



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/5  
14 January 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

### SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Fourteenth meeting

Nairobi, 10-21 May 2010

Item 3.1.4 of the provisional agenda\*

### IN-DEPTH REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PROTECTED AREAS<sup>1</sup>

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

#### I. INTRODUCTION

1. In paragraph 15 of decision IX/18 A, the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) requested the Executive Secretary, to convene regional and subregional capacity-building and progress-review workshops for the programme of work on protected areas. In paragraph 25 of the same decision, the Conference of the Parties, while deciding on the process for preparation of in-depth review of the programme of work on protected areas at its tenth meeting, requested the Executive Secretary to prepare the in-depth review using, *inter alia*, information contained in the fourth national reports, relevant global and regional databases and the results of the above-mentioned regional and subregional workshops and to propose ways and means for strengthening the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA).

2. Accordingly, the Executive Secretary, with the generous financial assistance of the European Commission, the Czech Republic, Germany, India, Colombia, Spain, Canada, Belgium and the Netherlands, convened regional workshops in Asia and Pacific, Africa, Latin America and Caribbean and Central and Eastern Europe in October, November and December 2009.

3. In paragraph 24 of decision IX/18 A, the Conference of the Parties invited IUCN to contribute to the review process of the programme of work on protected areas and to the ways and means to strengthen implementation of the programme of work on protected areas. Accordingly IUCN in collaboration with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity organized an international workshop in Jeju Island, Republic of Korea, on the future of the programme of work on protected areas, in September 2009. The regional workshops discussed the outcome of this workshop and suggested draft recommendations for consideration by SBSTTA.

4. The Executive Secretary has prepared this note, summarizing the progress at the global level based upon the information, *inter alia*, contained in annex III of 65 fourth national reports and

\* UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/1.

<sup>1</sup> An executive summary and suggested recommendations are contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/5/Add.1.

information gathered from Parties and organizations in the regional workshops, to facilitate the review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas by SBSTTA at its fourteenth meeting. More detailed information providing examples and case-studies is contained in an information document. Reports of the regional workshops depicting progress at regional and subregional levels are also submitted as information documents. Section II contains a synthesis of information on progress towards achieving targets of the programme of work at global level. Section III describes the main obstacles encountered by the countries in implementing the programme of work and some suggested ways and means to address those obstacles. Suggested recommendations for consideration by SBSTTA at its fourteenth meeting are included in the addendum to the present note (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/5/Add.1).

5. An earlier draft of this note was posted for peer review from 17 November to 20 December 2009 in accordance with notification 2009-156 and comments received were incorporated as appropriate.

## II. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING TARGETS OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK

6. It should be noted that the percentages used in this report reflect the total number of Parties for which information is available, either from national reports received or information gathered separately. In describing general progress, “nearly all” indicates at least 90 per cent (excellent progress), “most” indicates at least 70 per cent (good progress), “many” indicates at least 40 per cent (fair progress), “some” indicates at least 15 per cent (some progress) and “few” indicates less than 15 per cent (very little progress). A global snapshot of progress is described in table 1 below.

**Table 1: Overview of global progress in achieving the goals of the programme of work on protected areas**

Goal	Target	Progress
1.1	To establish and strengthen national and regional systems of protected areas integrated into a global network as a contribution to globally agreed goals (by <b>2010 for terrestrial</b> and <b>2012 for marine</b> ).	<i>Good progress for terrestrial; Very little progress for marine areas</i>
1.2	By <b>2015</b> , all protected areas and protected area systems are integrated into the wider land- and seascape, and relevant sectors, by applying the ecosystem approach and taking into account ecological connectivity / and the concept, where appropriate, of ecological networks.	<i>Some progress, likely to be achieved provided more systematic effort are put in place in next five years</i>
1.3	Establish and strengthen by <b>2010/2012</b> transboundary protected areas, other forms of collaboration between neighbouring protected areas across national boundaries and regional networks, to enhance the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, implementing the ecosystem approach, and improving international cooperation.	<i>Fair progress, could be achieved partially if current trends continue</i>
1.4	All protected areas to have effective management in existence by <b>2012</b> , using participatory and science-based site planning processes that incorporate clear biodiversity objectives, targets, management strategies and monitoring programmes, drawing upon existing methodologies and a long-term management plan with active stakeholder involvement.	<i>Fair progress, likely to partially achieved; but effective implementation is poor</i>
1.5	By <b>2008</b> , effective mechanisms for identifying and preventing, and/or mitigating the negative impacts of key threats to protected areas are in place.	<i>Fair progress regarding threat identification but mitigation and prevention is poor</i>
2.1 & 2.2	2.1: Establish mechanisms for the equitable sharing of both costs and benefits arising from the establishment and management of protected areas (by <b>2008</b> ); 2.2: Full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, in full respect of their rights and recognition of their responsibilities, consistent with national law and applicable international obligations, and the participation of relevant stakeholders, in the management of existing, and the establishment and management of new protected areas (by <b>2008</b> ).	<i>Some progress for both the targets in some areas; way behind meeting the targets at global level</i>

Goal	Target	Progress
3.1	By 2008 review and revise policies as appropriate, including use of social and economic valuation and incentives, to provide a supportive enabling environment for more effective establishment and management of protected areas and protected areas systems.	<i>Fair progress, partially achieved at global level</i>
3.2	By 2010, comprehensive capacity-building programmes and initiatives are implemented to develop knowledge and skills at individual, community and institutional levels, and raise professional standards.	<i>Fair progress, partially achieved at global level</i>
3.3	By 2010 the development, validation, and transfer of appropriate technologies and innovative approaches for the effective management of protected areas is substantially improved, taking into account decisions of the Conference of the Parties on technology transfer and cooperation.	<i>Fair progress, partially achieved at global level</i>
3.4	By 2008, sufficient financial, technical and other resources to meet the costs to effectively implement and manage national and regional systems of protected areas are secured, including both from national and international sources, particularly to support the needs of developing countries and countries with economies in transition and small island developing States.	<i>Very little progress, way behind meeting the target at global level</i>
3.5	By 2008 public awareness, understanding and appreciation of the importance and benefits of protected areas is significantly increased.	<i>Good progress, partially achieved at global level</i>
4.1	By 2008, standards, criteria, and best practices for planning, selecting, establishing, managing and governance of national and regional systems of protected areas are developed and adopted.	<i>Fair progress for developing standards, criteria and best practices but adopting them poor at global level</i>
4.2	By 2010, frameworks for monitoring, evaluating and reporting protected areas management effectiveness at sites, national and regional systems, and transboundary protected area levels adopted and implemented by Parties.	<i>Fair progress, further assessments being carried out so could be partially achieved at global level</i>
4.3	By 2010, national and regional systems are established to enable effective monitoring of protected-area coverage, status and trends at national, regional and global scales, and to assist in evaluating progress in meeting global biodiversity targets.	<i>Fair progress for monitoring coverage and trends through WDPA, but monitoring status is poor</i>
4.4	Scientific knowledge relevant to protected areas is further developed as a contribution to their establishment, effectiveness, and management.	<i>Good progress to date</i>

*Goal 1.1: To establish and strengthen national and regional systems of protected areas integrated into a global network as a contribution to globally agreed goals*

**Summary of progress:** Fair progress to date globally for terrestrial; very little progress for marine areas.

**Key issues considered for assessing global progress:** Gap analysis; creation of new protected areas; marine protected areas.

7. Nearly all reporting countries indicated progress towards target 1.1. By 2008, there were more than 120,000 nationally designated protected areas covering 21 million km<sup>2</sup> of land and sea. While the terrestrial protected areas listed in the World Database on Protected Areas cover 12.2 per cent of the planet's surface area; the marine protected areas occupy only 5.9 per cent of the world's territorial seas and only 0.5 per cent of the extraterritorial seas.<sup>2</sup> Out of the 15 regions of the world recognized by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP-WCMC), nine regions (Americas, East and South-east Asia, Eastern and Southern Africa, Western and Central Africa, Europe, and the Caribbean) have 10 per cent of their terrestrial area under protected areas,<sup>3</sup> whereas only three (Australia/New Zealand, South America and North America) of the 15 regions have more than 10 per cent their marine areas protected. Based on the information available from national

<sup>2</sup> UNEP-WCMC (2008) *State of the world's protected areas: an annual review of global conservation progress*. UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge.

<sup>3</sup> Coad, L. *et al* (2008) Progress towards the convention on Biological Diversity terrestrial 2010 and marine 2012 targets for protected area coverage. *Parks* 17(2)35-42. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

biodiversity strategies and action plans and national reports, coverage of protected areas as a percentage of a country's terrestrial area is available for 114 Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Of these 114 countries, 68 have kept more than 10 per cent of their territories under protection (with 33 countries having more than 15 per cent of their terrestrial area protected); 23 per cent (26 countries) have 5 to 10 per cent and only 14.5 per cent of countries (six countries) have less than 5 per cent of their land designated as protected areas.

8. An overlay of nationally designated protected areas with the world's terrestrial ecoregions reveals that 12 out of the 14 terrestrial biomes have more than 10 per cent of their area protected. Flooded grassland and savannah biome, with 42 per cent of its area under protected coverage is the most protected biome.<sup>4</sup> Only the tropical and sub-tropical coniferous forests biome and temperate grasslands, savannahs and scrublands biome recorded less than 10 per cent protection with the latter having about 5 per cent of its area under protection. However, the degree of protection to the ecoregions within these biomes varies, as out of the 825 terrestrial ecoregions more than 5 per cent are completely protected, 50 per cent have 10 per cent of their area protected and 8 per cent have less than 1 per cent of their area under protection.<sup>5</sup> Out of the 232 marine ecoregions, only 39 per cent of them have 10 per cent of their area under protection, whereas 50 per cent have less than 1 per cent of their area under protection. Considering the current annual growth rate of marine protected areas (4.6 per cent), achieving the 10 per cent target of the strategic plan of the Convention and the marine target of the programme of work on protected areas may well be high impossible within the next 20 years.<sup>6</sup>

9. More than 15 countries have completed a comprehensive ecological gap analysis and are in the process of implementing the results, whether by establishing new protected areas, extending existing protected areas, or by other means. In about 23 countries, attempts are under way to undertake comprehensive gap analyses. In some developed countries (Australia, Finland, Canada, and Germany) and in some developing countries (Brazil, Bhutan, Costa Rica), the protected area network is near comprehensive and ecologically representative covering major biomes (forests, pastures, deserts, grasslands, mountains, and wetlands) and includes public, private and community protected areas. Under-represented ecosystems typically include: coastal areas, oases, cave systems, karsts, grasslands, rivers and river canyons, marshes, and, most significantly, marine systems. Twenty-seven countries reported the establishment of a total of about 6,038 new terrestrial protected areas – national parks, nature reserves, nature conservation areas, nature parks, landscape reserves, natural monuments, protected landscapes, ecological lands, scientific reserves and areas of community importance and 802 marine protected areas, covering approximately 112.39 million ha of terrestrial and marine areas, since 2004 (table 2). A majority of reporting countries have indicated plans to establish additional protected areas and to adopt targets for protected areas. These targets have been included in relevant environmental policies, national strategies for sustainable development, national biodiversity strategies, national wildlife action plans and programmes. The planned expansion of coverage ranges from 5.74 per cent to 30 per cent of the total geographical area of countries.

Table 2: Number and coverage (where available) of protected areas established since 2000/2004

Country	Protected area (PAs)
Brazil	54 new federal PAs established and 9 existing PAs expanded covering 19.6 million ha. From 2000-05 State PAs increased 28.3 per cent in number and 64.7 per cent increase in size approximately 11.8 million ha.
India	14 new PAs or an increase of 15 per cent in number covering 0.1 million ha.
Hungary	93 new PAs (21 nature reserves, 71 protected natural areas of local significance, 1 landscape protection area) covering 26, 953 ha. In addition 6 new Ramsar sites covering 79,000 ha.
Mexico	47 new national parks covering 7.2 million ha.

<sup>4</sup> Some examples are the Sudd-Sahelian swamps, Zambeziian flooded grasslands (including the Okavango Delta), Lake Chad flooded savannah and Nile Delta flooded savannah (all in Africa). The Everglades in the USA, the Orinoco and Pantanal wetlands in South America and the marshes of Southern Iraq are examples outside Africa.

<sup>5</sup> UNEP-WCMC(2008) *op cit*

<sup>6</sup> Laffoley, D *et al* (2008) Progress with Marine Protected Areas since Durban, and future directions. *Parks* 17(2) 13-22. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

Country	Protected area (PAs)
Poland	1029 new PAs (Natural reserves 116, documentation sites 50; ecological sites 572; natural landscape complexes 37; protected landscapes 5; Special Bird protection areas 69; special areas under habitat conservation 180)
Australia	National reserve system has grown from 10.52 per cent in 2004 to 11.6 per cent in 2006; an increase of 9.11 million ha with 1,280 new PAs. 43 new MPAs covering 24 million ha
Canada	About 15 million ha increase from 2005 to 2009
China	136 new PAs from the end of 2006 to the end of 2007 covering 34 million ha.
Spain	184 new PAs covering 6.9 million ha (72 new SPAs for birds; 96 new protected natural areas; 16 new Ramsar sites). Area under Natura 2000 doubled from 5.5 to 11 million ha.
France	1,201 new PAs including Natura 2000 sites, national parks, national nature reserves, regional nature reserves, prefectural protection biotopes, forest biological reserves covering 6.84 million ha
Sweden	21 new MPAs. 280, 000 ha of productive forests protected by the end of 2008. Proposals to establish 17 new national parks, extension of 7 existing parks and 28 new MPAs by 2010.
Philippines	730 new MPAs from 1997-2007 with 48 per cent increase in the area. A 5.3 per cent increase in the proportion of terrestrial protected areas to total land area from 1992 to 2008. The proportion of forest cover to land area increased from 23.9 per cent in 2003 to 52.6 per cent in 2006.
Czech Republic	43 new PAs (2 national nature monuments, 1 national nature reserves, 9 nature monuments, 14 natural reserves, 1 Specially Protected Areas (SPA) and 16 Sites of Community Importance (SCI).
Germany	749 new PAs ( 588 nature conservation areas, 2 national parks – Eifel and Kellerwald, 152 landscape reserves and 7 nature parks) covering 0.7 million ha
Finland	Since 2004 added 845,000 ha of new PAs in national parks, strict nature reserves, protected peat land areas and herb rich forest areas.
Rwanda	2 new PAs (Ramsar site – Rugezi-Bulera-Ruhondo complex and Buhanga reserved forest area)
Norway	234 new PAs covering 1.2 million ha.
Madagascar	2 million ha of new PAs including 5 new MPAs
Albania	6 new PAs since 2004 (2 managed nature reserves coastal wetlands, 1 protected) ; expansion of Dajti national park and Mali me Gropa-Bize-Martanesh protected landscape
Algeria	2 new PAS (one terrestrial national park and one marine nature reserve)
United Kingdom	814 new PAs (19 special protection areas, 47 special areas of conservation, 2 Ramsar sites, 62 Sites of Special Scientific Interests (SSSIs) + Areas of Special Scientific Interests (ASSIs), 6 national nature reserves, 668 local reserves, 9 areas of outstanding natural beauty and 1 national park) covering 0.8million ha.
Cameroon	8 new PAs since 2001
Estonia	62 new PAs with an increase of 6 per cent in the coverage of PAs as percentage of territory.
Kyrgyzstan	143,000 ha increase in PA coverage from 2005-2008
Mongolia	An increase of 3 per cent in the coverage of PAs as percentage of territory.
Belgium	77 new PAs ( 66 reserve areas, 6 Natura 2000 sites and 5 wetlands) covering 48,470 ha

*Goal 1.2: To integrate protected areas into broader land- and seascapes and sectors so as to maintain ecological structure and function*

**Summary of progress:** Some progress to date may likely to be achieved by the date provided more systematic efforts are put in place in next five years.

**Key issues considered for assessing global progress:** measures taken for developing enabling environment for integrating protected areas into broader land and seascapes and sectors; application of ecosystem approach.

10. Progress towards achieving this target is more evident in Europe and a few other developed countries. The majority of reporting countries indicated enabling legislative, policy measures and tools for integrating protected areas into broader land and seascapes and sectoral interests. Some examples include: the Protected Areas Act in Albania; the Directions for the National Reserve System-A Partnership Approach in Australia; Directives Under Beyond Sites Requirement of the European Commission Bird and Habitat Directives-Natura 2000 in European Community member States; Article 3 of the Federal Nature Conservation Act in Germany; the National Natural Heritage Plan in France; Strategic Environmental Assessment in Lebanon; and the Ecological Network Act in Ukraine.

11. In many countries, protected areas are integrated into surrounding areas through regional development planning, spatial planning, including establishment of ecological corridors, core areas, buffer zones and Biosphere Reserves. Many reporting countries indicated they had taken steps to improve connectivity and ecological networks. Some examples include: Australian Alps to Atherton (A2A

connectivity conservation corridor); Greater Mekong subregion biodiversity conservation corridor in Viet Nam; ecological green corridors in Hungary; and eco-tunnels and eco-passages in Belgium. Many developing countries reported that on a conceptual level, the need for adopting the ecosystem approach and establishing/managing protected areas in the regional context is well understood; however, in practice the sectoral interests and competing land uses make it difficult to integrate protected areas into broader land and seascapes. Information on integrating marine and coastal protected areas into surrounding seascapes has not been well reported.

*Goal 1.3: To establish and strengthen regional networks, transboundary protected areas (TBPAs) and collaboration between neighbouring protected areas across national boundaries*

**Summary of progress:** Fair to good progress to date globally, 34 per cent increase in number of transboundary protected areas complexes, partially achieved at global level.

**Key issues considered for assessing global progress:** Increase in the number of transboundary protected areas established; the kinds of collaboration across national boundaries.

12. The UNEP-WCMC transboundary protected areas inventory (2007), based on reviewing the digital maps of the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA), identified 227 Transboundary Protected Areas Complexes (TBPA) incorporating 3,043 individual protected areas.<sup>7</sup> Based on GIS analysis the total area TBPA was estimated as 4,626,601.85 km<sup>2</sup> with 63 per cent of this occurring in both continents of America. Africa and Asia recorded about 32 per cent and the Europe has only 5 per cent of this total area. The TBPA complex “Ellesmere/Greenland between Canada and Greenland is the biggest TBPA complex in size covering 1,008,470.127 km<sup>2</sup>. With 169 TBPA in 2001, their number increased to 188 in 2005 and to 227 in 2007 a 34 per cent increase in number since 2001.

13. Nearly all reporting countries indicated collaboration with neighbouring countries in establishing transboundary protected areas and regional networks, as well as cross-boundary management agreements. Multilateral environmental agreements such as the Convention on Migratory Species, the Convention on International Trade on Endangered Species, the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, along with the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as many other regional instruments, including the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife, the Barcelona Convention, and the Alpine Convention provided suitable frameworks for regional cooperation that facilitated the achievement of this target.

14. Important regional protected area networks include the Meso-America Regional Network, the Alpine Protected Area network, the Pan European Ecological Network, the Central Africa Network of Protected areas, the Marine Protected Areas Network for the Western Indian Ocean Countries, and Transnational River Basin Districts on the Eastern Side of the Baltic Sea Network. Transboundary initiatives include, *inter alia*, ZIMOZA (Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Zambia) Trans-boundary initiative; KAZA (Angola, Namibia, Botswana, Zimbabwe, and Zambia) initiative; the Gobi desert reserves and Altai mountain reserves between China and Mongolia; trans-frontier marine conservation between Tanzania and Mozambique; Danube Delta and Prut river initiative between Romania, Ukraine and Moldova; Eastern Carpathian migratory corridor (Polish-Slovak-Ukrainian Biosphere Reserve); transboundary protected areas between Eritrea, Djibouti and Somalia; the intercontinental Biosphere Reserve of the Mediterranean Andalusia (Spain) established in 2006 and the East Asian-Australasian Flyway.

*Goal 1.4: To substantially improve site-based protected area planning and management*

**Summary of progress:** Fair progress to date with about 30 per cent of national protected areas having management plans in place and another 30 per cent under development, but effective implementation of plans are lagging behind. Likely to achieved partially by the target date of 2012.

**Key issues considered for assessing global progress:** Percentage of protected areas (area and number) have science based management plans; their preparation through stakeholder involvement; and implementation.

<sup>7</sup> [www.tbpa.net/tpa\\_inventory.html](http://www.tbpa.net/tpa_inventory.html)

15. In general, reports indicated that science-based management plans exist for at least 30 per cent of protected areas and management plans are in development for an additional 30 per cent. Some examples are given below. In some reporting countries, development of management plans is a statutory requirement and almost all of their protected areas either already have management plans or plans are under development. However, in nearly all developing countries, and in some developed countries, lack of sufficient human and financial resources is a major impediment to the effective implementation of management plans. Most of the reporting countries have developed guidelines and approaches for developing management plans and used participatory approaches that included the input of various stakeholders while developing the plans.

**Table 3: Development of management plans**

<i>Country/Region</i>	<i>Number of protected areas having management plans (MPs)</i>
Australia	All jurisdictions seek to develop PA management plans. South Australia State recorded an increase from 42.8 per cent to 61.7 per cent in the last ten years and plans to achieve state wide coverage by 2011. Victoria State approved MPs for 13 MPAS and 11 marine sanctuaries by 2007.
Albania	3 national parks have MPs
Bhutan	6 out of the 9 national parks have MPs
China	Many protected areas developed MPs but many of them have not been implemented due to various impediments.
Colombia	50 out of 51 protected areas have MPs and they are being implemented
EC	5312 of Natura 2000 sites have MPs, for another 3250 sites MPs are under development
Estonia	For 25 protected areas MPs are under effective implementation, for 35 protected areas MPs are under development.
France	80% of nature reserves, 100% of biological reserves and around 60 % of Natura 2000 sites have management plans.
India	For national parks 39 per cent have MPs; 22 per cent are under preparation. 39 per cent have no management plans. For wildlife sanctuaries 34 per cent have plans; 16 per cent under preparation and 50 per cent no plans. Annual plans of operations are prepared for all protected areas.
Spain	40 per cent of protected areas have MPs
Sweden	75 per cent of Natura 2000 sites have conservation plans

*Goal 1.5: To prevent and mitigate the negative impacts of key threats to protected areas*

**Summary of progress:** Fair to good progress to date in identifying the threats, but threat mitigation and prevention are lagging behind globally.

**Key issues considered for assessing global progress:** Status of threat assessment; actions to improve threat prevention and mitigation.

16. Nearly all reporting countries have established at least some measures to identify, prevent, and/or mitigate the negative impacts of threats to protected areas, however, the level of detail varied considerably. In general, threats to protected areas are identified through threat reduction analysis as part of the management plan for individual protected areas. Threats are also identified through routine field patrols by staff, community members or members of the public. Threats to protected areas and their levels vary from country to country. Prevalent threats include habitat fragmentation, conflicting adjoining land use, invasive alien species, mining and oil drilling, pollution, altered fire and hydrological regimes, legal and illegal logging, visitor impacts, hunting, and farming practices. Many countries highlighted climate change as one of the most significant threats in their fourth national reports.

17. Regarding prevention and mitigation measures, many countries reported that they have developed legislative, policy and regulatory measures, including mandatory environmental impact and strategic

environmental assessment of development projects and incentive schemes. Some countries indicated that prevention and mitigation of threats is accomplished through pre-emptive actions in the threat-reduction analyses, including sharing of responsibility between protected-area staff and local communities, and conflict resolution. Many countries reported that they were undertaking measures to restore and rehabilitate the ecological integrity of protected areas. Some examples include: boundary demarcation; selective salvage operations in forest reserves; replanting with indigenous species; strict law enforcement; conversion of water balance in bogs and fens; establishment of grazing systems in grasslands; removal of shrubs and trees from high value grasslands, bogs and fens; and coral-reef mooring.

*Goal 2.1: To promote equity and benefit-sharing and Goal 2.2: To enhance and secure involvement of indigenous and local communities and relevant stakeholders*

**Summary of progress to date:** Some progress to date in both the targets but way behind meeting the targets at global level and also at regional level except the Pacific islands region.

**Key issues considered for assessing the progress:** assessment of socio-cultural costs and benefits of protected for indigenous and local communities; recognition of governance types and community conserved areas; mechanisms for full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities.

18. Although one can conclude that these two targets of programme element 2 are not achieved at the global level, the principles of equity, participation, governance and sharing of costs and benefits are increasingly being considered at national levels and being incorporated into national policies.

19. Nearly all countries reported having legislative and policy frameworks for the equitable sharing of costs and benefits arising from the establishment and management of protected areas. However, few countries provided details and many countries indicated gaps in terms of equitable sharing of costs and benefits. One country (Australia) indicated that all its states and territories have enabling legislation related to conservation covenants on the title of private lands. Some countries established joint/collaborative/ participatory forest management programmes, tourism ventures, etc., to share revenues with local communities. Assessments of economic and socio-cultural costs and benefits of protected areas for indigenous and local communities have not been undertaken in the majority of reporting countries. Some countries reported undertaking measures to avoid and mitigate negative impacts on indigenous and local communities through the establishment of protected areas, which, *inter alia*, include alternate livelihood options; acquisition-compensation grants; covenanting programmes and revolving funds; and development of regulations to protect the rights and interests of indigenous and local communities.

20. A majority of responding countries reported that their relevant laws and policies incorporate a clear requirement for the participation of stakeholders and indigenous and local communities in the planning, establishment and management of protected areas. A few countries also reported that a process of public consultation, particularly with local communities, is undertaken at the national or local level before protected areas are established. In general, multi-stakeholder protected areas advisory committees or conservation boards are important mechanisms to facilitate participation of all stakeholders. Many countries indicated measures taken to support indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs), which, *inter alia*, include training, assistance through non-governmental organizations, dissemination of information, and funding. However, not much information is available regarding how many countries accorded recognition to ICCAs and co-managed protected areas. A survey of 16 countries by IUCN-WCPA Theme on Indigenous and Local Communities Equity and Protected Areas (TILCEPA)<sup>8</sup> found that six Parties (Australia, Brazil, Guyana, India, South Africa and Vanuatu) enacted legislation recognizing ICCAs as part of the country protected area network. Another five Parties (Canada, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Mauritania and the United Republic of Tanzania) provided legal backing to ICCAs, but as part of more general laws providing recognition of indigenous or community territories, rather than as protected areas or specific conservation mechanisms. Four countries (China, Morocco, Nepal and Nigeria) had no legal backing for ICCAs, but provided some level of administrative support. While there

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.iucn.org/about/union/commissions/ceesp/topics/governance/icca/ceesp\\_icca\\_legislation.cfm](http://www.iucn.org/about/union/commissions/ceesp/topics/governance/icca/ceesp_icca_legislation.cfm)

is some progress in terrestrial ICCAs, community managed marine protected areas, except the Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs) in the Pacific, are not well developed in other regions.

21. Information on how countries strengthened and diversified their governance types is not available except in a few instances. For example, Colombia has moved towards much greater participation of indigenous peoples, peasant communities, and others. It also encouraged the creation and incorporation of a complex set of regional and local reserves, collaboratively managed protected areas, indigenous territories, private protected areas, and community conserved areas. Australia has established 22 indigenous protected areas covering 14 million hectares and implementing new forms of conservation and covenanting programmes. Canada has established First Nations protected areas. Madagascar has also moved into diversifying protected-area governance types, and India extended its protected-area types to include those that could be managed in a collaborative manner with various government departments and local communities, and those to be managed by local communities themselves.<sup>9</sup> India has established 43 conservation reserves and community reserves. Brazil has reported that there are 65 indigenous lands in the community conserved areas, of which 38 are demarcated and 28 are legally established.<sup>10</sup> Under the UNDP/GEF project on the programme of work on protected areas, currently 19 countries (Afghanistan, Antigua Barbuda, Armenia, Benin, Burundi, Cambodia, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo, Federated States of Micronesia, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Kiribati, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Samoa, and Uganda) are assessing and diversifying protected area governance types.<sup>11</sup>

*Goal 3.1: To provide an enabling policy, institutional and socio-economic environment for protected areas*

**Summary of progress:** Fair to good progress to date, partially achieved the target at global level

**Key issues considered for assessing the progress:** assessment of policy, institutional environment; kind of social and economic valuation methods and incentives to support enabling environment.

22. The majority of reporting countries indicated that they had already put in place appropriate policy, institutional and socio-economic frameworks for effective establishment and management of protected areas. Some countries have already enacted specific legislation for protected areas and some countries have done so specifically for marine areas. Though some countries indicated that they carry out valuation of goods and services of protected areas, and use various types of socio-economic valuation methods, information on how those values have been captured into national accounts has not been provided. A number of tools are now available to assess the values and benefits of protected areas.<sup>12</sup>

23. Some countries developed and tested social and economic valuation methods concerning the effects of protected areas for regional development. Many countries indicated a lack of expertise and capacity in evaluating goods and services of protected areas and their reflection in national accounts, e.g., gross domestic product and national budgets.

24. From the information provided, some of the main impediments for effective establishment and management of protected areas include lack of financial resources; lack of trained manpower and capacities; competing needs on land; lack of intersectoral coordination, lack of clear-cut roles and responsibilities; jurisdictional conflicts; compensation issues and land tenure rights and ownership regimes; high rates of human population growth and resource consumption; lack of political support; lack of public awareness and support; boundary disputes between traditional leaders; wildlife damage and strained relations between local communities and management authorities.

<sup>9</sup> Kothari. (2008) A. Protected areas and people: the future of the past. *Parks* 17 (2).IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

<sup>10</sup> Implementation of the CBD in Brazil: Issues on the agenda of COP 9. Ministry of Environment , Brazilian Government.

<sup>11</sup> [www.protectedareas.org](http://www.protectedareas.org).

<sup>12</sup> Economic values of protected areas. Guidelines for protected area Managers, IUCN-WCPA [www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/pubs/pdfs/Econbomic\\_values.pdf](http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/pubs/pdfs/Econbomic_values.pdf).

*Goal 3.2: To build capacity for the planning, establishment and management of protected areas*

**Summary of progress to date:** Fair to good progress to date, could be partially achieved at global level.

**Key issues considered for assessing the progress:** comprehensive capacity needs assessments; programmes implemented for capacity-building.

25. Nearly all countries reported advancement toward achieving this target. Nearly all countries reported undertaking capacity-needs assessments and establishing capacity-building programmes. In the majority of countries capacity-building is an integral part of protected-area management plans. In some countries, premier specialized training institutions have been established for conducting regular and customized training programmes for managers and frontline staff. Some of these institutions have been recognized as regional training institutions for the countries of the region. In some countries, training programmes are also developed for non-governmental organizations and community groups as well as government protected-area staff. In many reporting countries, project-based training programmes are implemented. A few countries indicated that they are undertaking multidisciplinary approaches in the management of protected areas by incorporating information from natural sciences, social, economic and political sciences, and traditional knowledge.

*Goal 3.3: To develop, apply and transfer appropriate technologies for protected areas*

**Summary of progress:** Fair progress to date, could be partially achieved at global level.

**Key issues considered for assessing the progress:** development and transfer of technologies for protected areas.

26. Most countries reported the application of innovative approaches and technologies in the establishment and management of protected areas. In general these technologies include, remote sensing and geographic information systems, habitat and landscape mapping, satellite telemetry, and camera traps. Some new approaches include public-private partnerships, management effectiveness-tracking tools, rapid assessment and prioritization of protected areas management, and the IUCN Management Effectiveness Framework. Some countries reported development of new concepts and technologies such as “field biotope network planning”, “ecological security”, and “landscape security”. Some countries reported development of integrated information management systems for protected areas for the dissemination of information and approaches for effective management of protected areas. Many reporting countries indicated collaboration and sharing of information and technologies within the country and/or with other countries. Many developing countries called for regional collaboration, capacity and know-how, and financial support for using innovative and new technologies.

*Goal 3.4: To ensure financial sustainability of protected areas and national and regional systems of protected areas*

**Summary of progress:** Some progress to date but way behind meeting the target at global level and also at regional level.

**Key issues considered for assessing the progress:** financial needs estimates and status of development and implementation of sustainable finance plans; funding from bilateral and multi lateral sources.

27. **Financial needs assessment and status of sustainable finance plans:** The programme of work on protected areas requires Parties to develop and implement country-level sustainable plans for ensuring the financial sustainability of national systems of protected areas. Assessment of financial needs and gaps is one of the first steps in developing sustainable finance plans. With a few exceptions, most of the reporting countries have not undertaken these assessments. Information on financial-needs assessment is available for only 19 least developed countries, small island developing States, other developing countries and countries in economies in transition. The estimated annual funding gap for implementing the programme of work on protected areas by these 19 countries ranged from US\$ 3.28 million to US\$ 142.25 million. For developed countries information is available only for Australia and the European Community.<sup>13</sup> The majority of responding countries indicated that a major source of funding for

<sup>13</sup> UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/2/4.

protected areas is national and provincial budgets. With only few exceptions, most countries, including developed countries, find resources limited or very limited for the establishment and management of protected areas. None of the reporting countries elaborated on the strategies that are in place or under development to secure long-term funding for their national protected area system. Very few countries indicated the nature of supplementary funding mechanisms. To date, only a few countries are in the process of completing country-level sustainable financing plans.<sup>14</sup> Under the UNDP/GEF project on the programme of work on protected areas, eight countries (Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia) are currently developing sustainable finance plans.<sup>15</sup>

28. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) is the largest funding mechanism for protected areas worldwide. The GEF has invested in over 1,600 protected areas, covering more than 360 million hectares. The GEF has provided more than \$ 1.56 billion to fund protected areas, leveraging an additional \$ 4.15 billion in co-financing from project partners. In addition, the resources allocated to supporting protected area system projects have increased during each successive GEF replenishment cycle. In GEF-4 (2007-2010) approximately 450 million is allocated for protected-area systems. In addition other GEF initiatives such as the Small Grants Programme and the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund have also contributed significantly to protected areas. As per the guidance given by the Conference of the Parties in decision VII/28, GEF launched a UNDP/GEF project to support implementation of the programme of work on protected areas.

29. While there is increase in allocation under each GEF cycle, the share of biodiversity conservation under bilateral aid has remained fairly constant, between 2.4 per cent and 2.8 per cent of total bilateral official development assistance (ODA) through the last 15 years.<sup>16</sup> During the last meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Government of Germany launched the LifeWeb initiative, as a means to support and strengthen implementation of the programme of work on protected areas through new and additional financial resources. The Government of Germany has committed approximately 120 million euros over three years to support projects brokered through this initiative, within the framework of the International Climate Initiative. The Government of Spain has also recently committed 5 million euros. A number of other donors have expressed interest in supporting projects brokered by the LifeWeb Initiative. The vision is that LifeWeb will over time combine a diversity of donors, including public bilateral and multilateral agencies, foundations, and the private sector and become a 'one stop shop' for information and opportunity on protected areas financing. A small LifeWeb Coordination Office has been recently established within the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity in order to develop and manage the initiative.

*Goal 3.5: To strengthen communication, education and public awareness*

**Summary of progress:** Fair to good progress to date; partially achieved at global level.

**Key issues considered for assessing the progress:** Awareness raising activities; communicating benefits

30. Most countries reported undertaking at least some communication, education and awareness-raising activities for enhancing public understanding and appreciation of protected areas. In many countries conservation foundations and NGOs are supplementing governmental efforts in public awareness activities. In some countries, both federal and provincial governments are engaged in education strategies and programmes in communicating the biodiversity and other values of protected areas. Public awareness activities included the publication of brochures, booklets, posters, websites, CD-ROMs; organization of guided tours; engagement of folk art and cultural shows; construction and maintenance of nature trails, camping, mountain biking, recreational vehicle driving; competitions; observance of important days and festivals; establishment of conservation education/interpretation centres in protected

<sup>14</sup> UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/2/INF/7.

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.protectedareas.org/show/93082B15-F203-1EE9-B94F63E7C1525E11>

<sup>16</sup> OECD. 2007. Statistic on Biodiversity-Related AID. OECD Paris. Online at [www.oecd.org/dac/stats/crs](http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/crs)

areas, visitor centres, and “discovery ranger programmes” aimed at families gaining a first-hand experience of reserve values. One country reported development of a communication strategy for its national protected area system, including its marine protected areas. In many reporting countries, environmental education is introduced in the school curriculum. Information specifically on the inclusion of protected areas in the formal school curricula has not been provided.

*Goal 4.1: To develop and adopt minimum standards and best practices for national and regional protected area systems*

**Summary of progress:** Fair to good progress to date in developing standards, criteria and best practices but lagging behind in adopting them at global level and also at regional level.

**Key issues considered for assessing the progress:** development of standards and criteria for planning, selecting establishing and managing protected areas and adopting best practices.

31. A few countries (15 per cent) reported having comprehensive standards, criteria and best practices for site selection, management and governance of protected areas. In some countries, monitoring protocols for some categories of protected areas have been formalized. With regard to the Natura 2000 network, a number of guidelines for site management have been developed at the level of the European Union.<sup>17</sup> One reporting country indicated the approach undertaken in the systematic protection of marine areas and standards and best practices for new activities in terrestrial reserves.<sup>18</sup> IUCN-WCPA has produced an extensive series of “best practice” guides for protected area establishment and has proposed a set of minimum standards for protected area management. As of now 16 best-practice guidelines covering, *inter alia*, sacred natural sites to indigenous and community conserved areas, transboundary protected areas, mountain protected areas, management effectiveness, sustainable financing etc.<sup>19</sup>

*Goal 4.2: To evaluate and improve the effectiveness of protected areas management*

**Summary of progress:** Some progress to date, but unlikely to achieve the target at global and regional level by 2010.

**Key issues considered for assessing the progress:** Status of management effectiveness assessment; measures taken to implement results of assessment to improve management effectiveness.

32. Significant inter- and intra-regional differences among countries can be discerned in tracking the progress in this target. Within a region, some countries indicated significant advancement in carrying out management-effectiveness evaluations. However in a number of countries within the same region management-effectiveness assessment has yet to be undertaken. Most of the reporting countries indicated adoption of the IUCN-WCPA management-effectiveness framework, and have adopted either the WWF Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM) methodology, or a scorecard approach, for carrying out assessments. Some countries strongly articulated the need for availability of these methodologies and tools in local languages and increased technical capacity for undertaking management effectiveness evaluations. Information on the percentage of the overall surface of protected areas that have been evaluated, or conclusions of evaluations and incorporation of the results of evaluations into management plans of protected areas, is not made available in the reports. However a global study undertaken by the University of Queensland, with support from WWF, The Nature Conservancy, IUCN-WCPA, UNEP-WCMC, has documented over 7,600 management-effectiveness assessments from 128 countries.<sup>20</sup> Details of the global study are given in the information document.

<sup>17</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/guidance\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/guidance_en.htm)

<sup>18</sup> [http://www.gbrmpa.gov.au/corp\\_site/management/zoning/planners\\_info](http://www.gbrmpa.gov.au/corp_site/management/zoning/planners_info)  
[www.parks.tas.gov.au/publications/tech/management\\_code/summary.html](http://www.parks.tas.gov.au/publications/tech/management_code/summary.html)

<sup>19</sup> The documents can be downloaded from [www.iucn.org/about/union/commissions/wcpa/wcpa\\_puball/wcpa\\_bpg/index.cfm?](http://www.iucn.org/about/union/commissions/wcpa/wcpa_puball/wcpa_bpg/index.cfm?)

<sup>20</sup> Leverington, F, Hockings, M and Lemos Costa, K (2008). Management Effectiveness Evaluation in Protected areas: Report for the project ‘Global study into management effectiveness evaluation of protected areas’ The University of Queensland, Gattton, IUCN WCPA, TNC, WWF, Australia.

*Goal 4.3: To assess and monitor protected area status and trends*

**Summary of progress:** Fair to good progress to date, in monitoring coverage and trends at national, regional and global scales through the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA), but monitoring status is lagging behind.

**Key issues considered for assessing the progress:** mechanisms for monitoring and reporting; inputs to WDPA

33. A few countries (15 per cent) reported having mechanisms in place for monitoring the coverage, status and trends at national level. All reporting countries indicated that environment ministries are responsible for annually collating national protected-area statistics and submitting information to WDPA, to other site-based conventions and treaties such as the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, the World Heritage Convention, the Man and Biosphere Programme of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). Some countries also indicated that monitoring programmes for rare and endangered species, trade in endangered species through TRAFFIC, etc., are put in place. At the European Union level, a regional system of monitoring the coverage, status and trends of Natura 2000 network based on the data provided by the member States when submitting the lists of potential sites and later in the periodic national reports.<sup>21</sup>

*Goal 4.4: To ensure that scientific knowledge contributes to the establishment and effectiveness of protected areas and protected area systems*

**Summary of progress:** Fair to good progress to date.

**Key issues considered for assessing the progress:** Use of scientific knowledge and identification of research priorities for protected areas

34. Many reporting countries indicated extensive and appropriate use of scientific knowledge in establishment and management of protected areas including dissemination of information and knowledge to protected area managers and field staff. The IUCN-WCPA, other major conservation organizations are constantly incorporating the scientific developments in conservation biology, ecosystem science and remote-sensing applications in best-practice guidelines, tools and resources. Some countries have established specialised institutions for carrying out research in protected area related aspects. Some reporting countries indicated the establishment of scientific advisory bodies and the development of frameworks with scientific institutions. In some countries, specialized courses at undergraduate and graduate levels have been established in universities.

---

<sup>21</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/barometer/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/barometer/index_en.htm)

### III OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PROTECTED AREAS, AND WAYS AND MEANS FOR FUTURE SUCCESS

Issue	Discussion	Ways and means for future success
<b>1. Limited commitment by Governments, NGOs, protected area agencies to implement</b>	<p>Generally policy frameworks have been put in place in particular where guidance, methodologies and best practice exist (e.g. legal frameworks, gap analysis, management planning and management effectiveness) but implementation of policy and/or assessment findings is hard to judge. Issues to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of clear understanding of country commitments and obligations</li> <li>• Low national priority for protected areas and lack of understanding about protected area benefits, goods and services and their contribution to sustainable development</li> <li>• Unstable political situation</li> <li>• Lack of regional cooperation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation strategies; ideally developed at a regional level to help foster regional cooperation and implementation</li> <li>• National consortiums working with focal points for the programme of work on protected areas to implement and report progress and share best practice</li> <li>• Communication of protected areas benefits; and encouragement of economic assessments to help raise awareness</li> </ul>
<b>2. Inadequate integration into regional/national PA priorities and plans</b>	<p>Problems relating to integration focus around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of inter-sectoral coordination</li> <li>• Conflicting national legislation and policy</li> <li>• Lack of multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms</li> <li>• Lack of transparency in decision-making process</li> </ul>	<p>More regional support for Governments through better established regional and national networks and “Friends of the programme of work on protected areas” partnerships to highlight best practices, provide advice and aid implementation to support the development of better enabling environments for PAs</p>
<b>3. Deadlines difficult to achieve in countries with low capacity</b>	<p>There is an estimated 60% to 70% funding gap for effective implementation of the programme of work on protected areas. The perceived lack of funding is exacerbated by countries not developing strategies to secure long-term funding for their national PA systems. Although capacity remains an issue in relation to some of the very ambitious targets of the programme of work on protected areas; the main restraints in implementation associated more with lack of tools/guidance/best practice (i.e. in relation to theme 2). There is also clearly always going to be a disparity between rates of implementation between different countries which have well-developed and managed PA systems and those that do not. The programme of work on protected areas thus should consider reviewing not just achievement of targets but progress toward achievement.</p>	<p>There is a need for greater priority in developing needs assessment; funding strategies; financial and business planning. As this is a priority for GEF and other donors there is a major opportunity to work with Parties to develop appropriate financial planning and funding. Various other forms of capacity development are also required in relation to elements of the programme of work on protected areas which are not being adequately implemented – tools need to be urgently developed and field tested (i.e. in relation to costs and benefits) .</p>
<b>4. Lack of detailed action plans at national and regional levels for implementation</b>	<p>This issues related to the one above but also reflects the need for capacity development, additional tools and guidance, etc.</p>	<p>Develop national action plans for implementation of the programme of work on protected areas as part of NBSAP and regional plans</p>

Issue	Discussion	Ways and means for future success
<b>5. Limited implementation of Programme element 2</b>	Programme element 2 of the programme of work on protected areas which relates to issues of governance, participation, equity and benefit sharing remains the most under implemented part of the programme; problems include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate involvement of indigenous and local communities in protected areas planning and management</li> <li>• Local-community resistance to protected areas</li> <li>• Governments not embracing the wide range of governance types in PA strategies</li> </ul>	Various strategies could be developed, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement of areas of mutual interest, agreed processes etc between some indigenous peoples organizations and implementers of the programme of work on protected areas</li> <li>• Better reporting and dissemination of information in relation PAs designated/managed by indigenous and traditional peoples</li> <li>• Better reporting on (and progress on) how countries strengthen and diversify their governance</li> </ul>
<b>6. Limited reporting on the programme of work on protected areas implementation and lack of a reporting framework</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Various gaps in reporting relating to the reporting format</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt an effective reporting process that posters more periodic updates, using standardized, user friendly, web based frameworks and that show cases overall progress in achieving the goals of the programme of work on protected areas.</li> </ul>
<b>7. Inadequate knowledge regarding the programme of work on protected areas, dissemination of tools, best practice and training hampering implementation</b>	In some cases the best practices envisaged in the programme of work on protected areas are not backed up by suitable guidelines and tools to implement the activities; although progress has been made there remains a lack of simple, easily understandable methods and guidance and for these to be accessible in local languages and backed up with training modules and best-practice examples. Particular gaps relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methods for valuation of protected areas</li> <li>• Cost benefit analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advice, best practice and tools in relation to the assessment and equitable sharing of costs and benefits</li> <li>• Many countries indicated a lack of expertise and capacity in evaluating goods and services of protected areas</li> <li>• More translation of existing tools</li> </ul>

-----