CBD

UNEP

CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/9/INF/39
9 November 2003

ENGLISH ONLY

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE
Ninth meeting
Montreal, 10-14 November 2003
Item 4.1 of the provisional agenda*

PROTECTED AREAS

Report of the International Workshop on Protected Forest Areas

INTRODUCTION

1. In paragraph 19 (d) of decision VI/22, on forest biological diversity, the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity requested the Executive Secretary to collaborate with the United Nations Forum on Forests, IUCN and other relevant member of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests, and other relevant bodies, institutions and processes, non-governmental organizations, indigenous and local communities, and other relevant stakeholders to prepare and hold an international workshop on protected areas as a measure to conserve and sustainably use forest biological diversity.

2. Following the request of the Conference of the Parties, the Executive Secretary convened in Montreal an International Workshop on Protected Forest Areas from 6 to 8 November, immediately prior to the ninth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA). The purpose of the Workshop was to exchange current knowledge and experience on opportunities and challenges to establishing and ensuring long-term sustainability of protected forest areas and provide recommendations for the further implementation of activities under programme element 1, goal 3, objective 3 of the work programme on forest biological diversity. The report of the Workshop is being submitted herewith as an information document for the consideration of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) at its ninth meeting.

3. The Workshop was attended by 22 Government-nominated experts, from Australia, Austria, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, the European Community, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Lithuania, Madagascar, the Netherlands, Philippines, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, and the United States of America.

4. Representatives of the following United Nations specialized agencies, bodies, Secretariat units and convention secretariats also participated in the Workshop: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

* UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/9/1

/…

5. The following other organizations also participated: IUCN-The World Conservation Union, Biolatina, Conservation International, Environment Protection Committee, Global Environment Forum, Greenpeace International, Hariban Foundation, The Nature Conservancy, CRC Sogema, and Mc Gill University.

6. A full list of participants is attached as annex I.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

7. The Workshop was opened by Mr. Hamdallah Zedan, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, at 9.30a.m. on Thursday, 6 November 2003. He welcomed the participants and expressed his appreciation to the Government of the Netherlands for its financial support and to the other Governments and organizations that supported participants. He informed the meeting of the ratification of the Convention by Thailand, and briefly described the programmes of work of the Convention on thematic areas and cross cutting issues. Drawing attention to the tenth anniversary of the Convention's entry into force the following month, he said that the Convention had entered into a phase whereby implementation became very important. He made reference to a number of milestones being developed to facilitate and guide implementation, including, in particular, the target of significantly reducing the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010. The World Summit on Sustainable Development had endorsed the the 2010 biodiversity target and, in its Plan of Implementation, had called on the international community to implement the expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity under the Convention. In this context, he emphasized the importance of the Workshop and requested the participants to provide guidance on how forest protected areas could contribute to the 2010 targets. They were also invited to come up with recommendations on the further implementation of activities described in the programme of work on forest biodiversity, in particular, programme element 1, goal 3 and objective 3 on protected forest areas.

8. Mr. Peter Schutz, of the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, the Netherlands, also welcomed the participants and wished the Workshop success in its deliberations.

9. A member of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity described the relevance of the documents distributed for the workshop.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

2.1. Election of officers

10. After a brief self-introduction of participants, Mr. Peter Schutz of the Netherlands and Mr. Braulio Ferrreira de Souza Dias of Brazil were elected as the Co-Chairs of the Workshop.

2.2. Adoption of the agenda

11. The Workshop adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/IW.PFA/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. Opportunities and challenges to the establishment of protected forest areas and ensuring their sustainability:
    - 3.1 Outcomes of relevant regional and international meetings:

(a) IFF international experts meeting on forest protected areas (San Juan, Puerto Rico, March 1999);

(b) The second session of the United Nations Forum on Forests (New York, March 2003);

(c) Meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on protected areas (Tjärnö, Sweden, June 2003);

(d) World Parks Congress (Durban, South Africa, September 2003);

(e) Other relevant meetings.

3.2 Exchange of views and recommendations for the further implementation of programme element 1, goal 3, objective 3 of the programme of work on forest biological diversity on:

(a) Assessment of the comprehensiveness, representativeness and adequacy of protected areas relative to forest types and identification of gaps and weaknesses;

(b) Establishment, with the full participation and with respect for the rights of indigenous and local communities, and other relevant stakeholders, of comprehensive, adequate, biologically and geographically representative and effective networks of protected areas;

(c) Establishment of restoration areas to complement the network of protected areas;

(d) Revision of, and ways and means to ensure, the comprehensiveness, adequacy, representativeness and efficacy of existing protected area networks;

(e) Assessment of the efficacy of protected forest areas for the conservation of biological diversity;

(f) Ways and means to ensure that relevant protected areas are managed to maintain and enhance their biodiversity components, services and values.

4. Other matters

5. Adoption of the report

6. Closure of the meeting.

2.3. Organization of work

12. Under this agenda item, participants endorsed the organization of work as proposed in the annotated provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/IW.PFA/1/1/Add.1). They agreed to consider all items first in plenary and to establish as needed working groups to draft recommendations on the proposed activities under goal 3, objective 3 of programme element 1 of the programme of work on forest biological diversity.

ITEM 3 OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PROTECTED AREAS AND ENSURING THEIR SUSTAINBILITY

3.1 Outcomes of relevant regional and international meetings

13. After a brief introduction of agenda item 3 by a member of the Secretariat, the following presentations were made:

(a) " Protected forest areas in the context of the international forest policy dialogue" by Ms Mia Söderlund of the secretariat of UNFF;

(b) Meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Protected Areas, held in Tjärno, Sweden, in June 2003;

(c) Results of the Fifth IUCN World Parks Congress by Bruce Amos, Vice-Chair of IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA);

(d) Fourth Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe, by Mr. Christoph Wildburger from Austria.

14. These presentations described the relevance of the outcomes of these regional and international meetings to the objectives of the meeting for possible consideration in the recommendations of the Workshop. Additional experiences and information were provided by other participants in the Workshop.

Protected forest areas in the context of the international forest policy dialogue

15. Ms Mia Söderlund said that the international forest policy dialogue since the Rio Summit, including intergovernmental deliberations in the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests, the Intergovernmental Forum on Forest and the United Nations Forum on Forests, as well as government- and organization-led initiatives in support of these processes, have considerably advanced the understanding of many of the complex and politically sensitive issues related to protected forest areas.

16. The deliberations over the last decade had resulted in some agreed actions, which were relevant to the establishment and ensuring the long-term sustainability of protected areas. These actions included:

(a) Establishment of networks of protected forest areas, including transboundary arrangements and linking protected areas, where possible, with corridors and buffer zones;

(b) Development and implementation of methodologies and criteria to assess adequacy, consistency, conditions and effectiveness management of protected forest areas;

(c) Strengthening of capacity to undertake national assessments of protected areas and identify areas of threat with particular emphasis on fragile and unique forest ecosystems;

(d) Development of partnerships to engage forest owners, private sector, indigenous peoples and local communities in planning and management of protected forest areas;

(e) North-South, South-South and North–North knowledge exchange on promotion and creation of national funds and other innovative mechanisms for financing action for forest conservation;

(f) Strengthening of international cooperation on finance, trade, transfer of environmentally sound technology and capacity-building for conservation and protection of unique types of forests and fragile ecosystems.

Meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Protected Areas (Tjärno, Sweden, June 2003)

17. The representative of the Secretariat informed participants that the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Protected Areas had met from 10 to 14 June 2003 in Tjärno, Sweden. The Group had reviewed a number of issues relating, inter alia, to the planning, establishment, and management of protected areas; status and trends of, and threats to, protected areas; stakeholders involvement; and ecological networks. The Group had also identified elements of a programme of work on protected areas for the Convention on Biological Diversity. The overall purpose of the programme of work on protected areas was to significantly reduce biological diversity loss at the international, national and subnational levels through the implementation of the three main objectives of the Convention, and to contribute to poverty alleviation and sustainable development, thereby supporting the objectives of the Strategic Plan of the Convention, the World Summit on Sustainable Development Plan of Implementation and the Millennium Development Goals. The programme of work consisted of three interlinked elements intended to be mutually reinforcing. It had been developed bearing in mind the need to avoid unnecessary duplication with existing thematic work programmes and other ongoing initiatives of the Convention, and to promote synergy and coordination with relevant programmes of various international organizations.

18. The report of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group was being circulated as an information document for the ninth meeting of SBSTTA (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/9/INF/3). It was emphasized that Section II of the report, on status, trends, roles and values of protected areas, and section III, on planning, establishing and managing protected areas and protected area networks, were of particular relevance to the present Workshop.

Results of the Fifth IUCN World Parks Congress

19. Mr. Amos said that the Fifth World Parks Congress had been hosted by IUCN and the Government of South Africa. The Congress had brought together some 3,000 delegates, representing a diverse range of countries, interests and experience in protected areas. Delegates had reviewed achievements since the Fourth World Parks Congress, in 1992, exchanged information and experience on a wide variety of topics, and charted a course for the global protected-areas community for the coming decade. The official outcomes of the Congress were embodied in four documents: (i) the Durban Accord; (ii) the Durban Action Plan; (iii) the message to the Convention on Biological Diversity; and (iv) the Congress recommendations.

Fourth Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe

20. Mr. Wildburger stated that, at the regional level, the Fourth Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe took place in Vienna from 28 to 30 April 2003. The Ministers had adopted the Vienna Declaration and five resolutions and addressed forest protected areas in resolution 4, on conserving and enhancing forest biological diversity in Europe. The countries had committed themselves to further develop protected forest networks and analyse their comprehensiveness, representativeness, adequacy and the effectiveness of their management. In addition, they had adopted the MCPFE Assessment Guidelines for Protected and Protective Forest and other Wooded Land in Europe and had provided pan-European data on forest protected areas collected on the basis of this new common assessment tool.

3.2. Exchange of views and recommendations for the further implementation of programme element 1, goal 3, objective 3 of the programme of work on forest biological diversity

21. A representative of the secretariat introduced the topic and provided a general introduction to the background document (UNEP/CBD/IW.PFA/1/2) and to each of the sub-items (a) to (f). Participants agreed to combine some of the sub-items as proposed in the above-mentioned document.

22. Each of the sub items of item 3.2 was considered consecutively in the plenary meetings held in the afternoon of Thursday, 6 November and in the morning of Friday, 7 November.

23. In addition the following presentations were made under these items:

(a) “Assessing comprehensiveness, representativeness and adequacy of protected areas in relation to ecosystem types: information availability and gaps”, by Ms. Valerie Kapos, UNEP-WCMC

(b) “Global Gap Analysis” by Mr. Luis Suarez, Conservation International, Ecuador;

(c) “Perspectives on forests and forest protected areas in the Philippines”, by Mr. Mallari, Haribon Foundation;

(d) “Indigenous peoples: not just another stakeholder” Mr. Harry Bombay, National Aboriginal Forestry Association; and;

(e) “Forest landscape restoration” by Mr. Andrew Deutz, IUCN.

24. These presentations highlighted a number of issues for possible consideration in recommendations of the workshop. The main points raised are summarized below.

Assessment of the comprehensiveness, representativeness and adequacy of protected areas in relation to ecosystem types: information availability and gaps

25. Ms. Kapos said that assessing the comprehensiveness, representativeness and adequacy of forest protected areas required information on where these protected were, how large they were, and what they contained, as well as their management objectives and how effectively they achieved them. Information to address the first two of these issues could be found in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA). Developed through the efforts of a broad consortium of organizations and managed by the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, WDPA was the largest repository of global information on protected areas. It was constantly updated, drawing on a broad range of information sources, and was now accessible via the Internet.

26. The WDPA currently contained data on over 102,000 protected areas, including information on their location, size, legal designation, IUCN management category and many other parameters. Mapped boundary information was held for around 60 per cent of the protected areas in the WDPA. Some sites were not yet included in the WDPA and information was particularly incomplete for private reserves, indigenous lands and other less formally protected areas. The database did not yet track measures of management effectiveness.

27. Information to determine which forest ecosystem types were contained in protected areas must come either from narrative sources, which were frequently incomplete and non-standardized, or from overlays with data on either potential ecosystem cover or actual forest cover and types. Analyses of protection coverage of biomes, ecoregions or other potential ecosystem categories were relatively straightforward and could yield such data as those on biome protection given in the background document. Assessing protection of actual cover of different forest ecosystems was more problematic. Mapped data were mostly derived from remote sensing, and were rarely classified to give forest types that were meaningful in a conservation context. The analyses of 22 forest types reported in the background document had been based on data from a mixture of sources with varying degrees of accuracy and resolution, with an average date of 1990. They were now largely outdated, but more recent global datasets based on satellite data did not provide sufficiently meaningful forest classifications.

28. Recommendations for further work included:

(a) Further work needs to be done to agree and apply meaningful harmonized forest classifications for analysis of protection at global and regional scales. Mapping these will require the combination of ancillary data with those from remote sensing and/or the aggregation of data from national maps;

(b) Ways need to be developed to address very localized types or those with special significance such as cloud forests. This may require specifically targeted studies;

(c) Ways should be developed to track protection in less formally designated areas and highlight its impacts;

(d) Meaningful analyses of forest protection at national scales should be conducted, using nationally appropriate forest categories;

(e) Ways should be developed to address ecosystem services and their management;

(f) Time-lines of data on forest protection should be built, using consistent approaches to forest cover assessment and classification.

Global gap analysis

29. Mr. Suarez focused on the findings of a project on global gap analysis relevant to forest protected areas. He said that the global gap analysis was the first overview of the effectiveness of the world-wide network of protected areas in covering species with the aim of providing guidance for the strategic strengthening and expansion of this network. For that purpose, the analysis had combined data from the

world database on protected areas, with distributional data for more than 11,000 species of mammals, amphibians, and globally threatened birds.

30. The global gap analysis had revealed more than 1,000 species that were not protected in any part of their range, about 700 of which were threatened with extinction. The results had highlighted regions that were priorities for the expansion and consolidation of the protected areas network. While forest biomes had significant levels of protection, the analysis showed that forest areas, particularly tropical forests, were priorities for protected areas expansion.

31. The implications of the study for the effective implementation of both the programme of work on forest biological diversity and the programme of work on protected areas included:

(a) The current global network of protected areas was far from achieving a complete coverage of vertebrate species;

(b) Protected area expansion and consolidation should prioritize areas of high irreplacability (containing species that could not be protected elsewhere) and high threat (where conservation action was urgently required before biodiversity values were lost);

(c) The expansion of the global protected areas network could not be based only on area targets (percentage of ecosystem types) but must also consider finer levels of biodiversity information available;

(d) Responsibility and cost for protecting these irreplaceable biological values must be shared by the international community.

Perspectives on forests and forest protected areas in the Philippines

32. Mr Mallari highlighted the extent of forest depletion in the Philippines and the importance of the remaining fragmented forests in conserving the threatened and endemic species. He said that the Philippines Local Government Code of 1991 provided a clear basis for the local government to play an important role in establishing forest conservation areas. Under the code, provincial and municipal authorities had the authority to approve and pass ordinances to protect the environment and develop and adopt comprehensive land-use plans, including programmes relating to the conservation of priority forest areas and rare and endangered species. Against that background, it was suggested that the issues of protected areas might be better addressed through local government initiatives.

33. Elaborating on the community based management programmes being managed primarily by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Mr. Mallari said that those programmes were mainly adopted a kind of top-down approach., without attempting to build the capacity of local communities, local government units and those involved in forest management. As the forest areas were critical for biodiversity conservation, as well as for livelihood security of people, the challenge was to respond to both those needs at the local level. He suggested developing awareness and building capacity among local people, as well as officials, for the conservation and management of forest areas.

Indigenous peoples: not just another stakeholder

34. Mr. Bombay highlighted the specific issues necessitating the participation of indigenous peoples and the concept and function of participatory mechanisms. He stated that participation process in Canada was determined by the fiduciary duty of the Crown and the Government, with an obligation to consult and to obtain an informed consent of indigenous communities, taking into account potential infringements of rights. Original ownership, historical occupation and proprietary interest provided a distinctly different background for Participation Participation of indigenous peoples should lead to co-management of the resources, contrary to participation of other stakeholders which was more advisory in nature. It also protected the rights of the indigenous people to reject or accept any proposal.

Forest landscape restoration

35. Mr. Deutz described the concept of forest landscape restoration as a process that aims to regain ecological integrity and enhance human well-being in deforested or degraded landscapes. In this concept,

landscape was considered as a contiguous area of land, intermediate between an eco-region and a site, with a specific set of ecological, cultural and socio-economic characteristics. The landscape level provided the best opportunities to optimize the flow of goods and services, and to balance the trade-offs inherent in land use.

36. Forest landscape restoration aimed at restoring the relevant functions of the forest, and not simply restoring forest cover. It was an inclusive approach, based on a participatory process. Current case-studies in the United Republic of Tanzania, Portugal, the United Kingdom, Nepal and Mexico indicated that forest restoration hadachieved the twin objective of biodiversity conservation and livelihood security of local communities.

37. A Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration had been established to develop and implement the concept of forest landscape restoration. The partnership sought to: (i) exchange information on opportunities and experiences ; (ii) present case-studies and highlight lessons learned; (iii) organization of regional and subregional workshops; and (iv) develop and promote a forest landscape investment portfolio. The partnership is also analysing how forest landscape restoration contributed to the implementation of existing international agreements.

Development of Workshop recommendations

38. In the afternoon of Friday, 7 November, participants agreed on a set of questions that would guide the development of recommendations. Participants split into three working groups for in-depth consideration of issues and for making recommendations. Mr. Luis Suarez chaired Working Group I; Ms Teresa Lim Working Group II; and Mr. Stefan Leiner Working Group III. The three working groups met four times each. Participants reconvened in plenary on Saturday, 8 November, and discussed and agreed upon the first draft of the recommendations for transmission to SBSTTA at its ninth meeting. The Workshop mandated the chairs of the working group to finalize the recommendations, with the assistance of the Secretariat, taking into account suggestions made in the last plenary session. The Chairs of the three working groups finalized the recommendations as contained in annex II below.

ITEM 4. OTHER MATTERS

39. There were no other matters.

ITEM 5. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

40. The present report was adopted at the plenary meeting on Saturday, 8 November 2003, on the basis of the draft report prepared and presented by the Co-Chairs, with the provision that the text would be finalized by the Chairs of the working groups.

ITEM 6. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

41. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Co-Chairs declared the Workshop closed at 5 p.m. on Saturday, 8 November 2003.

Annex I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	***Country/Organization***
Ms Nicola Beynon	Australia
Dr Christoph Wildburger	Austria
Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias	Brazil
Mr Ros Bansok	Cambodia
Dr Brenda McAfee	Canada
Mr Stefan Leiner	European Community
Prof Heikki Toivonen	Finland
Ms Anne Boisroux-Jay	France
Ms Anke Höltermann	Germany
Prof. Alfred A. Oteng Yeboah	Ghana
Ms Saori Hirai	Japan
Eng. Ra`ed Bani Hani	Jordan
Dr Ghassan Ramadan Jaradi	Lebanon
Mr. Dalius Sungalia	Lithuania
Dr Claudine Ramiarison	Madagascar
Mr. Peter Schutz	Netherlands
Dr. Theresa Mundita Lim	Philippines
Mr. Mikael Noren	Sweden
Mr. Robert Lamb	Switzerland
Ms Robyn Cross	Trinidad and Tobago
Mr. Nabil Hamada	Tunisia
Ms Mary Wagner	United States of America
Mr. Douglas Williamson	FAO
Dr Valerie Kapos	UNEP-WCMC

Name	*Country/Organization*
Ms. Mia Söderlund	UNFF
Ms Rocio Lichte	UNFCC
Mr. Bruce Amos	IUCN – The World Conservation Union
Dr Andrew Deutz	IUCN – The World Conservation Union
Ms Maria del Rosario Ortiz Quijano	Biolatina
Ms Rebecca Livemore	Conservation International
Mr. Luis Suarez	Conservation International
Mrs Mona Fouad Karakira	Environment Protection Committee
Mr. Hiroshi Nakamura	Global Environmental Forum
Mr. Martin Kaiser	Greenpeace
Mr. Neil Aldrin Mallari	Haribon Foundation
Dr Charles V.Barber	The Nature Conservancy
Mr. Pierre Methot	CRC Sogema
Ms Monica Torbio	McGill University

Annex II

RECOMMENDATIONS

Having met in Montreal, from 6-8 November, 2003, the participants of the International Workshop on Protected Forest Areas, recommend that the Subsidiary Body on Scientific Technical and Technological Advice may wish to consider the following in order to further implement activities under programme element 1, goal 3, objective 3 of the work programme on forest biological diversity:

I. GENERAL

1. The Workshop emphasized that:

(a) Forests hold a large proportion of global biodiversity and loss of forest biodiversity is a major contributing factor to global biodiversity loss. The effective protection of forests will contribute substantively to global biodiversity conservation, and to achieving the 2010 target;

(b) They provide ecosystem goods and services and contribute to poverty alleviation and sustainable development;

(c) Forest protected areas can contribute greatly to achieving the target of significantly reducing the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010 and the relevant Millennium Development Goals;

(d) Forest protected areas play an important role as gene banks (seeds, animals, etc) and blueprints for restoration efforts;

(e) The implementation of the proposed programme of work on protected areas will provide a strong framework for implementation of element 1, goal 3, objective 3 of the expanded programme of work on forest biodiversity adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in decision VI/22;

(f) Forest protected areas should be seen within the wider context of the landscape and other elements of the expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity;

(g) The effective participation of all relevant stakeholders, and in particular: indigenous and local communities, in the establishment and management of forest protected areas is important;

(h) The role of forest protected areas in the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change and the reduction of impacts of climate change on biodiversity should be more widely recognized.

2. In the light of the above, the Workshop recommended that:

(a) Targets be developed for the contribution of forest protected areas to the achievement of the 2010 target, e.g., “ensure sufficient forest protected areas established and effectively maintained to reduce forest biodiversity loss”;

(b) The term “forest protected areas” be used throughout to ensure consistency with other programmes of work, such as the term “marine and coastal protected areas”;

(c) The term “forest protected area” should apply to those areas that meet the definition for protected area under the Convention on Biological Diversity. An IUCN category should be assigned to all forest protected areas;

(d) The implementation of activities under the programme of work on forest biological diversity should proceed in support of and in harmony with the framework of the programme of work on protected areas;

(e) Cooperation between forest, environment and other agencies that are involved with forest protected areas be strengthened;

(f) The programme of work on forest biological diversity and the IPF/IFF/UNFF proposals for actions be implemented in harmony and synergistically;

(g) National forest programmes and national biodiversity strategies and action plans should be taken into account in planning and establishment of forest protected areas;

(h) More effort should be devoted to landscape-level planning of protected areas with respect to the goods and services they provide (e.g., pollination services, water catchment protection);

(i) Establishment, monitoring, assessment and identification of gaps of forest protected areas systems and networks should be done at national, regional and global levels;

(j) Communication and information-sharing between scientific community, local communities and among others should be improved to increase acceptance of all values of protected areas;

(k) Capacity should be built both in local communities and in government agencies;

(l) Parties should assess the need for additional financial resources and sustainable financing mechanisms to establish and implement forest protected areas;

(m) By the end of 2004, the current and potential contribution of forest protected areas to achievement of the Millennium Development Goals should be assessed and quantified;

(n) Forest protected areas, currently not officially included in national systems (for example, privately protected and community managed forest protected areas) and their role in forest biological diversity conservation should be taken into account in assessments and establishment of protected areas.

II. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Assess the comprehensiveness, representativeness and adequacy of protected areas relative to forest types and identification of gaps and weaknesses

3. For the purposes of the present report, the Workshop agreed that:

(a) ***Representativeness*** should be defined for the planning and monitoring not only using habitats (in this respect, the forest classification system included in the Forest programme of work is an essential tool}, but also genetic variability, species and ecological processes. A forest protected areas system based solely on protecting representatives of each habitat type will not necessarily be adequate for the needs of key stone or threatened species.

(b) ***Comprehensiveness*** and effectiveness includes consideration of socio-economic aspects (e.g. cultural, water, ecosystem goods and services)

(c) ***Adequacy*** is the sum of representative, comprehensive and effective. Using the message of the World Parks Congress to the Convention on Biological Diversity, an adequate forest protected areas network could be defined as one that:

(i) Effectively conserves all globally/regionally/nationally threatened species *in situ;*

(ii) Effectively conserves viable representations of every forest type within protected areas

(iii) Protects all natural ecological processes in forests that generate and maintain biodiversity and provide humanity with vital ecosystem goods and services.

This is also in line with the recommendations of the IFF country-led initiative on forest protected areas. 1/

1/ Final report of the IFF International Experts Meeting on Protected Forest Areas, sponsored by Brazil and the United States of America, Puerto Rico, 15-19 March, 1999.

4. Although current data on assessment of comprehensiveness, representativeness and adequacy are inadequate, existing coarse assessments suggest that forest protected areas are not yet representative of all types of forest or comprehensive.

5. Assessing the representativeness and comprehensiveness of forest protected areas should take place at different scales: local or sub-national, national, regional and international. Criteria and indicators for assessment may vary at different spatial scales; they may partly be biome-specific, and should cover genetic variability, species parameters, ecosystem types and ecosystem processes, goods and services. Socio-economic and cultural criteria and indicators should also be used.

6. Current assessments are inadequate, partly because forest type classification is inadequate. To remedy this problem, efforts to harmonize regional and national forest classification need to be accelerated and remote sensing techniques should be increasingly used.

7. To help determine the comprehensiveness, representativeness, adequacy and effectiveness of a forest protected areas system, there is a need, *inter alia*, to know the percentage of each forest type protected under different IUCN categories, bearing in mind the differing situations and forest cover of different countries.

8. Priorities for action need to be set at national, regional and global levels. Community, national and international priorities should be combined at multiple scales rather than viewed as contradictory. Criteria for setting such priorities already exist. They can be derived, *inter alia*, from the programme of work on forest biodiversity, the IPF/UNFF Proposals for Action, and the draft programme of work on protected Areas. They can include *high biodiversity and endemism, irreplaceability*, *uniqueness and intactness*, and *high threat of damage*. Priority-setting should also include socio-economic considerations, such as local livelihood needs, watershed protection, erosion control and the provision of other goods and services.

9. Many Parties, particularly developing countries, need technical and financial assistance in carrying out assessments and setting priorities.

B. Establishment, with the full participation and with respect for the rights of indigenous and local communities, and other relevant stakeholders, of comprehensive, adequate, biologically and regionally representative and effective networks of forest protected areas

10. Full participation and prior informed consent of indigenous and local communities for the establishment and management of protected forest areas require particular attention. Land tenure, prior informed consent and indigenous land rights are important issues in this regard.

11. Wider stakeholder participation is also important. Other important forest stakeholders, such as the forest industry and other commercial interests and resource users, need also to be involved.

12. Adequate participation needs time and capacity-building. Therefore, in priority forest areas under high levels of threat, moratoriums on extractive activities should be considered until decisions about protection are made.

13. Successful management of forest protected areas often depends on community-led management in which communities develop a sense of ownership, partnership and stewardship. In this regard, empowerment and capacity building are key elements for both local communities and the government agencies they interact with.

14. More effort should be devoted to landscape-level planning of forest protected areas with respect to the goods and services (e.g. pollination services and water catchment protection); they provide within the productive landscape, taking into the ecosystem approach.

15. Individual forest protected areas should be connected both through corridors, buffer zones and stepping stones, as well as through applying sustainable forest management and therewith maintaining or restoring biodiversity in the wider landscape.

C. Establishment of restoration areas to complement the network of forest protected areas

16. The Workshop endorsed the concept of forest landscape restoration, which is understood to mean restoring forest biological diversity and other functions and rehabilitating degraded lands on a landscape scale, based on community involvement and community-led management, including recognition of the importance and use traditional knowledge, and the ecosystem approach.

17. The Workshop noted that restoration can provide significant net economic benefits in the long-term, with respect to the provision of ecological goods and services.

18. Forest restoration and the restoration of biological diversity in forests are important both within and around forest protected areas, buffer zones and corridors, especially in highly fragmented forest landscapes, in irreplaceable ecosystems, and in regions where little natural forest cover remains. Landscape restoration should contribute to livelihoods and the three objectives of the Convention through the application of the ecosystem approach. Restoration should not be seen as a substitute for conserving existing forest stands.

19. Forest restoration should build on and manage natural regeneration processes, including natural disturbance regimes (e.g., fire), and recognize that forest protected areas can play an important role as gene banks and blueprints for restoration efforts.

20. The Workshop commended the work of the Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration, encouraged the effort of the Partnership to disseminate case-studies. The Workshop urged the Parties to the Convention to support the Partnership.

D. Revise in a similar manner and ensure comprehensiveness, adequacy, representativeness and efficacy of existing protected forest area networks

21. This item is covered by recommendations under section A above and section E below.

E. Assess the efficacy of protected forest areas, and their efficacy for the conservation of biological diversity

22. For the purposes of this meeting efficacy is mainly defined as the extent to which management objectives are achieved (see below).

23. In conducting management effectiveness evaluations, use should be made of existing frameworks and methodologies, including the IUCN-WCPA Framework on Management Effectiveness Evaluation and the criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management. Effectiveness includes different elements of management quality such as governance, financial sustainability, stakeholder participation, enforcement, equitable cost- and benefit-sharing.

24. The Workshop concluded that it should be recommended that Parties implement management effectiveness evaluations of forest protected areas as a contribution to the relevant goal of the proposed programme of work on protected areas stating that to management effectiveness evaluations of at least 30 per cent of each Parties protected areas should be implemented by 2010.

25. When considering certification or audit schemes for protected areas the experiences of forest certification schemes should be taken into account. Third party certification could be a tool to improve transparent reporting on effectiveness to stakeholders that could improve good governance. Experience under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) may also be relevant.

F. Ensure that relevant protected areas are managed to maintain and enhance their forest biodiversity components, services and values

26. To ensure that protected areas are managed to maintain and enhance their forest biodiversity components, services and values:

(a) Each forest protected area should have a management plan, which should be revised periodically as necessary, utilizing adaptive management;;

(b) As forests produce commercial commodities and provide important ecosystem goods and services, the value of ecosystem services should be reflected in the price of the forest commodities. Opportunities for tapping the value of ecosystem services as a source of income support for forest protected areas, for example water pricing, timber taxation, recreation, should be explored and utilized;

(c) The use of volunteerism to increase capacity for forest protected areas management should be encouraged;

(d) Parties should assess the need for additional financial resources and sustainable financing mechanisms to establish and implement forest protected areas;

(e) Promote economic valuations and assessments of the goods and services provided by forest protected areas in order to quantify the current and potential contribution of forest protected areas to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals;

(f) Promote international cooperation partnerships to support the establishment and management of forest protected areas;

(g) Climate change scenarios should be taken into account in the planning and management of forest protected areas.
