information contained in those third national reports.

15. In conclusion, he drew attention to special edition of the *CBD News* entitled “*Protected areas for achieving biodiversity targets*” that had been prepared by the Secretariat with support from the Government of Italy in preparation for the meeting and to the publication *Toward Effective Protected Area Systems: An Action Guide to Implement the Programme of Work on Protected Areas*, which had been published by the Secretariat in collaboration with the IUCN-World Commission on Protected Areas and The Nature Conservancy and with financial support from the Government of Netherlands.

1.4. Statements by the representatives of convention secretariats

16. At the opening plenary session of the meeting, the Working Group also heard statements by the representatives of the World Heritage Centre and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals.

17. The representative of the World Heritage Centre said that over 170 natural properties were included on the World Heritage List for their biodiversity values. The aim of the World Heritage Programme was to develop the World Heritage Sites into models of best practice for the designation, planning and management of protected areas. To that end, the World Heritage Centre, in conjunction with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, other United Nations agencies and international NGOs, had been coordinating pilot programmes in a variety of world heritage sites and biosphere reserves with a view to addressing such issues as the management of protected areas in regions of armed conflict and the management of ecotourism in the interest of local economies and livelihoods. The items on the agenda of the current meeting were extremely important and highly relevant to the work programme of the World Heritage Centre, which included a global initiative on the sustainable financing of protected areas. A

marine world heritage programme was also being developed and further collaboration with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) on matters of sustainable development was anticipated. Moreover, the World Heritage Centre was working in conjunction with the World Conservation Union (IUCN) to develop various tool kits, including one for management planning. In conclusion, he said that the best practices cited in the programme of work on protected areas could be piloted in the natural World Heritage Sites, which would have a positive impact on regional, national and global networks, thus contributing to achievement of the global biodiversity targets and the Millennium Development Goals.

18. The representative of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species (CMS) said that the CMS Secretariat stood ready to collaborate with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity in reviewing the potential for regional cooperation under CMS with a view to linking protected area networks across international boundaries and potentially beyond the limits of national jurisdiction through the establishment of migratory corridors for key species. CMS was working within different political and administrative contexts to reduce the loss of stretches of migratory ranges. From the outset, the Parties to CMS had understood and worked with the concept of connectivity of ecosystems. CMS laid a legal foundation for conservation measures, through extended migratory ranges, that could then be embedded and defined in detailed conservation and management plans. In addition, the transboundary character of CMS and its offspring Agreements had made it possible to set legal conservation standards and promote international cooperation for the conservation of animals migrating across national frontiers and their natural pathways. Through partnership projects of varying sizes, CMS was promoting collaboration among Parties concerned with key species, thereby protecting pathways and enhancing the connectivity of ecosystems. Such projects were heavily reliant on the establishment of protected areas for the conservation of species and protection of their habitats. CMS was committed to providing assistance to Parties for the creation of effective regional networks of protected areas, together with multi-country coordination mechanisms designed to support the establishment and effective long-term management of such networks. In that context, it was in a position to contribute effectively to all programmes of work under the Convention on Biological Diversity and hence to achievement of the biodiversity targets.

1.5. Statements by representatives of regional groups

19. At the opening session of the meeting, statements were made by the representatives of Ghana, on behalf of the African Group, Panama, on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group, and the Netherlands, on behalf of the European Union and Bulgaria and Romania.

20. The representative of Ghana, having recalled the involvement of his delegation in previous, related meetings, listed the issues that the African countries considered to be of particular importance. The first was agreement on new and additional financial resources for the establishment of new protected areas and enhanced management of existing ones. They also looked forward to establishment of a special trust fund for protected areas management and linkage of protected areas management to achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, in particular goals 1 and 7, for poverty alleviation and environmental sustainability. They further looked for fostering of partnerships and regional cooperation for cross-border protected areas. There should be intermediate action for protected areas, especially for those in the marine environment beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, and coast guards should be strengthened to help them patrol marine protected areas.

21. The representative of Panama said that the current meeting was of the greatest importance to the countries of her region, which had the greatest biological diversity in the world. The meeting should focus on protected areas in national and sub-national systems of jurisdiction, such as the Regional Strategic Programme of Work for Central America drawn up in 2005. Protected areas could achieve sustainability provided that they had instruments and resources which were adequate and flexible and which involved the participation of civil society and local communities.

22. The representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania, said that the programme of work on protected areas should contribute as much as possible to all three objectives of the Convention. Nevertheless, while the Parties to the Convention should agree on priorities, targets, principles, guidelines, criteria and common objectives, the selection and management of protected areas and ecological networks should involve all relevant stakeholders. The programme of work would be effective only if the proposed actions were precise and realistic, with clear deadlines and responsibilities. Urgent action must be taken to prohibit destructive fishing and other practices in certain marine areas, and the ad hoc open-ended informal working group on marine biodiversity established by the United Nations General Assembly should formulate the terms of reference for an intergovernmental negotiating committee to ensure conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. Existing regional fisheries management organizations should be strengthened and new ones established. Methods for identifying sites that required protection should be recommended, and a register created of representative networks of protected marine areas. Concrete, comprehensive needs assessments should be performed, and developing countries should make implementation of the programme of work a political priority. He hoped that the Working Group would agree on measures and criteria for evaluation of implementation and a schedule for stepwise assessment and reporting.

1.6. Statements by the representatives of indigenous and local communities and non-governmental organizations

23. At the opening plenary session of the meeting, the Working Group also heard statements from the representatives of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, on behalf of indigenous and local communities, and the NGO Consortium, on behalf of non-governmental organizations.

24. The representative of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity expressed his gratitude to the Government of Italy and the Secretariat for assistance in organizing the preparatory meeting in Montecatini on 11 and 12 June, which had brought together indigenous peoples from Latin America, Africa, Asia, Russia and the Pacific. He expressed the Forum's belief that issues relating to protected areas were inextricably linked to the rights of indigenous peoples. The establishment of protected areas around the world had resulted in, and continued to result in, the dispossession of the lands, territories and resources of indigenous peoples and the loss of their cultures and livelihoods. The World Parks Congress in 2003 had established a new paradigm for protected areas and the decisions taken at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties had recognized the rights of indigenous peoples. It was therefore particularly disappointing to note that none of the documents prepared for the current meeting mentioned respect for the rights of indigenous peoples. The latter had first-hand experience of matters related to protected areas and their contribution could help to achieve the objectives of the Convention.

25. The representative of the NGO Consortium said that it was particularly important for the meeting to underscore the contributions of protected area systems to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and poverty reduction, and to ensure that financing for the implementation of the programme of work was addressed at the MDG+5 summit to be held in September 2005. Parties might create, by the end of 2005, a GEF-led early action fund of \$20 to \$50 million which would combine additional GEF and bilateral resources and support key early targets. They might also agree on convening a financial commitments conference in 2006 to address longer-term and sustainable funding issues. To support the review of implementation of the programme of work, the Working Group should consider developing an evaluation matrix and a step-by-step evaluation process linked to the timetables in the programme of work. The good tools that existed should be applied immediately, but feedback, especially from the developing countries, was needed on how to improve them and on how to develop new tools when they were needed. As for high-seas marine protected areas, there was a need to identify those requiring urgent protection and promote the necessary management bodies, under United Nations oversight, to address the management inadequacies of marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

1.7. Keynote presentations

26. At the opening plenary session of the meeting, the Working Group heard keynote presentations by Mr. Nik Lopoukhine, Chair of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, and Mr. Carlos Salinas, Director of the Peruvian System of Protected Areas in the National Institute of Natural Resources (INRENA).

27. Speaking on the theme “Protected areas: key issues for implementation of the programme of work”, Mr. Lopoukhine said that protected areas represented a major shift in land use and now covered nearly 12 per cent of the Earth’s land surface. There was a strong relationship between the creation of protected areas and alleviating poverty; the challenge, however, was to convince funding sources that creating protected areas contributed to human needs. There was a clear shortfall in funding for implementation of the programme of work, and increased financial support was critical; donor countries should achieve the target of giving a larger share of new funds towards environmental sustainability, and the Global Environment Fund should be replenished with adequate funding dedicated to protected areas. Countries should assess their needs and make commitments based on clear priorities. Better business plans for protected areas were essential. Many tools for achieving the goals existed, at international and local levels, and implementation should not wait for the development of more tools. Relevant stakeholders had to be involved, including indigenous and local communities. Under item 4 of the agenda, the Group would explore options for protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. For that purpose, priority areas had been identified and pursued. The Working Group should give clear, practical recommendations to the Conference of the Parties and indicate the bridge towards the Summit on the Millennium Development Goals, showing that investment in protected areas was vital to that process.

28. Mr. Salinas focused his presentation on the financial implications of implementing the programme of work on protected areas and options for mobilizing financial resources. He said that his country, which had a coastline of 2,500 kilometres with a wide variety of marine coastal systems as well as sizeable tracts of mountainous land and tropical forest, believed that the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity was of vital importance. Peru’s system of protected areas involved new paradigms for their management that involved greater participation by the public and private sector as well as by local government and civil society. There was integrated management of biological and conservation corridors and an integrated programme of work, which was currently being made more representative, with greater decentralization to local governments, a training strategy, monitoring and follow-up, and the setting up of public and private partnerships. Peru had 61 national protected areas covering 17.7 million hectares, with a further 2.5 million hectares of protected forests. The requirements of the system for the period 2005-2014 covered short-term funding, institutional consolidation, the improvement of capacity, the introduction of more effective management and the consolidation of longer-term financial sustainability. There was currently a shortfall of \$27.5 million for the fulfilment of the programme of work, and among the options for the mobilization of resources were the private sector, the gradual introduction of tourism tariffs, payment for environmental services, further continued support from non-governmental organizations, partnerships with local governments, administration contracts and the involvement of volunteers. Peru was now engaged in consolidating the system of protected areas it had been developing over the past decade.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

2.1. Election of officers

29. At the opening plenary session of the meeting, it was agreed that the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties would serve as the Bureau for the meeting. It was further agreed that Ms. Chaweewan Hutacharern (Thailand) would act as Rapporteur.

2.2. Adoption of the agenda

30. At the 1st plenary session of the meeting, on 13 June 2005, the Working Group adopted the following agenda, on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/1):

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - 2.1. Election of officers;
 - 2.2. Adoption of the agenda;
 - 2.3. Organization of work.
3. Substantive issues:
 - 3.1 Options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction;
 - 3.2 Options for mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas by developing countries, particularly in the least developed and the small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition;
 - 3.3 Further development of “tool kits” for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas.
4. Review of implementation of the programme of work:
 - 4.1. Consideration of reports on implementation from Governments and organizations;
 - 4.2. Ways and means to improve implementation of the programme of work.
5. Preparation for the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas:
 - 5.1 Draft provisional agenda;
 - 5.2 Date and venue.
6. Other matters.
7. Adoption of the report.
8. Closure of the meeting.

2.3. Organization of work

31. At the opening plenary session of the meeting, on 13 June 2005, the Working Group approved the organization of work of the meeting, on the basis of the suggestions contained in annex II to the annotations to the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/1/Add.1).

32. Accordingly, it was decided to establish two sub-working groups: Sub-Working Group I, under the chairmanship of Ms. Karen Brown (Canada), to consider agenda items 3.1 (Options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction) and 3.3 (Further development of tool kits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas); and Sub-Working Group II, under the chairmanship of Mr. Orlando Rey Santos (Cuba) to consider items 3.2 (Options for mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas by developing countries, particularly in the least developed and the small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition) and 4 (Review of implementation of the programme of work). It was further agreed that the remaining items would be taken up directly in plenary.

Work of the sessional sub-working groups

33. Sub-Working Group I held nine meetings, from 13 to 17 June 2005. The Sub-Working Group adopted its report (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.1/Add.1) at its 9th meeting, on 17 June 2005. The report of the Sub-Working Group has been incorporated into the present report under the appropriate agenda items.

34. At its 2nd meeting, on 14 June 2005, Sub-Working Group I heard a brief report from Mr. Orlando Rey Santos (Cuba), Chair of Sub-Working Group II, on the progress made in the consideration of agenda items 3.2 and 4.1 by Sub-Working Group II.

35. At its 3rd and 6th meetings, on 15 and 16 June 2005, Sub-Working Group I heard brief reports from the Secretariat on the progress being made by Sub-Working Group II in its consideration of agenda items 3.2 and 4.1.

36. Sub-Working Group II held seven meetings, from 13 to 17 June 2005. The Sub-Working Group adopted its report (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.1/Add.2) at its 7th meeting, on 17 June 2005. The report of the Sub-Working Group has been incorporated into the present report under the appropriate agenda items.

37. The reports of the sub-working groups were presented to the plenary of the Working Group at the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 June 2005. Statements made at that time are reflected in paragraphs 160-163 below.

ITEM 3. SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

3.1. Options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction

38. Sub-Working Group I took up agenda item 3.1 at its 1st meeting on 13 June 2005. In considering the item, the Sub-Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/2) and information documents on scientific information on biodiversity in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/INF/1), legal aspects for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/INF/2) and on case-studies on the establishment of marine protected areas beyond national jurisdiction (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/INF/3).

39. Ms. Jackie Alder, Sea Around Us Project, Fisheries Centre, University of British Columbia, presented the map-based analysis of biodiversity in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction, as contained in the scientific study on biodiversity in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/INF/1). She expressed gratitude to the European Union and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for funding the study. There could be little doubt that marine biodiversity was under threat and that fishing constituted the main threat. Marine species were extremely

vulnerable, and there was poor understanding of marine biodiversity. Describing the methodology used for the study, she said that the high seas had been defined as marine areas outside exclusive economic zones or territorial seas, and the study had reviewed the distribution of species in those marine areas. The distribution had been adjusted using two gradients, as it was known that the number of species declined from the equator to the poles and also east and west of Indonesia. Maps showing the distribution of species richness of invertebrates, fish, reptiles, seabirds and mammals had been drawn up showing that there was a wide diversity of species and that seamounts were important areas of biodiversity. The areas where marine vertebrate species were most threatened had been identified on the basis of the maps.

40. Regarding future work, she said that more information would assist decision-making but would require substantial financial resources, although in her view it would not greatly alter the picture. However, the desirability of further information should not serve as an excuse to delay action.

41. Ms. Lee Kimball, IUCN—The World Conservation Union, introduced the study on the legal aspects of the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/INF/2) and thanked the European Union and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for their financial support. She said that the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea was the over-arching framework for the legal regime for marine areas. The seabed beyond national jurisdiction did not start at the same point for all States as exclusive economic zones and the continental shelf had to be taken into account. Freedom of the high seas did not mean that any activity could take place there as there were general obligations to protect and preserve the marine environment, to conserve and manage high seas living resources, as well as other rules of international law. The basic obligations laid down in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea were in a sense building blocks to be used for further legal developments. Decision VII/5 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity described what constituted a marine protected area and there were several other relevant global and regional conventions that contained a whole range of instruments of protection, but no global instrument provided protection from more than one threat.

42. Any regime for areas beyond national jurisdiction raised several problems: the exercise of control beyond national jurisdiction; the need to regulate activities and to coordinate; action by States not party to the instrument; flag-State jurisdiction; and enforcement on the high seas. There had to be an agreed global framework with goals and criteria and enforcement measures. The study before the meeting considered how existing instruments could be utilized and reviewed the options for new mechanisms and instruments.

43. A discussion ensued involving the two previous speakers and the representatives of the Bahamas, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Iceland and Monaco; the representative of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and the representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

44. The Secretariat then formally introduced the documentation under item 3.1, as listed in paragraph 38 above.

45. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Iceland, India, Japan, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), Norway, Thailand and the United Republic of Tanzania.

46. Statements were also made by the representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

47. A statement was made by the representative of Greenpeace.

48. At the 2nd meeting, on 14 June 2005, the Chair proposed the establishment of a group of Friends of the Chair to consider criteria for the establishment of marine protected areas and invited representatives of the European Union and Canada in particular, together with any other countries with specific interests, to take part.

49. The representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania) presented some possible ecological and practical criteria and considerations for the identification and selection of high-seas protected areas, which he proposed should be circulated as an informal working paper.

50. At its 3rd and 4th meetings, on 15 June 2005, the Sub-Working Group considered a draft recommendation submitted by the Chair on options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

51. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, the Bahamas, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Ghana, Iceland, India, Japan, Kiribati, Malaysia, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand, Norway and Spain.

52. Statements were also made by the representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (DOALOS), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

53. Statements were made by the representatives of Greenpeace, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and IUCN.

54. At its 5th meeting, on 15 June 2005, held without interpretation, the Sub-Working Group continued its consideration of the draft recommendation on the understanding that approval of text would be deferred until a meeting with interpretation was held.

55. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia (also speaking on behalf of Costa Rica), Denmark, Iceland, Japan, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand and Norway.

56. Statements were also made by the representatives of Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

57. The representative of IUCN also made a statement.

58. The Chair undertook to revise the text in the light of the amendments proposed.

59. At its 6th meeting, on 16 June 2005, the Sub-Working Group took up an addendum to the draft recommendation, proposing the convening of an inter-sessional meeting of experts to consider ecological criteria for the identification of potential areas for protection in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

60. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Iceland, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand and Norway.

61. Statements were also made by the representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO).
62. A statement was made by the representative of WWF.
63. The Sub-Working Group continued its consideration of the addendum at its 7th meeting, on 16 June 2005.
64. Statements were made by the representatives of Canada, Ghana, Iceland, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania) and Norway.
65. The Sub-Working Group decided to defer further consideration of the addendum in order to allow time for consultations.
66. Also at its 7th meeting, on 16 June 2005, the Sub-Working Group considered the revised text of the initial draft decision submitted by the Chair.
67. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Iceland, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand, Norway and Peru.
68. Statements were made by the representatives of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and IUCN.
69. At its 8th meeting, on 16 June 2005, the Sub-Working Group further considered the revised text submitted by the Chair.
70. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador (on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), France, Iceland, Japan, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand and Norway.
71. Statements were also made by the representatives of the International Maritime Organization and the United Nations Division of Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea.
72. At its 9th meeting, on 17 June 2005, the Sub-Working Group considered a further revision of the text of the draft recommendation.
73. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Ghana, Iceland, Japan, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand, Norway and Peru.
74. The representatives of Iceland, Japan and Norway stated that they could not accept any reference to an implementing agreement to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, even as an option or within square brackets.
75. The representative of Iceland, in response to a statement by another representative that the Sub-Working Group had not had time to discuss the paragraphs that remained in square brackets, said that those paragraphs had in fact been discussed extensively. They remained in square brackets because consensus had not been reached on their content.
76. The representative of Norway stated there was no provision in the current international legal framework that would allow for Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas in the high seas.

77. After the exchange of views, the Sub-Working Group agreed to transmit the draft recommendation, as orally amended, to the plenary as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.6.

78. Also at the 9th meeting, following the consultations on the addendum containing a draft recommendation on the convening of an inter-sessional meeting of experts (see paragraph 65 above), and in the absence of consensus, the Sub-Working Group decided to take no further action on the draft recommendation.

79. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 June 2005, the Working Group took up draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.6.

80. The Working Group discussed what procedure should be followed as far as the text in square brackets was concerned.

81. The representative of Argentina, supported by the representatives of Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica and Chile, expressed the view that, as there appeared to be little possibility of reaching consensus on the bracketed text at the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group, the text should be transmitted directly to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties so that a decision could be taken at the highest level.

82. The representative of Panama, speaking on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group, emphasized that the agreement of all was needed for the creation of a marine protected area beyond national jurisdiction, which should be the subject of a binding agreement appropriately negotiated and adopted within the framework of international law. The creation of any marine protected area beyond national jurisdiction should be the subject of an implementing agreement to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. Latin American and Caribbean countries, despite their lack of financial resources, were updating their legislation, strategies, policies, plans and programmes for national and local protected areas. Those countries reiterated their commitment to the programme of work on protected areas under the Convention on Biological Diversity and expressed the hope that the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group would include issues that were priorities for her Group. She concluded by expressing support for transmission of the text to the Conference of the Parties.

83. The representative of Iceland expressed the view that transmitting a text that contained square brackets to the Conference of the Parties would send the wrong signal. His delegation's position was that the text in brackets referred to issues that were outside the mandate of the Working Group.

84. The representative of Norway said that it would be preferable to resume discussion of the text at the second meeting of the Working Group.

85. The representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), supported by the representatives of Djibouti, Gabon, Ghana, Liberia and Guinea, suggested that the text as a whole be discussed at the second meeting, but that if agreement could not be reached, the text remaining within brackets should be forwarded to the Conference of the Parties.

86. The representative of Argentina said that she could not accept the removal of bracketed text for transmission to the Conference of the Parties. The text constituted a whole and should be considered in its entirety either at the second meeting of the Working Group or by the Conference of the Parties.

87. The representative of Panama, speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, said that she could not support the proposal made by the representative of the Netherlands. In her view, the text in its entirety should be considered by the Conference of the Parties.

88. The representative of Brazil endorsed the view expressed by the representative of Panama. If, however, the text were to be considered at the Working Group's second meeting, it should remain entirely within square brackets.

89. The Chair requested those who had expressed divergent views to hold informal consultations and report back to the Plenary.

90. Following the informal consultations, the representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania, proposed that the Working Group should adopt the text as it currently stood and refer it to the second meeting of the Group, on the understanding that only those parts of the text which remained within square brackets would receive further consideration with a view to reaching consensus and that no more than a limited period of time—possibly half a day— would be devoted to that task. Subsequent deliberations on the outcomes of the scientific expert workshop to be held in Canada should not, however, be precluded as a result.

91. On that understanding, the Working Group adopted draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.6 as recommendation 1/1, the text of which is contained in annex I to the present report.

3.2. *Options for mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas by developing countries, particularly in the least developed and the small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition*

92. Sub-Working Group II took up agenda item 3.2 at its 1st meeting, on 13 June 2005. In considering the item, the Sub-Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on options for mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/3).

93. Introducing the item, the representative of the Secretariat said that, in paragraph 29 of decision VII/28, the Conference of the Parties had suggested the tasks that needed to be undertaken by the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group. Those tasks included, *inter alia*, the exploration of options for mobilizing as a matter of urgency through different mechanisms adequate and timely financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work by developing countries, particularly in the least developed and the small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition, in accordance with Article 20 of the Convention, with special emphasis on those elements of the programme of work requiring early action. Accordingly agenda item 3.2 addressed that task.

94. Under the item, the Working Group was invited to explore options for mobilizing adequate and timely financial resources, through various mechanisms, for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas by developing countries, particularly by the least developed and the small island developing States among them, and countries with economies of transition, with an emphasis on those elements requiring early action.

95. To assist the Working Group in its consideration of the agenda item, the Executive Secretary had prepared the note on options for mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/3). The note reviewed published information on the actual financing of protected areas from multilateral and bilateral institutions/agencies, private foundations and non-governmental organizations. Options for mobilizing financial resources for protected areas were proposed.

96. The outcome of the Working Group's consideration of the item would be considered by the donors' meeting to be held immediately after the 1st meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

97. Statements were made by the representatives of Australia, Bolivia, Canada, Ecuador, Grenada, India, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand, Palau, Switzerland, Thailand and Uruguay.

98. Statements were also made by the representatives of Care International, Conservation International, Greenpeace, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and The Nature Conservancy.

99. At its 2nd meeting, on 14 June 2005, the Sub-Working Group took up a draft recommendation prepared by the Chair.

100. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Gabon, Grenada, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mexico, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru and Tunisia.

101. Statements were also made by the representatives of Care International and the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity.

102. At its 3rd meeting, on 15 June 2005, the Sub-Working Group resumed its discussion of the draft recommendation prepared by the Chair.

103. Statements were made by the representatives of Angola, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mexico, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Peru, Romania, the Russian Federation, Swaziland, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia and Uruguay.

104. Statements were also made by the representatives of Greenpeace and the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity.

105. At its 4th meeting, on 15 June 2005, the Sub-Working Group resumed its discussion of the draft recommendation prepared by the Chair.

106. Statements were made by the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Gabon, Guatemala, Indonesia, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mexico, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama (on behalf of GRULAC), Peru, Romania, the Russian Federation, Swaziland, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Uruguay.

107. Statements were also made by the representatives of Greenpeace, The Nature Conservancy and the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity.

108. At its 6th meeting, on 16 June 2005, the Sub-Working Group discussed a revision of the draft recommendation prepared by the Chair.

109. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gabon, Liberia, Madagascar, Mexico, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Romania, the Russian Federation, Thailand, Tunisia and Uruguay.

110. A statement was also made by the representative of Greenpeace.

111. After an exchange of views, the Sub-Working Group agreed to transmit the draft recommendation, as amended, to plenary as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.4.

112. At the 7th meeting of the Sub-Working Group, on 17 June 2005, the Chair announced that the language in draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.4 would be adjusted to bring it into line with the language used in the draft recommendations prepared by Sub-Working Group I.

113. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting on 17 June 2005, the Working Group considered the draft recommendation 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 (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.4).

114. The representative of Australia, supported by the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Iceland and New Zealand, said that regrettably his delegation must formally object to the adoption of draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.4, as well as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.3, on consideration of the process for review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas (see para. 145 below). Australia was fully supportive of the programme of work laid out in decision VII/28 of the Conference of the Parties, but was uncomfortable with the Working Group stepping outside that decision and requesting actions and decisions from Parties without the mandate of the Conference of the Parties. Both draft recommendations purported to do that. If Parties felt strongly that inter-sessional groups should have the capacity to make decisions or to commission additional work on their own, that issue should be debated and agreed by the Conference of the Parties.

115. The representative of New Zealand wished to record her country's dismay that procedural issues continued to overshadow the important work of the Convention. New Zealand also wished to record its support for the progress made on both issues covered in the draft recommendations, but considered it highly regrettable that a decision could not be taken because its procedural concerns could not be accommodated. It was absolutely critical to New Zealand that the Convention operate according to clear and transparent rules of procedure.

116. The representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania) said that the European Union had difficulty in understanding the position adopted by previous speakers. The Working Group had been given a mandate to support and review the programme of work and report to the Conference of the Parties. That meant that it had a mandate to implement certain activities which were needed and which included such recommendations as those inviting Parties or others to undertake particular activities. That had been the practice in other working groups under the Convention and had always been accepted by the Conference of the Parties.

117. The Chair requested those who had expressed divergent views to hold informal consultations and report back to the plenary.

118. Following the informal consultations, an amended version of draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.4 was adopted as recommendation 1/2, which is contained in annex I to the present report.

3.3. Further development of "tool kits" for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas

119. Sub-Working Group I took up agenda item 3.3 at its 2nd meeting, on 14 June 2005.

120. Under this item, Sub-Working Group I considered the note by the Executive Secretary on tool kits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/4).

121. The representative of the Secretariat introduced the note by the Executive Secretary on the further development of tool kits, which contained draft recommendations on further development, the provision of adequate financial resources and other support, enhancing the availability of existing tool kits and their updating.

122. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Guinea-Bissau, India, Liberia, Malaysia, Monaco, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay.

123. Statements were made by the representatives of the UNEP - Caribbean Environment Programme and UNESCO.

124. Statements were also made by the representatives of Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) International Secretariat, Greenpeace, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, IUCN and The Nature Conservancy.

125. The Chair concluded the second meeting by stating that on the basis of interventions she would prepare a Chair's text for the consideration of the Sub-Working Group.

126. At its 6th meeting, on 16 June 2005, the Sub-Working Group considered the draft recommendation on further development of tool kits submitted by the Chair.

127. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina (on behalf of GRULAC), Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Gambia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand, Norway and the United States of America.

128. A statement was also made by the representative of UNESCO.

129. Statements were made by the representatives of Greenpeace, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and The Nature Conservancy (also speaking on behalf of Conservation International).

130. After the exchange of views, the Sub-Working Group agreed to transmit the draft recommendation, as orally amended, to the plenary as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.2.

131. At the second plenary session of the meeting, the Working Group considered a draft recommendation on further development of "tool kits" for the identification, management monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.2), to which a number of editorial changes were made by the Secretariat.

132. The representative of Australia objected to inclusion of one of those changes, which consisted of adding "Human-wildlife interface" to the list of gaps in the existing tool kits in subparagraph 1 (h). He agreed to a suggestion by the representative of Liberia to replace the phrase by "Interrelation between plants and animals"; however, the representatives of India and Swaziland requested that that phrase "Human-wildlife interface" be retained.

133. The Working Group agreed to a proposal by the representative of Australia that the phrase be placed in square brackets until agreement had been reached. On that understanding, draft recommendation

UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.2 was adopted as recommendation 1/3. The text of the recommendation as adopted is contained in annex I to the present report.

ITEM 4. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROCESS FOR THE REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK

134. Sub-Working Group II took up agenda item 4 at its 1st meeting, on 13 June 2005. Introducing the item, the Secretariat said that, in paragraph 29 of decision VII/28, the Conference of the Parties had suggested the tasks that needed to be undertaken by the Working Group. Those tasks, *inter alia*, included: consider reports from the Parties, academia, and scientific organizations, civil society and others on progress in the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas, compiled by the Executive Secretary; and to recommend to the Conference of the Parties ways and means to improve implementation of the programme of work on protected areas.

135. In paragraph 30 of decision VII/28, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and invited other Governments and relevant organizations to report to the Executive Secretary on the implementation of that decision and the programme of work prior to each meeting of the Conference of the Parties until 2010, *inter alia*, through the third national reports and successive reports. In addition, in November 2004, the Executive Secretary had invited relevant organizations and convention secretariats to provide information concerning their activities to implement the programme of work.

136. In order to assist the consideration of this item, the Executive Secretary had prepared the note on consideration of the process for the review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/5). The note included proposals on the process and guidelines for the review of the implementation. At its first meeting, the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group would be invited to consider the process for the review of the implementation of the programme of work.

137. The Sub-Working Group might wish to discuss the ways and means for the review of the implementation of the programme of work. The review and the development of recommendations on ways and means to improve implementation would be undertaken at the second meeting of the Working Group.

138. Statements were made by the representatives of Grenada, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania) and New Zealand.

139. Statements were also made by the representatives of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and the Nature Conservancy.

140. At its 5th meeting, on 16 June 2005, the Sub-Working Group took up a draft recommendation under this item prepared by the Chair.

141. Statements were made by the representatives of Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Gabon, Grenada, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mexico, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania), New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Peru, Switzerland and Tunisia.

142. Statements were also made by the representatives of Greenpeace and the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity.

143. After an exchange of views, the Sub-Working Group agreed to transmit the draft recommendation, as amended, to plenary as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.3.

144. At the 7th meeting of the Sub-Working Group, on 17 June 2005, the Chair announced that the language in draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.3 would be adjusted to bring it into line with the language used in the draft recommendations prepared by Sub-Working Group I.

145. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 June 2005, the Working Group took up draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.3.

146. The representative of Australia, supported by the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Iceland and New Zealand, registered a formal objection to the text, as reflected in paragraph 114 above. The ensuing discussion, which also related to draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.4, is reflected in paragraphs 115-117 above.

147. Following informal consultations, an amended version of draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.3 was adopted as recommendation 1/4, which is contained in annex I to the present report.

ITEM 5. PREPARATION FOR THE SECOND MEETING OF THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON PROTECTED AREAS

5.1. Draft provisional agenda

148. The Chair introduced document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.7, which contained the draft provisional agenda for the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas.

149. In response to a request from the representative of Brazil, speaking on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group, to allow Parties time to comment on the draft provisional agenda, the Secretariat said that it would shortly be posted on the website of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. At that time, any Party would be able to comment on the provisional agenda.

150. On that understanding, the draft provisional agenda contained in document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.7 was approved and is attached as annex II to the present report.

5.2. Date and venue

151. The Chair announced that the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas would be held in Montreal from 5 to 9 December 2005.

ITEM 6. OTHER MATTERS

Message to the G8 Summit

152. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 June 2005, the Chair invited the Working Group to consider a draft message submitted by the Bureau for transmittal to the G8 Summit to be held in Gleneagles from 4 to 6 July 2005 (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.8).

153. Speaking on a point of order, the representative of Australia said that the text had become available only minutes before the beginning of the session, leaving no time for consideration of the content.

154. The representatives of Brazil and Argentina concurred with the view expressed by the representative of Australia.

155. The Working Group subsequently adopted a revised version of draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.8 as recommendation I/5, which is contained in annex I to the present report.

Tribute to the Government and people of the Italian Republic

156. The Chair also invited the Working Group to consider document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.7, which contained a draft submitted by the Chair containing a tribute to the Government and people of Italy.

157. The Working Group adopted the tribute to the Government and people of Italy in document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.5 as recommendation I/6. The text of the recommendation is contained in annex I to the present report

ITEM 7. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

158. The present report was adopted at the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 June 2005, on the basis of the draft report prepared by the Rapporteur (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.1) and the reports of the two sub-working groups (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.1/Add.1 and 2).

159. Introducing the report of Sub-Working Group I, Ms. Karen Brown (Canada), Chair of the Sub-Working Group I, said that there had been general support for the need to protect vulnerable marine biodiversity beyond national jurisdiction and willingness to make progress on that issue. An informal group that had discussed criteria for identifying priority marine areas for protection had concluded that existing criteria should be compiled and synthesized as a basis for future work, and the Government of Canada had offered to host a workshop on the issue.

160. The representative of Norway asked that the following statement be included in the report of the meeting:

“Norway would like it to be reflected in the report of this meeting that, although we welcome the increased focus on biodiversity in the high seas, we believe that the possible establishment of marine protected areas in the high seas needs to be consistent with international law. It is the law of the sea, including the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, which provides the legal framework for regulating activities in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction.

“The possible establishment of high-seas marine protected areas should be based on a practical system involving relevant organizations and conventions, and to this end States need to further explore, and use, the opportunities already present. The enhancement of knowledge and scientific information on biodiversity is an important element in this regard.

“We are not convinced, however that there is a need to establish a new legal framework specifically pertaining to the establishment of high-seas marine protected areas. To negotiate amendments to existing international law would be time-consuming and difficult, and it would take valuable resources and focus away from implementing specific measures with practical results. Rather than focusing on the development of new instruments States should cooperate to utilize existing possibilities. Existing knowledge shows that the main threat to biodiversity in the oceans is unsustainable fishing practices, and the first priority must be to adjust these practices.

“As a consequence we continue to believe that the establishment of a new legal framework should not be reflected in the final outcome (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.6) from this Working Group.

“On a more general note, Norway would like to draw attention to paragraph 12 of decision II/10 of the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity, which requested the Executive Secretary of the Convention, in consultation with the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea of the Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations, to undertake a study of the relationship between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) with regard to the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources on the deep seabed (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/8/Inf.3/Rev.1 of 22 February 2003). Paragraph 70 of Chapter C.1 ‘The jurisdictional scope of the Convention on Biological Diversity’, reads as follows: ‘As regards areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, the provisions of the Convention only apply to processes and activities carried out under a Contracting Party’s jurisdiction or control. In these areas, States have no territorial jurisdiction and, consequently, Contracting Parties may only regulate processes or activities under their jurisdiction and, consequently, Contracting Parties may only regulate processes or activities under their jurisdiction or control that may have an impact on the components of biological diversity in these areas. For example, Parties could regulate activities of their nationals in such areas. In effect, Parties have no obligation with respect to the conservation and sustainable use of specific components of biological diversity in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction’.”

161. The representative of Iceland associated himself with that statement.

162. Introducing the report of Sub-Working Group II, Mr. Orlando Rey Santos (Cuba), Chair of the Sub-Working Group II said that the two draft recommendations adopted by the Sub-Working Group (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/L.3 and L.4) represented a careful compromise which had been reached as a result of lengthy and intensive negotiations. They should therefore be adopted as they stood.

163. The representative of the Netherlands (speaking on behalf of the European Union, Bulgaria and Romania) requested the inclusion of the following statement in the report of the meeting:

“The European Union considers that both sub-working groups have made progress, but would like to express its disappointment about their inability to finalize the text of the recommendations on the two main agenda items. With respect to Sub-Working Group II, we believe that further progress in finding a consensus on some issues was within reach, if we had taken advantage of all procedural and logistical arrangements at our disposal. We insist on the fact that this should by no means set a precedent for the working arrangements of other meetings. The programme of work on protected areas is of great importance for achieving the 2010 target and we should not waste time in pursuing this target. Finally, we would like to express our concern that the generous support of Italy as the host country of this meeting, as well as all other contributors, has not been taken advantage of to its full extent.”

ITEM 8. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

164. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair of the Working Group declared the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group closed at 10.10 p.m. on Friday, 17 June 2005.

Annex I

**RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON
PROTECTED AREAS AT ITS FIRST MEETING**

CONTENTS

<i>Recommendation No.</i>	<i>Page</i>
1/1. Options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction	25
1/2. 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.....	30
1/3. Further development of tool kits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas	34
1/4. Review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas: consideration of the process for review	38
1/5. Message to the G8 Summit	46_Toc106879298
1/6. Tribute to the Government and people of the Italian Republic.....	47

1/1. Options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction

The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas,

Recalling paragraphs 29 and 30 of decision VII/5 of the Conference of the Parties, which note that there are increasing risks to biodiversity in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction and that marine and coastal protected areas are extremely deficient in purpose, numbers and coverage in these areas, and agreeing that there is an urgent need for international cooperation and action to improve conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, including the establishment of further marine protected areas consistent with international law, and based on scientific information, including areas such as seamounts, hydrothermal vents, cold-water corals and other vulnerable ecosystems,

Recalling also paragraph 29 of decision VII/28, by which the Conference of the Parties suggested that the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas should explore options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, consistent with international law, including the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, and based on scientific information,

1. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to transmit the outcomes of the work of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas for the information of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group established by paragraph 73 of General Assembly resolution 59/24;

2. *Invites* the Executive Secretary to compile a list of existing ecological criteria for identification of potential marine for protection and biogeographical classification systems based on submissions received from the Parties, other governments and organizations at the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas, and those received by the Executive Secretary no later than 31 August 2005, and *requests* the Executive Secretary to synthesize the information received, for reference by the Parties;

3. *Expresses its appreciation* to the Government of Canada for its initiative to host a workshop of scientific experts to review and assess existing ecological criteria and biogeographical classification systems and to initiate work on the development of a set of scientifically rigorous ecological criteria that could be used to identify potential sites for marine protected areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction; and *invites* the Executive Secretary to transmit the results of the workshop to the Parties, in advance of the next meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas for its consideration;

4. *Recommends* that the Conference of the Parties:

(a) *Welcomes* the scientific and legal studies prepared for the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Protected Areas (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/INF/1 and UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/INF/2), and *expresses its appreciation* to the European Community for its financial assistance in commissioning these studies;

(b) *Notes* that the establishment of marine protected areas in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction should be undertaken in the context of international law, including the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, as well as in the context of the best available scientific information, the precautionary approach and the ecosystem approach, and that the management of biodiversity in these areas should aim to achieve a balance between conservation and sustainable use objectives;

(c) *Recognizes* that the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea sets out the legal framework within which all activities in oceans and seas must be carried out;

(d) *Recognizes also* that marine protected areas are a tool to help achieve conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, and that in any decision to establish marine protected areas their utility would first have to be evaluated in relation to other available tools.

(e) *Takes note* of the findings of the preliminary scientific study (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/INF/1), which intended to identify priority biodiversity areas;

(f) *Requests* the Executive Secretary to work with relevant governmental, intergovernmental, nongovernmental and scientific institutions to synthesize, with peer review, the best available scientific studies on priority areas for biodiversity conservation in marine areas, and to update the peer-reviewed synthesis periodically, and make it available to the Conference of the Parties;

(g) *Recognizes* that the best available scientific information indicates that seamounts and cold-water coral reefs are ecosystems under severe threat, while also recognizing ongoing efforts to protect these vulnerable ecosystems on a case-by-case basis including the application of the precautionary approach, *urges* Parties to cooperate to take urgent action to protect those under most immediate threat, and *further urges* Parties to take urgent action to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control, do not cause damage to those ecologically significant cold-water coral reefs and seamounts;

(h) *Notes* that the scientific study (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/INF/1) highlighted that, in some cases, data on ecosystems, habitats and species in marine areas is still lacking, and *requests* research organizations, funding agencies and other relevant organizations to collaborate in filling these and other identified data gaps, including, *inter alia*:

- (i) The distribution of all Red-Listed marine species;
- (ii) Information on distribution of seamounts and cold-water coral reefs, their ecosystem functioning and the ecology of associated species, from a range of different depths, in particular from poorly sampled areas;
- (iii) Information on distribution of other habitats as listed in annex I, table 1, to the note by the Executive Secretary on options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/2) and the ecology of associated species;
- (iv) Studies of the ecology of marine species and their behaviours that determines their vulnerability to human activities, including those listed in annex I, tables 2 and 3, to the note by the Executive Secretary on options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/2);
- (v) Socio-economic information [including from indigenous and local communities] regarding use of marine biodiversity resources; and
- (vi) Studies, including information on evaluation of marine species, such as those being carried out by IUCN;

(i) *Further requests* the Executive Secretary to explore options with relevant international and regional organizations, including research organizations and indigenous and local communities, to verify and elaborate on the spatial database of biodiversity in marine areas building upon the database that was developed as part of the scientific study. This database should also include:

- (i) Information on marine areas, including, *inter alia*, habitat types and species, particularly threatened or declining species or habitats identified on a biogeographic basis;
 - (ii) Data on existing regional and national systems of marine protected areas and marine ecological networks;
- (j) *Agrees* that the identification, designation and management of marine protected areas would benefit from the participation of stakeholders and, indigenous and local communities where necessary and appropriate;
- (k) *Notes* that actions to protect biodiversity beyond national jurisdiction are a complement to activities to protect biodiversity within national jurisdiction, and that there is, in many cases, an ecological connectivity between these areas;
- (l) *Recognizing* the importance of national and regional marine protected areas as one of the essential tools and approaches for protecting biodiversity, [*urges* Parties, as appropriate, to undertake actions towards the establishment of such marine protected areas as a matter of priority, subject to the availability of financial resources];
- (m) *Notes* that the establishment of marine protected areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction could benefit from ecological criteria for the identification of areas for protection;
- (n) *Notes* that in addition to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, there are a large number of other relevant global and regional legal instruments that, together with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, collectively constitute the existing international legal framework for biodiversity in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction; that within this framework there are significant opportunities for promoting the establishment of marine protected areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction;
- (o) *Notes* that there is a need for improved multisectoral coordination and integration for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction;
- (p) *Also notes* that there is currently lack of implementation, compliance and enforcement of the international legal framework with respect to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction;
- (q) *Further notes* that there is a need for cooperation and coordination among various forums for the establishment of marine protected areas consistent with international law, and *urges* Parties to work towards such cooperation and coordination. Further notes that the establishment of such marine protected areas may in turn have a positive effect on the cooperation between the various forums;
- (r) *Notes* that illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing is one of the greatest threats to marine ecosystems and biodiversity and *urges* States to work domestically, in regions where they have an interest, and globally to develop and implement measures to combat unreported and unregulated fishing;
- (s) *Identifies* the following as options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas [beyond national jurisdiction]:
- (i) Parties and other States use the existing legal framework as a basis to cooperate as a matter of priority and to make [early] progress in the establishment of marine protected areas [beyond the limits of national jurisdiction], [taking into account paragraph 4 (f) above];

- (ii) Recognizing the respective mandates of each organization and need for cooperation in order to achieve their desired objectives, the Parties could cooperate with and work together as appropriate to ensure that, *inter alia*, United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the International Seabed Authority, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Maritime Organization, the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species, and the International Whaling Commission, as well as other relevant global and regional legal instruments including regional fisheries management organizations, regional seas conventions and action plans enhance their capacity to effectively implement existing legal instruments that respond to key threats to biological diversity in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, including the establishment of marine protected areas;
- [(iii) Parties to regional fisheries management organizations to establish regional fisheries management organizations where there are currently none, and strengthen the conservation powers of existing regional fisheries management organizations, where current management powers are inadequate in that respect.]
- [(iv) Regional fisheries management organizations to act in accordance with the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks (“the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement”) and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations;]
- [(v) A regular and periodic review and assessment of the performance of regional fisheries management organizations in implementing the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement amongst States Parties to that Agreement;]
- [(vi) Consideration by member Governments of the International Maritime Organization in conformity with international law to extend Particularly Sensitive Sea Area designations to marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction and, in proposing Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas for approval by the International Maritime Organization, to take into account areas of importance for biodiversity;]
- [(vii) Apply the relevant provisions of the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement to high seas discrete fish stocks;]
- (viii) Take measures to implement paragraph 66 of General Assembly resolution 59/25, to take action urgently, and consider on a case-by-case basis and on a scientific basis, including the application of the precautionary approach, the interim prohibition of destructive fishing practices, including bottom trawling that has adverse impacts on vulnerable marine ecosystems, including seamounts, hydrothermal vents and cold water corals located beyond national jurisdiction, until such time as appropriate conservation and management measures have been adopted in accordance with international law;
- [(ix) Consider in the appropriate forum the development and adoption of an implementing agreement to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity including the establishment and management of marine protected areas in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction;]

[(t) *Requests* the Executive Secretary, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication and to facilitate harmonizing outcomes to work in collaboration with other organizations with a mandate for and active in this field and processes, [[to facilitate the development of a framework for a more comprehensive approach to integrated ocean management] to ensure conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction];]

[(u) *Invites* Parties to propose the development and adoption of an implementing agreement to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea for [the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity] [the establishment and management of marine protected areas] in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction].]

1/2. 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

[The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas]

[The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas recommends that the Conference of the Parties:]

1. *Invites Parties:*

(a) To organize, as a matter of urgency, national—and as appropriate, regional—protected-area financing roundtables of donors and recipient Governments, for the purpose of advancing progress on national and regional-level sustainable finance strategies and the achievement of target 3.4 in the programme of work on protected areas adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its seventh meeting;

(b) To consider prioritizing the need to undertake immediately a national protected-area values and benefits initiative, in accordance with activities 3.1.2 and 3.4.6 of the programme of work;

(c) To assess, document and communicate the socio-economic values of protected-area systems, focusing in particular on the critical contribution to poverty alleviation and achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), including specific evaluations of the impacts of the existing variety of funding mechanisms and protected area programmes on indigenous and local communities;

(d) To effectively address protected-areas financing in the outcomes of the Millennium Review Summit in September 2005, including clear recognition of the critical role of protected areas in achieving all the Millennium Development Goals;

(e) To design and elaborate financial sustainability plans for protected-area systems that incorporate a diversity of national, regional and international funding sources and mechanisms and include:

- (i) Analysis of current financial income and expenditures, overall financial needs and gaps;
- (ii) Carry out an analysis of the administrative, legal and management-related barriers and address these in order to create an enabling environment and to facilitate financial sustainability;
- (iii) Concrete and comprehensive needs assessments to create better insight in the necessary resources for activities;
- (iv) Definition and quantification of protected area goods and services, and potential sources of investment to pay for such goods and services;
- (v) Screening and feasibility analysis of potential financial mechanisms; and
- (vi) Sustainable national financing plans for protected areas;

(f) To consider the following options in designing financial sustainability plans for ensuring long-term financial support for the system of protected areas:

- (i) National trust funds that support protected areas systems: to be used for channelling, *inter alia*, multilateral and bilateral grants, tourism-based revenues,

debt-for-nature swap proceeds, and contributions from non-governmental organizations;

- (ii) Funding mechanisms connected to socially and environmentally sustainable economic activities that have direct links to protected areas, while maintaining the integrity of the protected area and related ecosystems;
- (iii) Funding mechanisms that channel the economic values of ecosystem services at local, regional and global levels;
- [(iv) Redirection of perverse subsidies to support protected areas (possibly starting with those sectors having clearest linkages e protected areas);]
- (v) Further explore options for innovative international finance mechanisms to support the programme of work, taking into account the conclusion of national and international initiatives to combat hunger, reduce poverty and increase development funding;
- (vi) Retention, by local or national protected-area management authorities, of visitor fees and other revenues generated from protected areas; and
- (vii) Increase, where possible, of national and local government budgets for protected-area management;

(g) To support institutional strengthening and improved governance of protected-areas management authorities and to build capacities of protected-area officials to undertake sound financial planning and management;

[(h) To explore options for linking protected area funding to the Clean Development Mechanism under the Kyoto Protocol process, as a means of further enhancing the synergy between biodiversity and climate change;]

(i) To establish an ongoing dialogue on financing, including - if needed - a conference on long-term financing, in order to meet goal 3.4 of the programme of work by 2008, and to achieve a thorough assessment of this Goal by the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and to focus one of the future meetings of the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Protected Areas on the matter of financial commitments, taking into account financial plans and needs assessments;

(j) To note the need that all activities are carried out with the full and effective participation of, and full respect for the rights of, indigenous and local communities consistent with national law and applicable international obligations;

2. *Requests* the Conference of the Parties to:

(a) *Invite* the United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank, the United Nations Environment Programme and other Implementing Agencies of the Global Environment Facility, along with other relevant organizations, to help facilitate and financially support the protected-area financing roundtables referred to in paragraph 1 (a) above;

(b) *Invite* international and regional development banks to incorporate criteria for biodiversity conservation and/or sustainable use in their guidelines for investment projects which have potential impacts on the financial, ecological and social sustainability of protected areas;

(c) *Invite* the Global Environment Facility:

- (i) To approve and operationalize a new expedited project for fast-disbursing and flexible grant funding to support early action activities of the programme of work

(e.g., 2006 and 2008 timelines), between US\$ 25 and 50 million, taking into account the identified national needs at a scale to sufficiently support developing countries, particularly the least developed and small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition;

- (ii) To provide full-sized and medium-sized GEF grants designed to support national and regional systems of protected areas and the targets and timetables in the programme of work and focus more sharply on protected area systems and sustainability strategies;
 - (iii) To increase the envelope of GEF biodiversity funds for protected areas in the GEF-4 business plan, taking into account the goals and targets in the programme of work and GEF's niche in providing system-wide protected-areas support; and
 - (iv) To review and revise, as appropriate, its protected areas' policies in relation to indigenous and local communities;
- (d) *Urge* developed countries:
- (i) To support a strong fourth replenishment for the Global Environment Facility, taking into account the goals and targets in the programme of work and the need for new and additional funding to support this work in developing countries, particularly the least developed and small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition;
 - (ii) To provide enhanced support for conservation endowment funds and other long-term financing mechanisms, such as debt-for-nature swaps, that have proven to be particularly successful in supporting recurrent protected area management costs;
 - (iii) To take reasonable steps to assess, where practicable, Official Development Assistance programmes in order to consider ways to make development aid better support the goals and objectives of protected areas; and
 - (iv) To support projects aimed at long-term financial sustainability of protected area systems;
- (e) *Urge* developing countries and countries with economies in transition to evaluate their development priorities, as appropriate, ensuring that implementation of the programme of work on protected areas is a priority in the national development strategies;
- (f) *Urge* international non-governmental organizations, private foundations and private sector:
- (i) To provide developing countries, particularly the least developed and small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition, financial and technical support to implement the programme of work;
 - (ii) To support the design and implementation of capacity-building programmes on sustainable financing mechanisms for protected area managers in developing countries; including through such partnerships as the Conservation Finance Alliance and the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas;
 - (iii) To provide targeted financial support to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity initiatives of indigenous and local communities, including capacity-building activities, to promote the implementation of the programme of work; and

- (iv) To develop partnership initiatives and institutional arrangements for financing the implementation of the programme of work;

3. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To encourage an ongoing and focused dialogue on the financing of the programme of work by:

- (i) Reporting, as far as feasible and using existing information, on the progress regarding the follow-up to this recommendation to each meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Protected Areas in preparation of each meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and

- (ii) Inviting the donor community and relevant organizations to take part in this ongoing dialogue and to participate in the meetings of the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Protected Areas;

(b) To make existing conservation-finance tools available through the clearing-house mechanism and other means;

(c) To explore options, and report to the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting, on means to strengthen the use of innovative mechanisms to develop public-private partnerships to promote private investments of sustainable projects in protected areas, in cooperation with the international financial institutions;

(d) To submit the present recommendation for the information and for further action of participants in the donors' meeting to be held in Montecatini, Italy, following the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas; and

(e) To organize, subject to the availability of financial resources, regional workshops on ways and means to make full use of currently available sustainable-funding tools.

1/3. Further development of tool kits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas

The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas

1. *Notes with appreciation* the background document prepared by the Executive Secretary on further development of toolkits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/4), and *recognizes* that:

(a) Toolkits are sets of instruments to facilitate the systematic implementation of the programme of work on protected areas in accordance with the ecosystem approach, and may facilitate the identification of criteria for protected areas;

(b) Toolkits provide overall voluntary guidance and Parties are free to develop their own specific criteria, targets and methods whilst using toolkits;

(c) The development and dissemination of toolkits should be demand-driven, they should be user friendly, adaptive, understandable, action-oriented and respond to the needs of Parties including at the local level;

(d) There is need for greater emphasis on the applicability and validation of available toolkits and to facilitate access to existing toolkits, not just their further development;

(e) Capacity-building is required in many areas, including:

- (i) The use of toolkits at the regional, national and local levels;
- (ii) The application and/or development of regional, national and local toolkits, to include case-studies and lessons learned with the goal of refining the tools, especially by local and indigenous communities;
- (iii) The translation and availability of toolkits in diverse, including local, languages, including for increasing community awareness of the use of toolkits; and
- (iv) The exchange of experiences and lessons learned amongst countries and communities in particular amongst those with similar ecological and economic circumstances;

(f) The tools reflected must be adapted to local conditions and, wherever appropriate, locally available toolkits should be preferred;

(g) While selecting tools for addressing specific issues in respect of protected-areas, existence of toolkits with wider relevant objectives (such as sustainable use) may be kept in view;

(h) Gaps in the existing toolkits need further consideration, but some existing gaps may include:

- (i) Marine and freshwater ecosystems, and arid and semi-arid areas;
- (ii) Management and financial planning;
- (iii) Eco- and cultural tourism;
- (iv) Data management and spatial (GIS) modelling;

- (v) Integration of protected areas into broader land- and seascapes and sectors;
- (vi) Achieving favourable conservation status and coherence including the establishment of ecological networks*;
- (vii) The assessment and valuation of goods and services provided by protected areas and cost-benefit analysis of management options;
- (viii) Appropriate responses in the event of a natural or man-made disaster;
- (ix) How to promote better implementation of activities in order to reach common objectives and targets of the various multilateral environment agreements;
- (x) Links between protected areas and sustainable development including the Millennium Development Goals;
- (xi) Planning for and responding to climate change, including mitigation and adaptation measures;
- (xii) Social participation and co-management of protected areas;
- (xiii) The inclusion of effective participation of indigenous and local communities, including their traditional knowledge, in the identification of, and management actions for, protected areas;
- (xiv) Analysis of gaps at the national level;
- (xv) Restoration of protected areas, including the control and eradication of invasive alien species;
- (xvi) Large intact or relatively unfragmented areas;
- (xvii) Respecting the rights of indigenous and local communities;
- (xviii) Cultural and spiritual values;
- (xix) Governance and participation;
- (xx) Community-conserved areas;
- [(xxi) Human-wildlife interface;]

(i) The work on toolkit development and dissemination under the Convention on Biological Diversity should complement existing initiatives in this area;

(j) Toolkit development should identify gaps in relation to the programme of work on protected areas under the Convention on Biological Diversity;

(k) There is a need to test the validity and applicability of toolkits, including the ease with which they can be accessed by potential users; and

(l) In some instances, codes of conduct for protected-area managers may be necessary to complement tools in order to strengthen adherence to good practice;

2. *Recommends* that the indicative list of available toolkits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of protected areas (tables 2 and 3 of the note by the Executive Secretary on further development of tool kits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/4))

* In the context of the programme of work on protected areas, a generic term used in some countries and regions, as appropriate, to encompass the application of the ecosystem approach that integrates protected areas into the broader land- and/or seascapes for effective conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use.

be considered as a provisional list which should be continually developed, upgraded and improved and, accordingly, *invites* the Executive Secretary to:

- (a) Update the list to include suggested amendments and additions presented during the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas;
- (b) Request Parties, other Governments, other conventions, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, indigenous and local communities and others to submit additional information in order to improve the list, including in languages other than English;
- (c) Develop and implement mechanisms to involve the participation of local and indigenous communities in the development of the list;
- (d) Make the list and all available information available through the clearing-house mechanism, and by other means, in order to provide a user-friendly, interactive and searchable database of tools, case-studies and lessons learned that users can easily access and contribute to and, linked with the specific activities of the programme of work on protected areas, where possible by biogeographic region;
- (e) Enhance the list with information on validation and application of available toolkits based on practical experiences with using the toolkits and to explore ways and means of monitoring their use in order to identify how the instruments in the toolkits have been tested and how successful each has been, by, *inter alia*, seeking case-studies and other inputs;
- (f) Revise the structure of the list in terms of its division by topic and sub-topic in order to improve information on the purpose for which the toolkits can be used;
- (g) Establish a list of experts, including at the national level and from indigenous groups, in protected areas, in accordance with the programme of work on protected areas, for consultation and the exchange of information on the implementation of the programme of work including, *inter alia*, the development of new tools, publications, case studies and lessons learned in different countries and contexts;
- (h) Report on progress in these respects to the next meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas and for the information of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and
- (i) Transmit the full contents of the present recommendation to the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting;

3. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to work closely with the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas in coordinating the further review and development of toolkits, in cooperation with relevant research institutes, non-governmental organizations; and indigenous and local communities;

4. *Recommends* that the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting:

- (a) *Invite* Parties and other Governments to use the toolkits as appropriate in the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas;
- (b) *Urge* Parties, other Governments, funding and other relevant organizations to support, in accordance with demand identified by seeking inputs from potential users of toolkits, a “Tools Outreach Programme”, including in accordance with paragraph 27 of decision VII/28, national and regional-level

training workshops organized around key themes in the programme of work on protected areas, with initial focus on early actions in the programme of work;

(c) *Encourage* Parties to translate relevant tools into national and local languages so that they can be used effectively;

(d) *Urge* Parties, other Governments, funding and other relevant organizations to provide adequate financial resources and other support for the development of tool kits according to identified gaps and demand, including for toolkits at the local level, in local languages, and those developed or used by indigenous and local communities; and

(e) *Urge* Parties, other Governments, funding and other relevant organizations to provide adequate financial resources and other support for workshops to focus on the use and further development of available toolkits, in particular in relation to co-managed protected areas and community-conserved areas, and to ensure the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in this activity.

1/4. Review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas: consideration of the process for review

The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas

1. *Takes note* of the process proposed by the Executive Secretary contained in the annex I to the present recommendation;
2. *Agrees* to develop an evaluation matrix, taking note of the suggestions in annex II below, which includes for each target of the programme of work, the criteria for assessing implementation, the information needed to assess implementation, possible sources of information and the description of progress and main obstacles, for consideration by its second meeting;
3. *Further agrees* to develop a schedule describing elements of the programme of work to be reviewed at the eighth, ninth and tenth meetings of the Conference of the Parties, as contained in annex III below and further refined based upon the inputs received from Parties in accordance with paragraph 8 (b) below;
4. *Also agrees* to review the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas at its second meeting;
5. *Invites* Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and indigenous and local communities to contribute information needed for the review of implementation in accordance with the schedule referred to in paragraph 3 above;
6. *Requests* the Conference of the Parties to urge Parties, other Governments and multilateral funding bodies to provide the necessary financial support to developing countries, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition, to enable them to undertake the reporting required as part of review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas;
7. *Agrees* on the importance to undertake consultation processes on national and thematic reports relevant for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas including indigenous and local communities and relevant stakeholders;
8. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to:
 - (a) Carry out the activities described in annex I below and report thereon to the Working Group at its second meeting;
 - (b) Collect the views of the Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and indigenous and local communities on proposed content of the evaluation matrix for the further consideration of the second meeting of the Working Group;
 - (c) Issue an additional notification to Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and indigenous and local communities seeking views on the main elements to be reviewed at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;
 - (d) Organize, subject to the availability of the necessary funds, a regionally balanced workshop consisting of a small number of experts from Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and indigenous and local communities to pre-view the possible elements for review before the next meeting of the Working Group.

Annex I to recommendation I/4

**PROCESS, GUIDELINES AND MECHANISMS FOR MONITORING PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PROTECTED AREAS**

Action	Mechanisms/tools	Guidance on the use mechanisms/tools and time frame
Information acquisition	1.1. The third national reports that are due mid-May, 2005	1.1. Compilation of third national report will take place after the first meeting of the Working Group, to be held in June 2005 and should be finalized by early September 2005 [In the event not enough responses have been received in June 2005 the Executive Secretary will send a reminder and request for information with 15 August 2005 deadline for action.]
	1.1.1. Previous national reports containing sections on protected areas, thematic reports on protected areas, national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs); and other relevant documents considered during the preparation of NBSAPs	1.1.1. Sections in NBSAPs and other relevant documents used during the preparation of NBSAPs will be compiled and should be finalized by early September 2005. The Information regarding Article 8, in the first and second national reports submitted between June 1997 and January 1998, and in May 2001 respectively will be compiled, although they include activities carried out before the adoption of the programme of work. The overview of the analysis of this information regarding Article 8 is provided in document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/10. In pursuance of decision VI/25, Parties submitted thematic reports on protected areas A synthesis of information contained in these thematic reports is provided in document UNEP/CBD/COP/7/INF/8. Information contained in the thematic reports will be compiled and should be finalized by early September 2005.
	1.1.2. Additional notification to Parties seeking information on some key elements identified for review at COP8 in the schedule	1.1.2. A notification to Parties with a few short questions should be sent out in July 2005 to allow additional specific information on protected areas (e.g. in case an adequate number of third national reports has not been received and/or the information contained therein is not adequate for the review).

Action	Mechanisms/tools	Guidance on the use mechanisms/tools and time frame
	1.2. Information submitted by relevant academia, scientific organizations, civil society, indigenous and local communities and others, particularly those organizations identified as collaborators in the programme of work on protected areas	1.2. The Executive Secretary requested in November 2004 these organizations to submit reports. So far only five organizations responded. The Working Group at its first meeting may wish to request the organizations and others to submit the information by 31 July 2005, in particular on those issues for review at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (see annex II and annex III). Compilation of information should be finalized by early September 2005
	1.3. Reports on relevant GEF-funded projects	1.3. Progress reports on GEF-funded protected area projects will contribute to assessment of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas.
	1.4. Reports of any regional technical workshops organized in pursuance of para 27 of decision VII/28 or relevant to the programme of work	1.4. So far there is no information on the organization of any regional workshops. The Working Group at its first meeting may wish to request the organizations, and invite Parties and other Governments to organize such regional workshops and submit reports to the Executive Secretary.
	1.5. Questionnaire for a thematic report on the implementation of the programme of work	1.5. In decision VII/28, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and invited other Governments and relevant organizations to report to the Executive Secretary on implementation of the decision and the programme of work on protected areas at each of its meetings till 2010. Reporting to the Conference of the Parties at its eighth (2006) and tenth (2010) meetings is taken care of by the third and fourth national reports respectively. However, for the ninth meeting (2008), a thematic report is planned. Accordingly the Executive Secretary will prepare a draft questionnaire for a thematic report for consideration by the Working Group at its second meeting, in particular referring to issues identified in annex III for review at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Parties should undertake a stakeholder peer-review of the draft thematic report for the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Action	Mechanisms/tools	Guidance on the use mechanisms/tools and time frame
Synthesis of information	2.1. Preparation of a synthesis of information mentioned under 1.1 and 1.2 above, using analytical tools developed by the Secretariat.	2.1. This synthesis will commence in July 2005 and will be completed in September 2005
Assessment of the level of implementation	<p>3.1. Consideration of the synthesis report and development of a pre-review of the implementation on issues for the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties taking into account, what has been implemented, what remains to be implemented, obstacles to implementation by a workshop (depending on availability of time and funds) or, in absence of time/funding by the Executive Secretary and an electronic discussion forum.</p> <p>3.2. Regional technical workshops should also contribute to the review process.</p>	<p>3.1. This review of implementation of the key issues for the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties should be completed by October 2005</p> <p>3.2. The Working Group at its first meeting, depending on availability of time prior to its second meeting, may wish to recommend a workshop to undertake the pre-review. The workshop should consist of a small number of experts from Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and indigenous and local communities and be regionally balanced. It should meet ideally in September.</p>
Review and revisions of review process	4.1. Assessment and revisions of review process, including development of methodologies for further review	4.1. The Working Group at its second meeting may wish to recommend processes and mechanisms for further review taking into account inter <i>alia</i> the evaluation matrix and schedule as well as the thematic report for ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and the fourth national report for the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and other sources of information.
Assessment of the effectiveness of the programme of work and its contribution to the 2010 target	5.1 Review of the implementation of issues for the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties by the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas at its second meeting, taking into account results from assessments under items 3.1 and 3.2.	5.1 Based on the synthesis and the pre-review and using the evaluation matrix, the Working Group at its second meeting should recommend to the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting how to improve the implementation of the programme of work and its contribution to the 2010 target and related Millennium Development Goals, focusing on the main issues for considerations at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Annex II to recommendation I/4

EVALUATION MATRIX (TO BE DEVELOPED)

Goal, Target		Deadline	Assessment criteria and key evaluation questions	Description of progress and main obstacles	Information Sources
Number	Description				
1.1	Establishment and maintenance by 2010 ...	2010 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National (regional) definition of each of the terms comprehensive, ecologically representative and effectively managed developed. • National (regional) gap analysis undertaken by 2006 (activity 1.1.5) • National (regional) plan (map) for a comprehensive and effectively managed protected area network established (identification) by 2006. • National (regional) progress report on designation (inc. map) by 2008 • Mechanisms for assessing management effectiveness established by 2010 		National reports, UNEP-WCMC, IUCN WCPA, regional organizations, ...
1.2	Integration into the wider landscape and other sectors, connectivity	2015	Measures taken on, and progress made towards integration into the wider landscape, connectivity and integration with other sectors		National reports
1.3	Establish and strengthen regional networks and transboundary protected areas	2010/12	Measures taken for the establishment of regional networks and transboundary protected areas. Number or percentage of protected areas that are integrated into a regional network. Number and location of transboundary protected areas.		National reports, regional organizations
1.4	Effective management of all protected areas.	2008	See goal 1.1		National reports
1.5	Prevent and mitigate key threats	2008	Effective mechanisms to identify and prevent key threats in place (prerequisite to achieve effective management – see goal 1.1)		National reports
2.1	Promote equity and benefit sharing	2008	Mechanisms for equitable sharing of both costs and benefits arising from the establishment of protected areas		National reports, reports from non-governmental and indigenous people's organizations

Goal, Target		Deadline	Assessment criteria and key evaluation questions	Description of progress and main obstacles	Information Sources
Number	Description				
2.2	Enhance and secure involvement of indigenous people, local communities and relevant stakeholders	2008	Enabling environment (legislation, policies, capacities, resources, governance types, tools) developed ensuring participation and PIC of indigenous people. Plans and initiatives developed for participation in decision making in the identification, designation and management phases of the protected-area network—level of participation achieved.		National reports, reports from non-governmental and indigenous people's organizations and other relevant stakeholders
3.1	Review and revise policies to provide an enabling environment for protected areas	2008	Main impediments (see activities under this goal) to effective establishment and management of protected areas (by 2006) identified. Measures taken to overcome these impediments.		National reports
3.2	Capacity for the planning, establishment and management of protected areas	2010	Comprehensive capacity building programmes implemented		National reports
3.3	Technology transfer	2010	Appropriate technologies and innovative approaches for the effective management of protected areas developed, validated and transferred.		National reports
3.4	Financial sustainability	2008	Amount of financial needs identified (2005). Sustainable financing plans established. Amount of funding provided by public and private donors to protected areas. Level of integration of protected-area financing strategies into poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs) and national sustainable development strategies (NSDSs). Compilation of studies on value of ecosystem services provided by specific protected areas published.		National reports, ES, international organizations, GEF, World Bank,...
3.5	CEPA	2008	Measures taken to increase public awareness, understanding and appreciation of the importance of protected areas. Strategies and programmes elaborated.		National reports

Goal, Target		Deadline	Assessment criteria and key evaluation questions	Description of progress and main obstacles	Information Sources
Number	Description				
4.1	Minimum Standards and best practices	2008	National (regional) standards, criteria, and best practices for the selecting, establishing, managing and governance of protected areas developed and communicated to the Secretariat.		National reports, IUCN, ...
4.2	Effectiveness of PA management	2010	Methods, standards, criteria and indicators for evaluating management effectiveness of protected areas adopted (2006). Frameworks for monitoring, evaluation and reporting protected-area management effectiveness at site, national and regional system level implemented. Percentage of each country protected areas evaluated.		National reports, NGO,...
4.3	Assessment and monitoring PA status and trends	2010	Systems for enabling effective monitoring of protected area coverage, status and trends at national, regional and global scales established. Data on protected-area coverage, status and trends communicated to UNEP-WCMC In List. Harmonized reporting system (WHC, Ramsar, CBD, UNEP-WCMC,...) on protected areas established.		National reports, UNEP-WCMC, NGOs...
4.4	Scientific knowledge	?	Scientific results (in particular on Interdisciplinary research on ecological, social and economic aspects of protected areas) disseminated and shared (e.g. to the clearing-house mechanism).		Academia, scientific organisations, national reports, ...

Annex III to recommendation I/4

**SCHEDULE FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON
PROTECTED AREAS AT THE EIGHTH, NINTH AND TENTH MEETINGS OF THE
CONFERENCE OF PARTIES**

COP8	Activities to be completed by 2006: 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3 (related to inland water ecosystems), 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 1.2.1, 1.4.2, 1.4.5, 1.5.5, 2.1.2 (related to the promotion of different governance types), 2.2.1, 2.2.2 (related to participatory planning mechanisms), 2.2.3, 3.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.2 (related to the establishment of effective mechanisms), 3.4.9, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, 4.2.1 and 4.3.3
COP9	Activities to be completed by 2008: 1.1.3 (related to marine and coastal ecosystems), 1.2.2, 1.5.1, 1.5.6, 2.1.1, 2.1.2 (related to the recognition of community-conservation areas), 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.6, 2.2.2 (related to programmes for indigenous and local communities), 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.7, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.6, 4.1.1, 4.1.2 and 4.3.2
COP10	<p>Activities to be completed by 2009: 1.1.6 (related to designation of new protected areas), 1.4.1, 1.2.3, 1.4.3, 1.5.3, 1.5.4, 3.1.1 and 4.1.3</p> <p>Activities to be completed by 2010: 1.1.6 (related to the complete establishment of new protected areas), 1.1.7, 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.4, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.5.2, 3.2.2 (related to the implementation of comprehensive capacity-building programmes), 3.2.3, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.5.4, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.3.1, 4.3.2 (related to , 4.3.3, 4.3.4 and 4.3.5)</p>

1/5. Message to the G8 Summit

The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas

Welcomes the proposal by the Italian Minister to carry a message to the G8 Summit, to be held in Gleneagles from 6 to 8 July 2005, highlighting the importance of protected areas and sustainable use in achieving the Millennium Development Goals and in the importance of providing adequate financial resources to that end.

1/6. Tribute to the Government and people of the Italian Republic

The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas,

Having met in Montecatini from 13 to 17 June 2005, at the gracious invitation of the Government of the Italian Republic,

Deeply appreciating the especial courtesy and warm hospitality extended by the Government and people of Italy and by the city of Montecatini to the members of delegations, observers and members of the Secretariat who attended the meeting,

Expresses its sincere gratitude to the Government and people of Italy and to the city of Montecatini for the cordial welcome that they accorded to the meeting, and to those associated with its work, and for their contribution to the success of the meeting.

Annex II

**PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE SECOND MEETING OF THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED
WORKING GROUP ON PROTECTED AREAS**

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - 2.1. Election of officers;
 - 2.2. Adoption of the agenda;
 - 2.3. Organization of work.
3. Substantive issues:
 - 3.1 Options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction:
 - 3.1.1. Consideration of criteria and procedures for the identification of areas for protection in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction;
 - 3.2. Options for mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas by developing countries, particularly in the least developed and the small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition:
 - 3.2.1. Consideration of bracketed texts;
 - 3.3 Progress report on the further development of “tool kits” for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas;
 - 3.4 Review of implementation of the programme of work:
 - 3.4.1. Consideration of reports on implementation from Governments and organizations;
 - 3.4.2. Ways and means to improve implementation of the programme of work.
4. Other matters.
5. Adoption of the report.
6. Closure of the meeting.
