



## REPORT OF THE MEETING ON SUSTAINABLE OCEAN INITIATIVE PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT

### INTRODUCTION

1. At its tenth meeting, the 193 Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and their partners opened a new era of biodiversity conservation by adopting: (i) a new ten year Strategic Plan (2011-2020) and Aichi Biodiversity Targets to guide international and national efforts to save biodiversity through enhanced action to meet the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity; (ii) a resource mobilization strategy that provides the way forward to a substantial increase to current levels of official development assistance in support of biodiversity; and (iii) a new international protocol on access to and sharing of the benefits from the use of the genetic resources of the planet, so called "Nagoya Protocol".
2. In the midst of unprecedented challenges in reversing the trend of continuing loss of biodiversity, which is further threatened by emerging threats of climate change impacts, the historic steps made in Nagoya are to effectively engage our common efforts toward sustaining the well-being of humanity in harmony with other creatures on this one and only planet.
3. At the Nagoya Biodiversity Summit, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention (COP 10) also undertook its in-depth review of the progress made in the implementation of the CBD programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity, and provided further guidance for enhanced implementation of the programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity.
4. COP 10 also urged Parties and other Governments to achieve long-term conservation, management and sustainable use of marine resources and coastal habitats, and to effectively manage marine protected areas, in order to safeguard marine and coastal biodiversity and marine ecosystem services, and sustainable livelihoods, and to adapt to climate change, through appropriate application of the precautionary approach and ecosystem approaches, including the use of available tools such as integrated river basin and integrated coastal zone management, marine spatial planning, and impact assessments.
5. COP10 then emphasized the need for training and capacity-building of developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States, as well as countries with economies in transition, as well as through relevant regional initiatives, and that these training workshops should contribute to sharing experiences related to integrated management of marine resources and the implementation of marine and coastal spatial planning instruments, facilitate the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity, and may address other regional priorities that are brought forward as these workshops are planned.

6. Pursuant to the requests mentioned above, and building upon the initial consultation meeting convened during COP 10 on 24 October 2010, the Executive Secretary organized, jointly with UNU-IAS-Operating Unit Ishikawa/Kanazawa, with financial support from the Government of Japan including the Ministry of the Environment (through Japan Biodiversity Fund), Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Ishikawa Prefecture and Kanazawa City, a Meeting on Sustainable Ocean Initiative Programme Development. The meeting was held at the Kanazawa City Conference Center in Kanazawa, Ishikawa Prefecture, Japan from 2 to 4 August 2011.

7. The meeting aimed at building a long-term programme of the Sustainable Ocean Initiative with identification of short-term priority actions, including implementation measures, in consultation with various partners, toward the goal of setting in place the Sustainable Ocean Initiative as a long-term capacity building partnership to facilitate the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets on marine and coastal biodiversity, in particular Target 6 and Target 11, and effective implementation of CBD programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity, including the guidance by COP 10 in decision X/29.

8. The meeting was attended by experts from Brazil, France, Japan, Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission/UNESCO (through written submission), Northwest Pacific Action Plan-UNEP, United Nations University-Institute of Advanced Studies, Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia, Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative/IUCN, IUCN-Fisheries Expert Group-CEM, Census of Marine Life, WWF-West Africa Marine Eco-region (WAMER), and International Collective in Support of Fish Workers. Domestic participants include representatives from the Ministry of the Environment; Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries; Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism; Cabinet Secretariat of the Headquarters for Ocean Policy; Ocean Policy Research Foundation; Japan Agency for Marine and Earth Science and Technology; National Fisheries Research Agency of Japan; Research Institute for Humanity and Nature; The University of Tokyo; Hiroshima University; and Japan Wildlife Research Center. The full list of participants is attached as annex I.

9. The organization of the meeting is attached as annex II.

## **1. OPENING OF THE MEETING AND KEYNOTE SPEECHES**

10. Ms. Anne McDonald, director of UNU-IAS/OUIK, welcomed participants to the meeting. She recalled that Kanazawa was the site where the Sustainable Ocean Initiative was gradually conceived, starting in April 2010 at the Marine Sustainability Seminar that brought together the CBD Secretariat and local community representatives, fishermen and participants from the policy making process. This was followed by the Informal Consultation Meeting on the Sustainable Ocean Initiative in Nagoya, Japan, 24 October 2010. Those meetings emphasized, *inter alia*, the importance of linking the local scale implementation and stakeholders with the policy process.

11. Mr. Hideka Morimoto, Deputy Director General of the Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment of the Government of Japan, formally opened the meeting. Mr. Morimoto thanked the Kanazawa City, the United Nations University and the CBD Secretariat for their efforts in organising this meeting. Welcoming international participants, he expressed his gratitude for the international solidarity for Japan that followed the Great Northeastern Japan Earthquake in March. He recalled that with its rich forest and the sea, Northeast Japan is endowed with high biodiversity, and recalled the responsibility of the Ministry of the Environment in ensuring its recovery after the disaster, conservation and sustainable use. He laid stress on the importance of achieving the Aichi Targets in order to achieve a life in harmony with nature, and reiterated the willingness of Japan to cooperate within the Sustainable Ocean Initiative for the preservation of marine and coastal biodiversity. Finally, he informed participants that the launching event of the UN Decade on Biodiversity will be held in December in Ishikawa, and expressed his hopes that the Sustainable Ocean Initiative would contribute in an operational manner to the preservation of marine and coastal biodiversity.

12. In a video statement, Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, welcomed participants and conveyed his deep sympathy and high esteem for the resilience of

the coastal communities that were affected by the tsunami tragedy in March. He recalled the special connection with Japan of the biodiversity community, a bond that was strengthened following the successful achievements of COP 10 in Nagoya. He expressed his gratitude to the Japanese Government for its leadership in COP 10, and its generous support, through Japan Biodiversity Fund, to technical cooperation and scientific partnerships for the achievement of the Aichi targets, that include important components on marine and coastal areas. In the aftermath of the Tohoku tsunami tragedy, the Secretariat of the CBD immediately informed of its availability to assist in the efforts for reconstruction and restoration in its areas of competence. Finally, Mr. Djoghlaif informed participants of the objectives of the Tokyo special symposium on Great East Japan Rebuilding to be held on 5 August 2011 following this meeting later this week, which will address issues such as the resilience and effective rebuilding of coastal communities affected by disasters, both in Japan and in the world.

13. Mr. Thia-Eng Chua, Chair of the East Asian Seas Partnership Council, delivered a keynote speech on 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets on marine and coastal biodiversity and capacity disparity in the developing world, and Mr. Hiroshi Terashima, Executive Director of the Ocean Policy Research Foundation, delivered a second keynote speech on the theme of sustainable ocean governance and marine biodiversity conservation. The summary of these presentations and of the discussions that ensued are provided in annex III.

## **2. MEETING BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND ORGANIZATION OF WORKS**

14. Ms. Jihyun Lee, Environmental Affairs Officer for Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and the Ecosystem Approach of the CBD Secretariat, and Ms. Anne McDonald, Director of the United Nations University, Institute of Advanced Studies, Operating Unit in Ishikawa/Kanazawa (UNU-IAS/OUIK) presented the meeting background, objectives, expected outputs and organisation of the planned work. The presenters thanked the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for sponsoring the organisation of this meeting, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), and the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport (MLIT) and the Japan Biodiversity Fund whose support was instrumental in starting this initiative, and the representatives of Japanese partner organizations that played a key role in its conception. The presenters expressed their deep respect for the communities' resilience in Northeast Japan following the disaster in March.

15. The presenters recalled that important legacies from COP 10 in Nagoya include the Satoyama Initiative and the Sustainable Oceans Initiative (SOI), and briefed the participants on the genesis of SOI earlier in 2010. The role of local community leaders in defining the direction of SOI and advancing the development of its programme was emphasized, together with the role of existing networks of scientists, particularly the *satoyama* and *satoumi*. The opportunity presented by Japan's presidency of the Conference of the Parties was emphasized. The speakers stressed that SOI must remain closely aligned with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and should synergise effectively with other existing global initiatives, such as the Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative (GOBI), whose focus on international scientific partnerships on open ocean and deep sea habitats can be effectively complemented by the focus of SOI on coastal areas.

16. Proposed focus areas of SOI's were presented, including the sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity, coastal livelihood and communities, practical management tools and facilitating cross-sectoral dialogues in order to further enhance our common efforts toward achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets on marine and coastal biodiversity. The importance of biodiversity for community resilience for climate change was underscored, with the necessity to link the local level implementation to science and policy processes. The participants were reminded that the expected outputs of the meeting include a long-term vision for SOI, goals and approaches, short-term priorities, and identifying partnerships and potential financial resources. The presenters noted the diversity of expertise, geographic representation and organisational representation, and the asset these represented for the meeting. The meeting agenda, sessions and breakout groups were described, together with their links to upcoming international processes in biodiversity conservation. In response to a comment from the audience, it was clarified that the choice of Aichi Biodiversity Targets of focus will be up to the breakout groups themselves. The

Meeting was encouraged to participate in the meeting discussion based on the following principles of SOI:

S: Share experiences, expertise, ideas and suggestions in designing the long-term programme of SOI and identifying short-term priorities

O: Open to new ideas, diverse approaches, different sectoral concerns, and different ecological, socio-cultural, and economic contexts

I: Innovative, creating new partnerships, strengthening existing collaborations, inviting partners, and mobilizing necessary technical expertise and financial resources

### **3. SESSION I: COP 10 OUTCOMES ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIODIVERSITY AND CHALLENGES AHEAD**

17. In its consideration of this item, the meeting had before it the following background documents: Decision X/2 on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, Decision X/29 on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity, the Explanatory Guide on Target 11 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, a background note on the POWPA Implementation Support Consortium, the Report of the FAO/UNEP Expert Meeting on Impacts of Destructive Fishing Practices, Unsustainable Fishing, and Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing on Marine Biodiversity and Habitats, the Draft Summary Report of the Informal Consultation Meeting on the Global Sustainable Ocean Initiative.

18. The meeting participants shared, through individual presentations and open discussions, their global, regional and national experiences in advancing towards the CBD Programme of Work in marine and coastal areas and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Summaries of the individual presentations are provided in annex III.

### **4. SESSION II: SUSTAINABLE OCEAN INITIATIVE PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT ON ADDRESSING CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS TOWARD ACHIEVING AICHI TARGETS ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIODIVERSITY**

19. For the consideration of this item, building on the above-noted presentations and deliberations of the meeting, the meeting participants were divided into two break-out groups, to consider in-depth development of SOI programme, including:

- a) *Group 1.* SOI Programme in support of Aichi Target 6 (addressing biodiversity concerns in sustainable fishery)
- b) *Group 2.* SOI Programme in support of Aichi Target 11 (marine and coastal protected areas)

20. The results of break-out group sessions are contained in annexes IV below.

### **5. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE STEPS**

21. The Meeting considered the draft synthesis of conclusion and future steps prepared by Co-Chairs, Group Discussion Moderators and rapporteurs and the Meeting Secretariat, building upon the results of individual presentations, submission of the meeting participants and the results of group discussion session. The results are contained in annexes IV below.

### **6. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

22. The Meeting considered and adopted the report of the meeting on the basis of a draft report prepared and presented by the meeting Co-Chairs with some changes.

### **7. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

23. In closing the meeting, the Co-Chairs thanked all the participants for their contribution to the successful conclusion of the workshop. They thanked the Government of Japan and various partner organizations for their support to the organization of the meeting. Participants expressed their appreciation to the meeting Co-Chairs and the group chairs for their leadership in steering the meeting discussion, the rapporteurs for excellent report preparation, and the Secretariat members for their effective and efficient servicing of the meeting.

24. The meeting Co-Chairs declared the meeting closed at 15:00 pm.

### **Annex I**

#### **List of participants**

#### **Parties**

Tel.: +81-3-5575-1532  
Fax: +81-3-5575-0090  
E-mail: hajime.kawamura@cas.go.jp

#### **Brazil**

Ms. Monica Brick Peres  
Biodiversity Assessment Coordinator  
Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity  
Conservation, Ministry for Environment  
EQSW 103/104, Bloco "D", Complexo  
Administrativo, Setor Sudoeste  
Caixa Postal 7993, 70.670-350  
Brasilia/DF  
Brazil  
Tel.: +55 (61) 3341.9054 / 3341.9057  
Fax: +55 (61) 3341.9054 / 3341.9057  
E-Mail: monicabrickperes@gmail.com

Mr. Yasuaki Bungi  
Cabinet Official  
Cabinet Secretariat, Secretariat of the  
Headquarters for Ocean Policy  
6F 1-7-1 Akasaka, Minato-ku,  
Tokyo 107-0052  
Japan  
Tel.: +81-3-5575-1532  
Fax: +81-3-5575-0090  
E-mail: yasuaki.bungi@cas.go.jp

*Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  
(MAFF)*

#### **France**

Mr. Christophe Lefebvre  
Agence française des Aires Protégées  
16, Quai de la Douane  
Brest Cedex 2 F-29229  
France  
Tel. : +33 (0) 6 87 90 73 66  
E-Mail: Christophe.lefebvre@aires-marines.fr

Mr. Yoshinori Suga  
Section Chief  
Ecosystem Conservation Office  
Fisheries Agency  
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo 100-8907  
Japan

*Ministry of the Environment, Government of  
Japan (MOEJ)*

#### **Japan**

*Cabinet Secretariat, Secretariat of the  
Headquarters for Ocean Policy*

Mr. Hajime Kawamura  
Counsellor  
Cabinet Secretariat, Secretariat of the  
Headquarters for Ocean Policy  
6<sup>th</sup> fl. 1-7-1 Akasaka, Minato-ku,  
Tokyo 107-0052  
Japan

Mr. Hideka Morimoto  
Deputy Director-General  
Nature Conservation Bureau  
Ministry of the Environment, Government of  
Japan  
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo 100-8975

Mr. Naoki Amako  
Assistant Director  
Biodiversity Policy Division,  
Nature Conservation Bureau

Ministry of the Environment, Government of  
Japan  
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo 100-8975  
Tel.: +81-3-3581-3351  
Fax: +81-3-3591-3228  
E-mail: NAOKI\_AMAKO@env.go.jp

*Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and  
Tourism (MLIT)*

Mr. Yusuke Hayakawa  
Special Assistant to the Director  
Ocean Policy Division, Policy Bureau  
Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and  
Tourism  
2-1-3 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo 100-8918  
Japan  
Tel.: +81-3-5253-8266  
Fax: +81-3-5253-1549  
E-mail: hayakawa-y2am@mlit.go.jp

## **ORGANISATIONS**

### **Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, UNESCO (IOC/UNESCO)**

Mr. Wenxi Zhu  
Head, UNESCO/IOC Regional Office for the  
Western Pacific  
Programme Specialist of UNESCO Bangkok  
Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission,  
UNESCO  
c/o Department of Marine and Coastal  
Resources  
9th Fl., Government Complex B, 120  
Chaengwattana Rd,  
120 Chaengwattana Rd, Bangkok 10210,  
Bangkok 10210  
Thailand  
Tel.: +6621411287  
Fax: +6621439245  
E-Mail: w.zhu@unesco.org  
Web: <http://westpac.unescobkk.org>

### **Northwest Pacific Action Plan - NOWPAP - UNEP**

Mr. Sangjin Lee

Scientific Affairs Officer  
Northwest Pacific Action Plan - NOWPAP -  
UNEP  
152-1 Halan-ro Gijang-up  
Gijang-gun  
Busan 819-705  
Republic of Korea  
E-Mail: [sangjin.lee@nowpap.org](mailto:sangjin.lee@nowpap.org)  
Web: <http://www.nowpap.org/>

Mr. Masakatsu Ohyama  
Administrative Officer  
Northwest Pacific Action Plan - NOWPAP -  
UNEP  
5-5- Ushijimashin-machi  
Toyama City 930-0856  
Japan  
E-Mail: [masakatsu.ohyama@nowpap.org](mailto:masakatsu.ohyama@nowpap.org)

### **United Nations University - Institute of Advanced Studies (UNU-IAS)**

Ms. Marjo Vierros  
Adjunct Senior Fellow  
Institute of Advanced Studies  
United Nations University - Institute of  
Advanced Studies  
9311 Emerald Drive  
Whistler, B.C. V0N 1B9  
Canada  
Tel.: + 604 938-1512; 604 902 0877  
E-Mail: [vierros@ias.unu.edu](mailto:vierros@ias.unu.edu)

### **Census of Marine Life**

Mr. Patrick Halpin  
Associate Professor  
Nicholas School of the Environment at Duke  
University  
Census of Marine Life  
Nicholas School of the Environment  
A324 LSRC Building, Duke University Marine  
Lab  
Durham, NC 27708-8062  
United States of America  
Tel.: +1 919 613 8062  
E-Mail: [phalpin@duke.edu](mailto:phalpin@duke.edu)

**European Bureau for Conservation  
Development (EBCD)**

Ms. Despina Symons  
Director  
European Bureau for Conservation Development  
Rue de la Science 10  
Brussels B-1000  
Belgium  
Tel.: +32 2 230 3070  
Fax: +32 2 230 8272  
E-Mail: [despina.symons@ebcd.org](mailto:despina.symons@ebcd.org)  
Web: <http://www.ebcd.org>

**Hiroshima University**

Mr. Osamu Matsuda  
Professor Emeritus  
Hiroshima University  
6-8-13 Hachihonmatsu-Minami, Higashi-  
Hiroshima  
Hiroshima 739-0144  
Japan  
E-mail: [matsuda036@go3.enjoy.ne.jp](mailto:matsuda036@go3.enjoy.ne.jp)

**IUCN - International Union for Conservation  
of Nature**

Mr. Patricio BERNAL  
GOBI Project Coordinator  
IUCN - International Union for Conservation of  
Nature  
Rue Mauverney 28  
Gland 1196  
Switzerland  
Tel.: 41 22 999 0322  
E-Mail: [patricio.bernal@iucn.org](mailto:patricio.bernal@iucn.org)  
Web: <http://www.iucn.org>

**International Collective in Support of  
Fishworkers**

Ms. Chandrika Sharma  
Executive Secretary  
International Collective in Support of  
Fishworkers  
27 College Road  
Chennai 600 006  
India

Tel.: +91 44 282 75303  
Fax: +91 44 282 54457  
E-Mail: [icsf@icsf.net](mailto:icsf@icsf.net), [icsf@vsnl.com](mailto:icsf@vsnl.com)  
Web: <http://www.icsf.net>

**Japan Agency for Marine and Earth Science  
and Technology (JAMSTEC)**

Mr. Yoshihisa Shirayama  
Executive Director  
Japan Agency for Marine and Earth Science and  
Technology (JAMSTEC)  
2-15 Natsushima Cho, Yokosuka City  
Kanagawa 237-0061  
Japan  
Tel.: +81-46-867-9000  
E-mail: [yshira@jamstec.go.jp](mailto:yshira@jamstec.go.jp)

**Japan Wildlife Research Center**

Mr. Kohei Hibino  
Research Scientist  
Japan Wildlife Research Center  
3-10-10 Shitaya, Taito-ku  
Tokyo 110-8676  
Japan  
Tel.: +81-3-5824-0967  
Fax: +81-3-5824-0968  
E-mail: [khibino@jwrc.or.jp](mailto:khibino@jwrc.or.jp)

**National Fisheries Research Agency of Japan**

Mr. Mitsutaku Makino  
Head  
Fisheries Management Group  
National Research Institute of Fisheries Science  
Fisheries Research Agency of Japan  
2-12-4 Fukuura, Kanazawa-ku, Yokoyama-shi  
Kanagawa 236-8648  
Japan  
Tel.: +81-45-788-7655  
Fax: +81-45-788-7655  
E-mail: [mmakino@affrc.go.jp](mailto:mmakino@affrc.go.jp)

**Ocean Policy Research Foundation**

Mr. Hiroshi Terashima  
Executive Director

Ocean Policy Research Foundation  
Kaiyo Senpaku Bldg., 1-15-16  
Toranomon, Minato-Ku  
Tokyo 105-0001  
Japan  
Tel.: 81-3-3502-1834  
Fax: 81-3-3502-2033  
E-Mail: h-terashima@sof.or.jp

**Partnerships in Environmental Management  
for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA)**

Mr. Thia-Eng Chua  
Chair  
Department of Environment and Natural  
Resources (DENR)  
Partnerships in Environmental Management for  
the Seas of East Asia  
P.O. Box 2502  
Quezon City 1165  
Philippines  
E-Mail: thiaengchua@gmail.com  
Web: <http://www.pemsea.org>

**Research Institute for Humanity and Nature  
(RIHN)**

Mr. Tomoya Akimichi  
Professor  
The Center for Coordination, Promotion and  
Communication  
Research Institute for Humanity and Nature  
457-4 Motoyama, Kamigamo, Kita-ku  
Kyoto 603-8047  
JAPAN  
Tel.: +81-75-707-2410  
Fax: +81-75-707-2510  
E-mail: akimichi@chikyu.ac.jp

**The University of Tokyo**

Mr. Nobuyuki Yagi  
Associate Professor  
Graduate School of Agricultural and Life  
Sciences  
The University of Tokyo  
1-1-1 Yayoi, Bunkyo-ku  
Tokyo 113-8657  
Japan

Tel.: +8103(5841)5599  
E-mail: yagi@fs.a.u-tokyo.ac.jp

**WWF-Sénégal**

Mr. Arona Soumaré  
Conservation Director  
Western African Marine Ecorégion WWF-  
WAMER  
WWF-West Africa Marine Ecoregion  
Sacre Coeur III No 9639  
Dakar  
Senegal  
Tel.: +221 869 3700  
Fax: +221 869 3702  
E-Mail: asoumare@wwfsenegal.org,  
arona.soumare@gmail.com

**SECRETARIAT**

**Secretariat of the Convention on Biological  
Diversity**

Mr. Jo Mulongoy  
Principal Officer  
Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and  
Technological Advice  
(STTM)  
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological  
Diversity  
413, Saint-Jacques Street W.  
Suite 800  
Montreal Quebec  
Canada  
Tel.: +1(514) 287 7027  
Fax: +1(514) 288 6588  
E-Mail: jo.mulongoy@cbd.int  
Web: [www.cbd.int](http://www.cbd.int)

Mr. Atsuhiko Yoshinaka  
Global Coordinator  
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological  
Diversity  
413, Saint-Jacques Street W.  
Suite 800  
Montreal Quebec  
Canada  
E-Mail: atsuhiko.yoshinaka@cbd.int  
Web: [www.cbd.int](http://www.cbd.int)

Ms. Jihyun Lee  
Programme Officer

Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters  
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological  
Diversity  
413, Saint-Jacques Street W.  
Suite 800  
Montreal Quebec  
Canada  
Web: [www.cbd.int](http://www.cbd.int)

**United Nations University Institute of  
Advanced Studies, Operating Unit  
Ishikawa/Kanazawa (UNU-IAS OUIK)**

Ms. Anne McDonald  
Director  
UNU-IAS Operating Unit Ishikawa/Kanazawa  
Shiinoki Cultural Complex, Ishikawa Prefecture  
3F 2-1-1 Hirosaka, Kanazawa  
Ishikawa 920-0962  
Japan  
Tel.: +81-76-224-2266  
Fax: +81-76-224-2271  
E-mail: [mcdonald@ias.unu.edu](mailto:mcdonald@ias.unu.edu)

Dr. Joannès Berque  
Conseiller du directeur  
Institut Mauritanien de Recherches  
Océanographiques et des Pêches  
BP. 22, Nouadhibou  
Mauritania  
Tel. : +222 2248-8302  
E-mail: [joannes.berque@gmail.com](mailto:joannes.berque@gmail.com)

Dr. Raquel Moreno-Penaranda  
Postdoctoral Fellow  
United Nations University Institute of Advanced  
Studies  
6F International Organizations Center  
Pacifico-Yokohama  
1 Minato Mirai, Nishi-ku, Yokohama  
Kanagawa 220-8502  
Japan  
Tel.: +81-45-221-2300  
Fax: +81-45-221-2302  
E-mail: [moreno@ias.unu.edu](mailto:moreno@ias.unu.edu)

**Annex II**  
**meeting agenda**

<b>Date/Time</b>	<b>Meeting Activities</b>
<b>2 August (Tuesday)</b>	
10:00 – 10:30	<b>Welcome Address</b> – Anne Mc Donald, director, UNU/IAS-OUIK  <b>Opening remarks</b> CBD Executive Secretary Ahmed Djoghlaif Hideka Morimoto, Deputy DG, the Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment
10:30 – 11:30	<b>Keynote Speech 1</b> <b>2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and Capacity Disparity in Developing World</b> <i>By Thia-Eng Chua (Chair of East Asian Seas Partnership Council)</i>
11:30 – 11:50	Coffee Break
11:50 - 12:20	<b>Keynote Speech 3</b> <b>Sustainable Ocean Governance and Marine Biodiversity Conservation</b> <i>By Hiroshi Terashima (Executive Director, Ocean Policy Research Foundation)</i>
12:20 – 13:00	<b>Meeting Background, Objectives, Expected Outputs, and Organization of Works</b> <i>By Anne McDonald (UNU-IAS) and Jihyun Lee (CBD Secretariat)</i>
13:00 – 14:00	<b>Lunch</b>
<b>Session I. (Plenary)</b>	<b>Theme : COP 10 Outcomes on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and Challenges Ahead</b>
14:00 – 14:20	<b>2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets and Capacity Development for Refining National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans</b> <i>By Atsuhiko Yoshinaka (CBD Secretariat)</i>
14:20 – 14:40	<b>CBD Programme of Work and COP 10 Decision on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity</b> <i>By Jihyun Lee (CBD Secretariat)</i>
14:40 – 15:00	<b>Japan’s National Strategy for Conservation of Marine Biodiversity and Capacity Development Needs</b> <i>By MOE Representative</i>
15:00 – 15:20	<b>Japan’s Fisheries Management and Fishing Ground Conservation</b> <i>By Nobuyuki Yagi (University of Tokyo), Yoshinori Suga (Fisheries Agency).</i>
15:20 – 15:40	<b>Coffee Break</b>
15:40 – 18:00	<b>National/Regional Efforts for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and Capacity Development Needs</b>  16:10 - 16:30 <b>Satoumi experiences</b> by Osamu Matsuda (Hiroshima University) 16:30 - 16:50 <b>Brazil experiences</b> by Monica Brick Peres (Brazil) 16:50 - 17:10 <b>French experiences</b> by Christophe Lefebvre (French National MPA Agency) 17:10 - 17:30 <b>Western African experiences</b> By Arona Soumare (WWF)
17:30 - 18:00	Questions and Answers
<b>3 August (Wednesday)</b>	
<b>Session I. (Plenary) continued</b>	<b>Theme : COP 10 Outcomes on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and Challenges Ahead</b>
09:00 – 09:30	<b>Key messages from Day 1 Workshop</b>

09:30 – 12:00	<p><b>Global Efforts for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and Capacity Development Needs</b></p> <p>09:30 - 09:50 <b>GOBI experiences on biodiversity conservation in high seas</b> by <i>Patricio Bernal (Global Oceans Biodiversity Initiative)</i></p> <p>09:50 -10:10 <b>IUCN experiences on sustainable fishery</b> by <i>Despina Symons (IUCN-FEG-CEM)</i></p> <p><b>IOC experiences on marine protected areas/marine spatial planning</b> by <i>Wenxi Zhu (UNESCO/IOC Regional Office for the Western Pacific)</i></p> <p>10:10 - 10:30 <b>Empowering Artisanal Fishworkers</b> by <i>Chandrika Sharma (International Collective in Support of Fishworkers)</i></p> <p>10:30 - 10:50 <b>Empowering Communities for Marine Conservation</b> by <i>Marjo Vierros (UNU-IAS)</i></p> <p><b>Global Scientific Partnerships for Marine Biodiversity: Census of Marine Life</b> by <i>Patrick Halpin (Duke University)</i></p> <p>10:50 - 11:30 Questions and Answers</p>
11:30 - 12:00	
12:00 – 13:00	<b>Lunch</b>
<b>Session II. (Break-out Group Session)</b>	<b>Theme: SOI Programme Development on Addressing Capacity Development Needs toward Achieving Aichi Targets on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity</b>
13:00 – 16:00	<p><b>Break-out Group 1. Target 6 (Addressing biodiversity in sustainable fishery)</b></p> <p><b>Break-out Group 2. Target 11 (Marine and coastal protected areas)</b></p> <p>Each group will identify the followings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Long-term goal of SOI Programme</li> <li>○ Scope and Approaches</li> <li>○ Short-term Priority Areas</li> <li>○ Partners and Resources for Implementation</li> </ul>
16:00 – 17:00	Presentation of Results of Break-out Group Session
<b>4 August (Thursday)</b>	
<b>Session III. (Plenary Session)</b>	<b>Theme: Conclusions and Future Steps</b>
09:00 – 11:00	Synthesis of Conclusions Based on Group Discussion Results
11:00 – 12:00	Identifying Future Steps
12:00 – 13:00	<b>Lunch</b>
14:00 – 15:00	Adoption of Meeting Conclusions and Closing of the Meeting

### Annex III

#### SUMMARY OF SESSION I PRESENTATIONS AND ENSUING DISCUSSIONS

##### **Keynote speech 1: 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets on marine and coastal biodiversity and capacity disparity in the developing world**

Mr Chua presented PEMSEA's approach towards the achievement of the 2020 Aichi biodiversity targets on Marine and Coastal biodiversity and capacity disparity in the developing world. Following is the summary of his presentation:

The obstacles outlined in the Review on the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity Action Plan (2002-2010) largely remain as the main impediments to achieving the 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets (ABT) particularly for coastal and marine areas. These impediments are largely related to lack of political will, policy and institutional conflicts, weak capacity, inefficient coordination of interagency functions, insufficient integration of sectoral policy and management functions, inaccessibility of information, lack public awareness and participation, etc. These impediments must be addressed if the ambitious 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets are to be achieved especially within a short timeframe of 10 years.

The coasts and oceans contribute a large part of the planet biodiversity. The ocean alone contributes no less than 50% of the global biodiversity and hence conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity becomes an indispensable major global effort if the ABT is to be achieved. Both national and local government efforts are needed to integrate and mainstream biodiversity conservation as part of their national and local economic development agenda. Stakeholder's participation is also essential.

Whilst recognizing the indispensable and often effective role of local and the scientific communities in biodiversity conservation, it is the prime responsibility of the various levels of government to help resolving or removing many of the above mentioned impediments. In this connection it is important to integrate marine biodiversity conservation such as marine protected areas, habitat restoration, species protection, etc as part of the coastal and ocean management agenda.

The Integrated Coastal Management (ICM) approach has evolved and improved over the years into a management system which provides a holistic and integrative planning and management framework, action programs and operational procedures for various coastal and ocean concerns including those on biodiversity conservation and for overcoming the various impediments especially at the sub national level. The ICM system covers 6 essential components: (i) Governance ( policy, legislation, strategies, actions, information, public awareness, sustainable financing and capacity development), (ii) Sustainable Development Aspects ( hazards, biodiversity, water resource, food security and livelihoods (e.g. fisheries, aquaculture) and land-sea based pollution); iii) the Planning Process ( ICM cycle); iv) Monitoring and Reporting ( State of the Coasts report) and v) Stakeholder's Participation and Partnerships and vi) Quality Control and Certification. The geographical and functional scaling up of ICM enables the expansion of management coverage across sectors and jurisdictions and provides a useful operational approach to achieving the goals of the CBD and the ABT.

At the regional level, the countries bordering the seas of East Asia have launched a regional coastal and ocean strategy viz "Strategy for Sustainable Development of the Seas of East Asia ( SDS-SEA), that comprehensively, strategically and holistically address the sustainable development challenges and their impediments including transboundary concerns, covering six Large Marine Ecosystems, viz: the Yellow Sea, East China Sea, South China Seas, Sulu Celebes Seas, the Gulf of Thailand and the Indonesian Seas. The regional strategy covers 217 programs related to implementation of international conventions (36), development and implementation of coastal and ocean policies (6), large marine ecosystems (15), biodiversity (28), Land-based pollution (18), water resource and river-basin management (7), fisheries and aquaculture (17), maritime transport (22), integrated coastal management (71), environmental investments (26) and scientific research (30). If fully implemented, the SDS-SEA can be effective in addressing almost all the key concerns of the Aichi Biodiversity targets and the impediments listed above. Implementation of the SDS-SEA is a long-term, collective endeavour. Each nation is encouraged

to develop its own national implementation plan for the SDS-SEA, the implementation of which will not only demonstrate greater national commitments at the ground level in achieving the overall goals of CBD and more specifically a long-term road map for achieving the various Aichi biodiversity targets.

Political support to the adoption and implementation of the SDS-SEA at regional and national level is facilitated through the Putrajaya Declaration in 2003 and the Haiko Declaration in 2006 when the Partnerships in Environmental Management of the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA) was formerly endorsed as the implementing mechanism. In 2009, the countries formerly endorsed its international legal personality as an international organization with a long term mandate to implement the SDS-SEA. In partnership with another 19 non-country partners, PEMSEA play a central role in mobilizing technical, financial and political commitments to undertake implementation of the 6 strategies and 217 programs at local, national and regional level in the East Asian Seas.

In order to ensure concerted national and local government efforts, the region has agreed to place by 2015 at least 20% of coastline with the adjacent land and waters under some form of integrated coastal management and at least 70% of the participating countries adopting national ocean or coastal policy, legislation or strategies. To date, the region has achieved more than 10% of its coastline under ICM practices while almost all countries in the region have already developed or developing either coastal / ocean policies, legislation, presidential degree and strategies or action plans.

The region on the other hand is confronted with various types and levels of challenges particularly in terms of capacity disparity between countries and between local governments in addition to the lack of strategic planning and integrated management skills for coasts and oceans. Whilst there are significant development in marine science and technology in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the region still lack behind in generating coastal and ocean managers equipped not only with the needed technical and management knowledge of the coasts and oceans but also coastal managers who have the skills to facilitating, negotiating and mediating with different types and levels of stakeholders and policy makers from government and private sectors. A paradigm shift in existing marine educational programs will be needed to generate the types of products most needed for managing and enhancing the sustainable use of the products and services generated by the coastal and marine ecosystems.

In the plenary discussions that followed, on the use of different terms for ICM, Mr Chua highlighted that how to implement is more important than how we call this management process, in view of diverse terms available to indicate the needed efforts for integrated management in coastal areas. He recalled his appreciation of certain successful MPAs, but underscored that the many unsuccessful cases should be learned from as well, particularly in cases where they are externally-driven. He recalled that there are many indicators that have been conceived for measuring progress in ICM, but that these are often too complex for use by local governments. He emphasized the need for simple, practical indicators, and recalled some of the key indicators used by PEMSEA. On the discrepancy between the political and election time scale, compared to the time scale of engagement required for ecosystem management, Mr Chua recalled that one key is to focus on local governments that are interested, that may then demonstrate their success. He emphasized the importance of listening and understanding the priorities of the local governments, which are often quite concrete and indirectly related to biodiversity. Finally, commenting on the change in language and keywords for the donor communities. The example of the shift from the ICM or ICZM terminology to Marine Spatial Planning was mentioned, along with the adverse consequences for efforts in implementation on the ground. Mr Chua stressed that ultimately what matters is not the terminology, but actions that improve the environment on the ground.

## **Keynote speech 2: Sustainable ocean governance and marine biodiversity conservation**

Mr. Hiroshi Terashima, Executive Director of the Ocean Policy Research Foundation, presented on the theme of sustainable ocean governance and marine biodiversity conservation. Mr Terashima thanked the Ministry of the Environment of Japan, the Secretariat of the CBD, and UNU-IAS for organising this meeting. Recalling the objectives of SOI, Mr Terashima expressed his appreciation of the opportunity for progress provided by this meeting. The importance of ocean resources and the risks they are facing were briefly reviewed, with resulting legislation and policy needs. Mr Terashima presented some of the key aspects of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, Agenda 21 and the Convention on Biological

Diversity, the World Summit on Sustainable Development and PEMSEA's Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA). He then reviewed the challenges of implementing the UNCLOS, the Agenda 21 Framework and the resolutions adopted at COP 10, including pollution and biodiversity decline, and some of the possible approaches in addressing them. The Nagoya Ocean Statement was presented, with a call to governments to encourage the establishment of the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and to support the renewed programme of work of the CBD, and highlighted the need for enhanced international cooperation. Mr Terashima provided an overview of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets of relevance to marine and coastal ecosystems. Recent Japanese initiatives on marine biodiversity were reviewed, including recent development in the legislative framework: the Basic Act on Ocean Policy, the Basic Plan on Ocean Policy, the Basic Act on Biodiversity, the New National Biodiversity Strategy and the Strategy for Conservation of Marine Biodiversity. *Satoumi*, a form of traditional stewardship of local seas by local communities, and its modern revival, were also discussed, as well as efforts in concerning Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), and collaborations between scientists and fishermen.

In the plenary discussions that followed, on plans to make different geographical sectors to distinguish between these vastly different ecosystems in countries with large meridional extent like Japan or Chile, Mr Terashima observed that the Basic Law on Ocean Policy does pay attention to this diversity of ecosystems, and that the Ministry of the Environment may provide detailed information on this matter. On the challenges involved in developing a holistic approach between different sectors, he informed participants that one aspect to keep in mind is the formulation of the basic ocean law was not under the responsibility of a particular ministry but of the diet and cabinet. As a non-governmental organisation, the OPRF was able to provide a cross-sectoral point of view and approach. A critical success factor that was highlighted was the political opportunity provided by the interest of the governing party and the collaborative spirit on this issue of the opposition parties, which fostered the active involvement of various ministries in cross-sectoral study groups. A provisional working group on ocean policy formulation was established at cabinet level. Mr Terashima finally laid emphasis on the critical role played by political will in the successful formulation of the ocean-related policies in recent years.

### **2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets and capacity development for refining national biodiversity strategies and actions plans**

Mr. Atsuhiko Yoshinaka of the CBD Secretariat presented this item. He recalled the sense of urgency emerging from the Third Global Biodiversity Outlook, including from the reported failure to achieve the 2010 biodiversity targets. He noted, however, that the report also pointed out emerging opportunities to take the decisive actions that will be needed in the coming years. An overview of COP 10 and MOP 5 decisions was provided, followed by a brief presentation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Mr Yoshinaka described the five goals of the Strategic Plan, in light of the need that emerged to address the underlying causes of the failure to meet the 2010 targets. A discussion of some of the Aichi Targets that relate to SOI followed. Regarding Target 11, he observed that complementary to the objective of protected areas coverage, it was critical also to ensure more effective management of existing protected areas, and that 64% of the oceans lies beyond national jurisdictions. Mr Yoshinaka then presented the guiding principles of National Biodiversity Action Plans (NBSAPs), and the next steps that Parties adopted in Decision X/2. Regarding setting of national targets, he emphasized that the global targets should be adapted to national circumstances, and that they should be Specific, Measurable, Ambitious and Attainable, Result-oriented and Time-bound (SMART), and illustrated this with examples from different regions. Progress achieved in organising NBSAP capacity building workshops in many countries organised was presented, as well as the Thematic Capacity Building activities, undertaken with the support of the Japan Biodiversity Fund. Mr Yoshinaka then showed a schematic timeline for targets achievements, and emphasized that sustainable use should be a key focus in the coming decade.

## **CBD Programme of Work and COP 10 Decision on Marine and Coastal Biological Diversity**

Ms. Jihyun Lee of the CBD Secretariat presented this item. Ms Lee began with an overview of the vision, basic principles and programme elements of the first programme of work adopted in 1988, and their elaboration in Decision VII/5 after in-depth review in 2004, focussing on elements of relevance to SOI. She reviewed some of the key findings from the Third Global Biodiversity Outlook, and the Nagoya Achievements for marine and coastal biodiversity. An overview of relevant Aichi Targets and of Decision X/29 was provided, including scientific synthesis, EBSA/ABNJ, and expert processes, followed by a brief review of the guidance provided in Decision X/29 on sustainable fishing and marine protected areas. Ms Lee then presented the CBD Expert Workshop on Marine Protected Areas to be held in March 2012. The scientific criteria that were adopted at COP 9 on the identification of EBSAs were summarised, and ongoing activities for growing capacities in this field were described. Ms Lee then listed a number of opportunities for developing international collaboration in the context of upcoming high profile meetings and events.

In the plenary discussions that followed, it was remarked that there is a perception that implementation significantly lags the planning processes, and that there may be a corresponding need to find ways to better communicate medium and long-term goals. Ms Lee concurred and provided the Secretariat's view of the challenges involved in building on current momentum and working on a diversity of issues in different regions at once, noting that many of these will take a long time to address. She agreed also with a participants' comments on the breadth of the challenges to address before 2020, pointing out the critical need for enhanced efforts for capacity development, particularly in developing regions. Finally, Ms Lee expressed her hopes that SOI will allow decisive progress on these issues.

### **Japan's National Strategy for Conservation of Marine Biodiversity and capacity development needs**

Mr. Naoki Amako, Assistant Director of the Biodiversity Policy Division, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment of Japan, presented this item. Mr Amako presented the Japanese Marine Biodiversity Strategy. He began the strategy's definition of MPAs, which used the IUCN's definition as reference. He then provided examples of the different types of existing MPAs, that comprise a great diversity from National Parks and Natural Monuments to locally-designed and locally-enforced MPAs, focused on fisheries resource management. He noted that different ministries manage different types of MPAs. Mr Amako reported that the total areal coverage of MPAs is 8.3% of the Japanese Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), however remarking that the term MPA is applied to a great diversity of situations on the ground. Regarding capacity building needs, Mr Amako informed participants of activities within the International Coral Reef Initiative, and of other activities that reflect the diversity of Japanese agencies active in marine capacity development. He reviewed the identified needs in capacity development, and invited participants to discuss and update these needs during this workshop.

In the plenary discussion that followed, Mr. Shirayama, Executive Director of Research at JAMSTEC, provided further details on the process of formulating the National Strategy for Conservation of Marine Biodiversity, highlighting the large number of contributions and comments received on the strategy and emphasized the participatory nature of the process, in which the public played an active role. He further commented that some aspects of EBSA may not be fully applicable to coastal regions, and of the possible need to clarify this aspect in future meetings. He informed participants of ongoing research on the applicability of EBSA to the coastal ocean. Mr. Shirayama also informed participants of the "monitoring sites 1000" project by the Ministry of the Environment, aiming at monitoring biodiversity on a long-term basis, for hundred years or more. In response to a question on the evaluation processes for the representativity and connectivity of the various MPAs presented, Mr Amako concurred that that is an important issue and briefly summed up efforts planned in this domain.

### **Japan's fisheries management and fishing ground conservation**

Mr Yoshinori Suga, Section Chief, Ecosystem Conservation Office of the Fisheries Agency of Japan, and Mr Nobuyuki Yagi, Associate Professor at the Graduate School of Agriculture and Life Sciences of the University of Tokyo, presented this item. Mr Suga reviewed Japanese fish production and imports in the

last 50 years, indicating that the condition of the resource is relatively stable except for the Japanese sardine, and the conservation, management and sustainable use of fishery resources, including the importance of the limited entry system and voluntary measures by fishers. The Total Allowable Catch system was introduced as early as 1996 for certain species, followed by resource recovery plans, 66 of which have been implemented on the Japanese coast as of 31 March, 2010. He emphasized that the conservation of critical marine habitats, such as seagrass beds, are an integral and essential component of fisheries policy. He noted the strong involvement of fishing communities in the resource conservation, over 90% of which had voluntarily engaged in events such as beach cleanups. Mr Yagi provided a comparative overview of the different instruments used in different countries for fisheries resource conservation and management. Japan's system is characterised by strong bottom-up, community-based instruments, by the diversity of conservation measures including tree planting to complement no-take and other restrictive measures, and by the central role of local fishery cooperatives. Dr Yagi's earlier work reported over a thousand MPAs in Japan, several hundred of which are unpublished rules self-imposed by the local fishery cooperatives. He pointed out an important challenge for the future, reporting that the number of fishers decreased from over 400,000 in 1970s, to less than half that in recent years, with a concomitant aging of the fishers population. Dr Yagi provided a final example of a no-take zone in Yaeyama islands, southernmost in Japan. Dr Yagi noted that it offers a good example of participatory conservation area, and could be a good candidate for the next SOI meeting.

Comments were invited in plenary on community-based views of Japanese fishery management. Dr Akimichi described the case of the management of the Japanese sandfish fishery in the Akita Prefecture, and of the lengthy but eventually successful process of building consensus for the moratorium and reaching an agreement among members of local fisheries cooperatives, working group, prefectural and national government. Meeting held in association with the resource management of sandfish reached more than 240 in number among relevant stakeholders between January 1992 and August 1997. Dr Akimichi further commented that an earlier count of community-based MPAs in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century reported over 4,000 locally designated and enforced MPAs. Regarding the diversity of MPAs, Dr. Yagi gave an example of an autonomous MPA in the Tokyo Bay, where local communities, not fishers, took the initiative to restore seagrass beds. Other examples were discussed, including other autonomous MPAs in Okinawa and in the Kagoshima prefecture. In the latter case the MPA was established by the local high school in collaboration with the local fishers. The MPA in a highly urbanised area in the Tokyo Bay provided a valuable experience in organising the local community, that highlighted the consensual view on the importance of providing children with the experience of catching and eating seafood. In response to a question on reporting of these particular Japanese experience into intergovernmental processes, a number of recent international publications, including the CBD Technical Series on satoumi, were mentioned as examples. On a question on the uptake at ministry level of the experiences gained at the community level, the presenters reported that communication between the various ministries and local processes is functioning and achieving good progress. A question was raised on the classification of the various types of MPAs in IUCN's category 6 protected areas, and their accounting by the CBD within the Aichi Targets. The presenters view was that many of the MPAs could certainly be taken into account, although the exact proportion of them is not determined at this point. It was commented that accounting into international processes and representativeness is an important aspect to clarify with the MPAs. To a question on the types of communities that the presentation referred to, it was clarified that these as a rule meant coastal fishermen and their families, high schools, usually excludes non-fishing industries. In response to participants comments, the speakers further informed that prior to undertaking this study on the number of Japanese MPAs, Zengyoren, the national union of fisheries cooperatives, was asked for a nationwide number on MPAs, but the figure was not available. Mr Yagi remarked that the total number of MPAs could be underestimated by the study, as some of the local community probably did not report on all their MPAs, particularly the very small ones.

### **Satoumi experiences in Japan with special reference to the Seto Inland Sea**

Mr. Osamu Matsuda, Emeritus Professor at Hiroshima University, presented this item. Mr. Matsuda spelt out the definition of *satoumi* as a coastal area where human interaction has increased both biological diversity and productivity, as first proposed by Yanagi in 1998. He highlighted the importance of linking

the management of satoyama and satoumi, and provided an overview of the 5 main elements of satoumi. Continuing with the case of the Seto Inland Sea, he informed of its extremely high fishery productivity per unit area. The environmental degradation that started in the 1970s, and the role of industrialisation and land reclamation on tidal flats and seagrass beds were then presented. Available information on the biodiversity of the Seto Inland Sea was presented, showing a large decrease of seashore animals during the 1960s and 1970s, starting in estuarine areas. The loss of habitat in shallow areas appears to be the main driver of biodiversity loss in the sea. Mr. Matsuda reviewed the recent policy developments pertaining to satoumi. A review of the 7 types of activities in satoumi creation activities followed, including the collaboration between coastal communities and those upstream in the watershed, those based on fisheries communities and their locally-driven regulations, protected areas of biologically or culturally significant sites, local volunteer activities with schools or diving clubs, particularly on restoration of *Zostera* seagrass beds. Encouraging data on biodiversity increase following such efforts were presented. Dr Matsuda then presented results of the Sub-global Assessment on satoyama and satoumi assessment, and the recently published manual and guideline for satoumi creation. He then reviewed the links of satoumi to other forms of coastal management, including community-based management, ecosystem-based management and integrated coastal management. He pointed out that a specificity of satoumi is that it often complements passive conservations measures with active measures to conserve the ecosystem. He continued with an overview of future perspectives, including the upcoming EMECS 9 meeting in Baltimore, Maryland, USA 28-31 August 2011, and the CBD Technical Series on Satoumi. Mr Matsuda concluded with remarks on the areas of potential contribution of satoumi to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

Responding to a question on implementing organisations, Mr. Matsuda provided further information on the satoumi-related activities undertaken by the Japanese Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), which has over 100 *satoumi* sites in Japan. He provided further information on the role of the Ministry of the Environment, and on the contributions of the Ministry of Land Infrastructure and Transport (MLIT).

### **French experiences**

Mr. Christophe Lefebvre, of the French National MPA Agency, presented this item. Mr Lefebvre began with an overview of the marine areas concerned by the French experience, with large Exclusive Economic Zones overseas, particularly in the Pacific. He presented the historical development of legal tools for the protection and management of coasts and seas in France. He began with the Coastal Conservancy, a public trust created in 1975 and dedicated to the acquisition of key coastal areas for their protection, with a target of acquiring 30% of the French coastline in the long run. The budget of the coastal conservation, of 35 million Euros per annum, comes from a tax on yachts and leisure boats. The Coast Law, adopted in 1986, is concerned with the protection of outstanding areas of the coast (green windows), costal planning and roads, to be forbidden within 2 km of the shore. Mr Lefebvre continued with a presentation the French MPA agency, which was acted in 2006, with targets of 10% of the sea protected by 2012, 20% by 2020, and an objective to build a comprehensive MPAs network. The components for developing eco-regional marine networks were presented, and illustrated with maps. Mr Lefebvre then presented the diversity of marine protected areas, and their mapping on the 6 IUCN categories. He continued with information on the Grenelle de la mer national intersectoral debate, conducted in 2009, and on the blue book produced by this process. The National Council of the sea and coasts, established in 2011, was then presented. Finally, Mr Lefebvre informed participants of a third international marine protected areas congress in Marseille, 18-25 October 2013.

In the discussions that followed, Mr Lefebvre clarified that the coastal conservancy acquisition decision are a mix of top-down and bottom-up approaches. Regarding the numerical target of 50% of MPAs as no-take zones and their potential effect on the fishers, he observed that it was not possible at this early stage to evaluate the benefit for fishers, and that the target of 50% of MPAs to become no-take zones, corresponding to 10% of the French territorial and economic exclusive zone, was an objective agreed upon within the Grenelle process where fishers were well represented. He remarked that the Aichi Targets were already achieved within the territorial seas, but that the objective now was to achieve them over the entire EEZ.

## **Western African Experiences**

Mr. Arona Soumare of the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) presented this item. Mr Soumare thanked the organisers for this opportunity to share West African experiences. He began with a brief overview of the bio-geographical and cultural diversity of the West African region. The West African Process was then presented, with the joint regional vision, the establishment of the Sub Regional Programme on Marine Coastal Conservation (PRCM), and the definition of a joint regional strategy. The rapid expansion of the number of MPAs was then presented, followed by a depiction of the many challenges involved in bringing “paper parks” to become “real parks”, that are useful to local livelihoods and sustainably financed. The issue of managing MPAs near or overlapping with areas of oil and gas exploration was then described. The decline of natural resources was another challenge, discussed in the context of societal needs and fishers migration. Mr Soumaré then provided information on the challenge of delivering tangible benefits in a context of poverty and urgent national needs. He then discussed the enabling factors for PoWPA implementation, including the linking with climate change issues, capacity-building, new regional challenges and donor roundtable processes. Landscape planning at different levels, from local to international, was then discussed. Mr Soumare then presented the CBD Targets and West African Priorities, in order to implement the strategic plan 2011-2020 in the region. In conclusion, Mr Soumare presented propositions to keep the momentum, including building on existing initiatives on the ground and local ownership and informed decision-making process.

In the discussions that followed, regarding the relationship of biodiversity and ABS in West Africa, a little studied region with high potential for undiscovered biodiversity and genetic resources, Mr Soumare highlighted the need for reliable and trustworthy information to make urgent and important decisions. Regarding the large proportion of fish that is exported outside the region, it was clarified that certain areas do have strong tradition in consuming local fish, with certain successful examples of grassroots based conservation. The regional context was recalled, including the difficult labour conditions of fishers, national needs for fish proteins were recalled, and potential contribution to enhanced food security. The gradual shift towards less sustainable fishing practice was highlighted as one of the important challenges, for which MPAs could be a precious tool.

### **Key messages from day 1**

Mr. Patricio Bernal, summarised the discussions of the previous day. Commenting on the many achievements of PEMSEA, he emphasized that SOI should provide tools for management that capitalise on the experience gained in previous decades. He described his view of SOI as an action-oriented holistic and integrated framework. He further noted that there were capacity development needs in all regions. He concurred with the presenters on the importance of inviting all relevant players in discussions of integrated management frameworks, noting the value of both horizontal communication between peers and the more challenging “vertical” communication, for example between scientists and managers. Harmonisation and effective interaction between local, national, and international levels was another essential challenge pointed out. He noted that several presentations showed the great diversity of MPAs, both within a country, and between different cultures, emphasizing the critical need to have site-specific adaptations. He observed that many presentations demonstrated that capacity development is urgently needed. Access to information and transparency were also highlighted. He noted as well that the importance of assessing effectiveness of MPAs was pointed out by several participants, possibly with the use of indicators. He commented on the consensus that participatory approaches are essential, noting the diversity of forms this may take, for example with the Grenelle de la mer in France or *satoumi* in Japan. He concluded expressing his pleasure with the quality of the presentations from the previous day.

### **Brazil experiences**

Ms. Monica Brick Peres of the Ministry of Environment of Brazil thanked organiser for the opportunity to share Brazilian experiences. She began with an overview of the Brazilian coastal and marine areas, comprising large mangrove and key coral reef areas and indicated the areas of large primary productivity. An overview of the Southern, North East and Central, and Northern regions of this maritime domain was then provided, followed by a description of the main coastal and marine impacts. Ms Peres further described the pressure on ecosystems from fisheries, which she identified as a key driver of biodiversity

decline in Brazil, as in most other parts of the world. She then described the fisheries management framework and associated challenges for biodiversity conservation. She emphasized the societal and food security importance of small scale fisheries, providing livelihood directly or indirectly to some 3.5 million Brazilians, and mentioned the successful experiences of community-based management of Extractive Reserves, representing about 10% of the total area of Brazilian marine protected areas. She described several ongoing and developing activities and initiatives for resource conservation which included coastal planning, environmental education and awareness building, international agreement implementation, coral reef and mangrove conservation and monitoring programmes, several successful threatened species conservation programmes as marine turtles (TAMAR, 30 years), albatrosses, manatee, Goliath grouper and the creation of the Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation. She showed that in Brazil the continental-side of coastal zones are better protected than the marine-side. The country is committed to increase the number of representative, integrated MPAs to reach the 10% Aichi target. To support this, there is a developing marine programme, mainly funded by GEF and Petrobras.

In the discussions that followed, responding to questions regarding the role international partners, Ms Peres stressed the importance of international cooperation to advance conservation objectives within the country. A participant commented on the environment impact of Petrobras considering for example its involvement in deep sea mining development. Ms Peres recalled that Petrobras in recent years has made great progress towards better environmental responsibility, transparency and provision of essential information, and expressed the view that their activities impact is probably much less than that of the fishing industry. She concurred however that further research is needed on the impact of prospecting activities on different taxonomic groups and ecosystems. Participants commented that this presentation, like several others, highlights the need for enhanced synergies between the fisheries conservation and the biodiversity conservation organisations, with several success stories in bridging the gap between resource management and biodiversity management. It was emphasized that this better link between fisheries and biodiversity conservation could be major contribution of SOI.

### **GOBI experiences on biodiversity conservation in high seas**

Mr. Patricio Bernal, of the Global Ocean Initiatives (GOBI), presented this item. Mr Bernal recalled that high seas is a legal term from the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, distinguishing it with the terms “open ocean” and “deep seas”. Reminding that the high seas are 64% of the world ocean, a large part of which is affected by human pressures (uses, climate change, and acidification). He noted that the degradation of ocean is less visible than land degradation, and receiving much less attention and funding, including from intergovernmental programmes. Mr Bernal presented the key objective of GOBI, of extending protection to the high seas. He informed participants that countries of the North East Atlantic regional sea have recently agreed to establish a large network of MPAs in the high sea, and showed other example of established and planned high seas MPAs. Commenting on the work in progress for the Clarion-Clipperton zone, he noted the difficulty of reaching an agreement between different countries, with a background of potential mineral wealth. Dr Bernal recounted the genesis of GOBI and described its objectives, and detailed the 7 CBD EBSA criteria for protecting biodiversity in the ocean. He concluded remarking that there are no citizens of the high seas, observing that only developed countries have access to them and that this aspect must be kept in mind.

In the discussions that followed, participants noted that some of the high seas species are long distance migrators, the high seas MPAs must be carefully designed. Mr Bernal concurred that this is one of the key challenge to be addressed for high-seas protection, pointing out limits to the site-based approaches, and noting potential areas for progress with closure periods that follow migratory paths, offering the example of the recent experience of Australia and Indonesia. Noting that the fisheries industries is extremely adaptive, operated with information on marine productivity on a real time basis, he emphasized that management in the high seas will have a number of very new challenges to address in order to become effective. In response to participants’ questions, Dr Bernal provided his views on potential synergies between SOI and GOBI. He noted that there are examples of EEZ that are also deep seas. He gave the information that the extension and adaptation of EBSAs to the coastal zone was requested by several island countries at COP 10, with plans for MPAs in their EEZs that would represent a large domain in the high-seas. It was commented that despite their limitation, area-based protection

mechanisms at least do allow a management of the effort. A question was asked on the critical factors of success that emerge from the GOBI experience. Mr Bernal recalled that GOBI was first and foremost a major science partnership, and that this aspect did attract the donors, which were keenly interested in advancing the knowledge. He further noted that the new knowledge and its visualisation should be effective in raising awareness on environmental issues in the high seas. However, he observed that using the exiting knowledge for policy is an equally important, complementary approach. A participant commented on the very different situation in the Mediterranean Sea, where EEZ leave little place for high seas. Mr Bernal concurred that the overlap between the legal high seas and the EEZ are a complex and important issue, he noted that the riparian countries in the Mediterranean have operational platforms for intergovernmental dialogue. Mr Bernal observed that the situation in the Arctic has a number of complexities of this kind.

### **IUCN-CEM-FEG - the fisheries expert group of IUCN: a brief description**

Ms. Despina Symons, coordinator of the IUCN Fisheries Expert Group (FEG) of the Commission of Ecosystem Management (CEM) presented this item. She began with an overview of the FEG's genesis, mission, objectives and principles of operation. She described the members of the FEG and their mode of selection, and presented the FEG composition, with a bureau and scientists from around the world. She then presented some of the products of work of FEG, including the FAO/UNEP/CBD report on the impact of destructive fishing practices and illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing on marine biodiversity, as well as the organization and outputs of the scientific workshop on selective fishing and balanced harvest in relation to fisheries and ecosystem sustainability including their uptake in policy. Other activities presented is the review of the role of MPAs in fisheries management and the participation in the CBD workshop on the implementation of Article 53 of the Nagoya decisions. Ms Lee mentioned a number of upcoming activities in collaboration with FEG, including workshops planned within the year.

In the discussions that followed, participants commended FEG for their production of policy-actionable reports with high quality science. On a question on management tools proposed by FEG, Ms Simmons clarified that the main role of FEG is to organise scientific debates based on the ecosystem approach and to produce reports/briefings. The key role of FEG within CBD and FAO was also highlighted by participants.

### **Empowering small-scale fishworkers for management and conservation of coastal and marine resources**

Ms. Chandrika Sharma of the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF) presented on this issue. She began by recalling the important contribution made by small-scale fisheries and fishworkers to employment, food security and livelihoods, as well as the relative sustainability of small-scale fisheries. The small-scale subsector, however, faces various threats, both from within and outside the sector. In response, small-scale fishworkers have taken up campaigns and struggles against what they perceive to be destructive developments. At another level, fishing communities have taken up resource management initiatives to protect and manage the resources on which they depend for their livelihoods. Ms. Sharma stressed that such examples demonstrate that communities can/ have managed resources, and that if small-scale fisheries communities can be empowered to manage resources, tremendous progress can be achieved in meeting both the targets set by the CBD as well as the Millennium Development Goals.

In supporting communities to manage resources it is important, she noted, to recognize that: social success is the basis for biological success. It is also important to recognize that communities have significant relevant local/ traditional/ experiential knowledge that can be used in design and implementation of interventions and that strengthening tenure rights is a major motivation for communities to take up conservation and management, in a context of competing uses of coastal spaces. Furthermore, efforts to strengthen local institutions are essential, to enable communities to claim and strengthen their rights and fulfill their responsibilities. Ms. Sharma detailed several measures that need to be taken to create enabling conditions that could make this possible. She also stressed the need to improve implementation of existing fisheries and environmental legislation, such as the ban on destructive gear, the enforcement of artisanal fishing zones (a major demand of small-scale fishworker), and regulation and control of pollution and habitat degradation.

In the discussions that followed, it was noted that a major challenge was the inadequate data and statistics on small-scale fisheries that often rendered the contribution and role of the subsector invisible. This often meant that the subsector did not get the policy and other support it needed. It was further noted that empowering communities and developing institutions is a process that needs time. Furthermore, it is only if enough attention is paid to issues of process, that the outcomes can be equitable. Communities are not homogenous entities and it is important that the perspectives and interests of different groups are addressed. It was also noted that the artisanal fishing zone, that was declared by many countries mainly to ensure equity between the small-scale and industrial fleets, also had a role to play in delivering environmental benefits.

### **Empowering communities for marine conservation**

Ms. Marjo Vierros, of the UNU-IAS Traditional Knowledge Initiative, presented this item. Ms Vierros emphasized the importance of the traditional understanding of the coastal areas by indigenous communities, which often is the base for community-based holistic management systems, with a strong sense of local stewardship. She noted the difference in view of this traditional view with sectoral approaches. She continued with a review of a number of examples of the effective application of traditional knowledge in a modern context in Canada and the Pacific Islands. She provided further information the revival traditional management systems in the Pacific Islands, putting forward a number of successful cases demonstrated effectiveness. She pointed out the challenge that many of the local management tools, such as protected areas, in global processes ; and unexpected impacts of global targets on the ground, such as fostering top-down approaches. Ms Vierros discussed the experience gained in the process of identifying community needs, reporting some of the demands from communities such as ownership of marine areas resources, or new cooperative management strategies. Finally Ms Vierros discussed the potential role of SOI, several aspects of linking processes from local to global scales.

In the discussions that followed, participants commented on the need for documentation of all the information from community-level management experience and results. Ms Vierros concurred and noted that the documentation would serve several purposes, such as communication between communities, and between communities and global processes. Responding to comments, Ms Vierros provided further information on the respective roles played by religion and resource management objectives for the establishment of tabu areas, with a recent shift towards a stronger role for the latter.

### **Global scientific partnership for marine biodiversity: census of marine life**

Mr. Patrick Halpin of Duke University presented this item. Mr. Halpin commented that a priority for this meeting appears to be to define a precise scope for SOI, noting that new and sustained scientific partnerships will be critical for SOI. He summarised the objectives of the census and its collaboration with the CBD. He noted that open oceans are outside national jurisdiction, with a consequent need for international partnerships to study and manage these areas. He noted that the majority of marine resource use is in the areas within national jurisdiction. He summarised the CoML and its statistics. He noted that the majority of the biodiversity research within CoML was done at the national level, with one important component of CoML being to take stock of these efforts. Mr. Halpin then briefly reported on the use of various recent technologies. Mr Halpin then raised a question on the research needs within SOI. He then presented CoML work on Ecologically and Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs), and OBIS, one of the legacies of the CoML. He presented statistics and characteristics of OBIS. He then provided further information on the CoML contributions to the CBD/EBSA process. He then presented the continuation of projects initiated within CoML, and ongoing exploration for a second census of marine life. He noted that a second census could play a key role in supporting the proposed work in SOI. He then presented elements of the Nereus programme on predicting the future of the oceans.

In the discussion that followed, participants commented that CoML provides an example of how science can contribute to an initiative like SOI, however with a need to keep in mind that science has its own drivers and objectives. The question raised on how much science is really needed to achieve the objectives of SOI, as many of the management needs are not prioritising new knowledge. Mr. Halpin noted that although many areas do have sufficient knowledge, the new competition for resource and coastal space between different uses of marine areas has often results on much higher requirements for

science. A participant noted that the areas of high biodiversity as indicated by the CoML are also close to areas of strong ecosystem degradation. Mr. Halpin noted that indeed these areas of highest diversity are those with heavy human resource use and impacts, and high risks of further degradation. A participant noted that the community needs for scientific information was very much at a very fine scale. Mr. Halpin concurred that for specific management questions in coastal areas, much finer scale information is needed, calling for needs in technological advances for finer observation of the ocean. He noted that base line and time series data remain absolutely essential for anticipating future change. Participants agreed that although more knowledge will always be needed, this cannot be a reason to delay action and making decision with available information – there will always be non-zero uncertainty.

### **IOC Efforts in the Conservation of Marine and Coastal Biodiversity (Written submission)**

Mr. Wenxi ZHU, Head of IOC Regional Office for the Western Pacific, briefed the meeting on the efforts of IOC in the conservation of marine and coastal biodiversity through the development and promotion of relevant scientific partnership, capacity building and provision of products and service. He presented Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) as an effective approach in and a public process of analyzing and allocating the spatial and temporal distribution of human activities in marine areas to achieve the harmony between biodiversity conservation and economic development. In view of the fundamental importance of a unified spatial information framework for the target 6 and 11, he reported that IOC's International Oceanographic Data and Information Exchange program (IODE) now gives attention to all ocean related data including biological, following the decision of the 2009 IOC Assembly to incorporate into IODE the Ocean Biogeographic Information System (OBIS) of the Census of Marine Life. With nearly 30 million observations, OBIS will be of great help in the development of a unified framework for spatial information on key habitats. With the ever-growing concern over the effects of ocean acidification on marine biodiversity, information on IOC's International Ocean Carbon Coordination Project (IOCCP) was introduced with its objectives. In collaboration with the SCOR and IGBP, IOC has been organizing one international scientific symposium series titled "Ocean Acidification- the Ocean in a high CO<sub>2</sub> world" aiming to attract the world's leading scientists to discuss the impacts of ocean acidification on marine organisms, ecosystems, and biogeochemical cycles. Moreover, He stressed the importance of capacity building on biodiversity conservation at national and regional level by enumerating IOC's Sub-Commission for the Western Pacific (WESTPAC). In addition to several capacity building activities of IOC in the Western Pacific, he further expressed his hopes that CBD considers the possibility of co-establishing one regional training and research center on biodiversity conservation with training module to be jointly developed in the near future.

**Annex IV**  
**SYNTHESIS OF MEETING CONCLUSIONS, AND SUMMARY OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS**  
**RESULTS**

**1. Developing a common vision for SOI**

While the overall vision and goal for SOI is still being developed, there has emerged a common understanding of elements that could form a part of this vision. These elements include:

- A focus on facilitating achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets on marine and coastal biodiversity, particularly targets 6 and 11, in a holistic manner
- A strategic, action-oriented approach that will support on-the-ground implementation priorities
- Reliance on partnerships and sharing at various scales (local, regional and global) and between different sectors, groups and stakeholders including between biodiversity and fisheries sectors
- A focus on providing targeted capacity development at all levels throughout its activities
- Achieving a balance between sustainable use and conservation and the promotion of flexible and diverse approaches towards this end.

**2. Time Frame**

SOI activities will be undertaken within a ten year time period, which is consistent with the time frame for achieving the Aichi Biodiversity targets (2011-2020). While this time frame is relatively long, it is also important to undertake selected activities that can get underway quickly, that are achievable, and that can provide results in time for COP-11 in 2012. Both short and long-term activities will thus be considered within the scope of SOI.

**3. Developing activities for SOI**

There is a long list of specific activities that could be undertaken within the scope of SOI, depending on priorities, available resources and capacity. Section 4, below, provides such lists for targets 6 and 11, which are closely linked. While it is expected that these activities will be further refined in the future, they fall in the following general categories that are considered central for the work of SOI:

- Facilitating information sharing and exchange, as well as learning from both successful and unsuccessful experiences
- Creating partnerships that can provide for targeted capacity building and technical assistance
- Providing for a two-way communication between global policy and scientific communities and local stakeholders
- Improving the scientific basis for implementation, including through improved technologies, cooperative research efforts, objective monitoring, results-based initiatives, open access data and analysis, and integration of local knowledge and science.
- Monitoring progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets on marine and coastal biodiversity (particularly targets 6 and 11) and facilitating the provision of guidance and capacity that will help their achievement.

**4. Towards developing a work programme for SOI**

The following provides ideas and directions that can be used to further develop the work of SOI for targets 6 and 11. The text was developed as a result of group discussions, and will be refined and prioritized in the future. The long term goal, scope and approaches, short term priorities as well as partners and resources for implementation are addressed. Targets 6 and 11 were discussed separately, with the understanding that many issues and activities related to these targets are interlinked and should also be considered holistically.

**TARGET 6:** By 2020, all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably and legally, and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided,

recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits

**Long term goal of SOI programme (2011 to 2020):**

Facilitate achievement of target 6.

**Scope and approaches**

Share and disseminate:

- information and experiences (good and bad), case studies and lessons learned relating to biodiversity concerns in sustainable fisheries
- documentation of ecosystem-based fisheries, integration of biodiversity concerns into fisheries
- Scientific knowledge and data
- Information about standards and protocols, comparable studies, and new technologies that can facilitate capacity building
- Methods for creating linkages between TEK and science

Facilitate communication and partnerships between:

- Biodiversity and fisheries communities and institutions
- Existing programs and partnerships of relevance to biodiversity and sustainable fisheries
- Regions, stakeholders, communities
- global, national and local levels
- CBD and private sector (including carbon market, e.g. Marine Ecosystem Services Partnership and blue carbon – keeping in mind equity and benefit sharing with communities)

Provide for capacity building through:

- Partnerships
- Training programs
- Facilitating continuation of efforts from Bergen meeting
- Developing a menu of tools and approaches for biodiversity and sustainable fisheries for local stakeholders
- Awareness building
- Developing e-learning tools

Develop an evaluation process to measure success of SOI in regards to target 6

**Short term priority areas (by COP 11)**

- Case studies – community initiatives on sustainable fisheries and biodiversity (published and web-based case studies, side event)
- Examples of collapsed fisheries and lessons learned
- Review of existing literature on biodiversity concerns in fisheries (possibly in partnership between fisheries and biodiversity organizations)
- Training workshop on sustainable fisheries
- Create network/partnership between local community initiatives

**Partners and resources for implementation**

- Small scale fishers' associations
- Networks and groups trying to manage resources

- International development agencies (e.g., JICA)
- NGOs and IGOs (e.g. IUCN-FEG-CEM and others)
- Educational institutions
- Local governments
- Park rangers

**TARGET 11:** By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascapes.

### **Long term goal of SOI programme (2011 to 2020)**

Facilitate achievement of target 11 through addressing issues of network representativeness and connectivity.

### **Scope and approaches**

- Promote the two ways to achieve target 11:
  - Protected areas
  - Other effective area-based conservation measures
- Produce and disseminate further guidance (criteria and steps) relating to representation and connectivity
- Hold expert meetings
- Facilitate capacity building for MPA managers, local stakeholders, communities and institutions by
  - Assessing and communicating the values, costs and benefits of MPAs and networks
  - Holding training workshops
  - e-learning
  - Information sharing
  - Development of case studies, best practices, guidelines, etc.
- Define a strategy to foster synergies between MPAs, fisheries and other sectors
- Undertake work on multiples scales as follows:
  - Global :
    - Undertake resource mobilization
    - Provide technical and financial support for cross-regional learning and information sharing
  - Regional:
    - Work / collaborate with regional organizations to develop and implement strategies for the Aichi marine and coastal targets (eg. PEMSEA, etc)
  - Sub-regional
    - Utilize existing frameworks, such as Regional Seas Programmes, multi-stakeholders platforms, etc.

### **Short term priority areas (by COP 11)**

- Organize potential special SOI sessions on MPAs at the following international events in 2012 and request SCBD to participate:
  - WSSD 2012 MPA targets

6th Global Oceans Forum  
SBSTTA 16 (April, 2012)  
Ramsar Congress (June, 2012)  
RIO + 20 (June, 2012)  
East Asian Seas Congress 2012 (July 2012)  
Yeosu Expo, Korea (high level event on marine and coastal biodiversity, June 20th)  
IUCN World Conservation Congress , Jeju, Korea (September, 2012)  
COP 11, India

- Review the current state of MPAs and update the World Database on Protected Areas (with UNEP-WCMC)
- Organize a SOI meeting on implementing the Aichi marine and coastal targets (MPA), March 2012 in Okinawa
- Invite regional seas organization and programmes to share experience and opportunities for implementing and achieving Aichi targets 11
- Organize a second SOI meeting at IMPAC 3, Marseille, Oct 2013

#### **Partners and resources for implementation**

- French MPA agency
- Norway and/or other countries
- IOC-UNESCO
- IUCN Global Marine and Polar Programme
- Regional and subregional programmes and organizations (regional MPA networks)
- International development agencies (e.g., JICA)
- Private sectors involvement and sponsorship
- International conservation IGO and NGO's
- Financial resources are needed for
  - Participation in International 2012 events
  - Okinawa workshop and SOI meeting
  - IMPAC 3 SOI meeting
  - Communication, outreach / fundraising
  - Human resources
  - Support staff for SOI -SCBD, UNU IAS, IUCN marine programme, others?
  - Technical resources
  - Existing social MPA networks

-----