



CBD



**Convention on
Biological Diversity**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/19
11 April 2016

ENGLISH ONLY

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC,
TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Twentieth meeting

Montreal, Canada, 25-29 April 2016

Item 4.1 of the provisional agenda *

**COMPILATION OF SUBMISSIONS OF VIEWS AND INFORMATION ON PRACTICAL
OPTIONS TO FURTHER ENHANCE SCIENTIFIC METHODOLOGIES AND
APPROACHES FOR THE DESCRIPTION OF AREAS MEETING THE EBSA CRITERIA**

Note by the Executive Secretary

1. Pursuant to paragraph 10 of decision XII/22, the Executive Secretary issued a notification on 30 September 2015 (ref No. 2015-113) inviting Parties and other Governments to submit views and information on practical options to further enhance scientific methodologies and approaches on the description of areas meeting the EBSA criteria. In addition, relevant organizations and indigenous peoples and local communities, including fishers, were invited to submit relevant scientific and technical information, including traditional knowledge.

2. The submissions from Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Colombia, El Salvador, the European Union, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, the International Maritime Organization, the South-east Atlantic Fisheries Organization, Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative, and The Marine Mammal Protected Areas Task Force of IUCN, in response to this notification, were compiled, collated and summarized in the table below.

* UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/1/Rev.1.

From notification:

1. Inputs, methodological approaches and outputs of previous regional EBSA workshops;
2. Types of information used to describe areas meeting the EBSA criteria;
3. Insights from other experiences in applying the EBSA criteria or other relevant compatible and complementary nationally or intergovernmentally agreed scientific criteria, including through national-level exercises (please refer to <https://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2015/ntf-2015-071-nat-eb-sa-en.pdf>);
4. Ways in which information compiled, analyzed and synthesized for the regional EBSA workshops has been used for research, planning and/or management purposes, and insights and lessons learned from these experiences;
5. Categorizing different types of areas described to meet the EBSA criteria, considering how the information used to describe these areas would be useful to different groups of stakeholders and for different research, planning and management purposes;
6. Incorporating new scientific data, including traditional knowledge, into previous EBSA descriptions where new information has become available; and
7. Considerations that may be taken into account when applying the criteria in different types of systems (e.g., frontal zones, upwelling zones, gyres, seamounts)

Submitter	1. Methods and outputs from previous workshops	2.Types of information used to describe EBSAs	3.Insights from other experiences	4.Information used for research, planning and management	5. Is information useful to other groups	6.Incorporating new data as it becomes available	7.Considerations for applying to different systems
Australia	Australia is supportive of the program of work on marine and coastal biodiversity under the CBD and the Convention's advice on issues such as the identification of Ecologically or	The existing EBSA process could be enhanced by increased global and sectoral scientific collaboration, improved sharing of data, and the means to access data at appropriate levels of	Australia has developed criteria for 1) Key Ecological Features (KEFs) and 2) Biologically Important Areas(BIAs) to describe its conservation values in the marine region, as a national alternative to EBSAs.	In Australia, BIAs were developed as part of Australia's Marine Bioregional Plans (MBPs), which characterize the marine region and its conservation values and help to develop regional priorities and planning advice based on the		Australia supports the Global Ocean Observing System, led by the Australian Institute of Marine Science (AIMS), CSIRO and the Integrated Marine Observing	

	Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs). Australia supports the use, by Parties to the Convention as appropriate to their national legislations and current practices, of EBSAs as a scientific and informational tool which may be used to inform ecosystem-based management of the marine environment, noting their usefulness in describing marine features which may be transboundary and/or in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ).	aggregation. The EBSA program provides a good starting point for an international model to build and improve upon.	1)KEFs are elements of the Commonwealth marine environment in the marine regions that are considered to be of regional importance for either the region's biodiversity, or ecosystem function and integrity. KEFs meet one or more of a set of 4 criteria. An interactive map detailing protected matters including the location of KEFs in Australia can be found at http://www.environment.gov.au/webgis-framework/apps/pmst/pmst.jsf. KEFs are used to assist with decision making under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act, including the assessment of impacts of proposed activities and in prioritizing monitoring of marine ecosystem health. Australia's experience	information provided through the BIA and KEF processes.		System (IMOS), and notes the value of sustained observation programs to support the monitoring and long-term management of areas, including those areas identified as EBSAs. An interactive map detailing protected matters including the location of Key Ecological Features in Australia can be found at http://www.environment.gov.au/webgis-framework/apps/pmst/pmst.jsf.)	
--	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

			in the development of these plans and their application may provide examples of how areas identified using similar criteria might be used to support spatial management and sustainable development. 2) BIAs: Australia has developed criteria for BIAs of regionally significant marine species. BIAs are spatially defined areas where aggregations of individuals of a species are known to display biologically important behaviour such as breeding, foraging, resting or migration. These areas serve to highlight the parts of a marine region that are particularly important for the conservation of protected species. They are an important consideration for decisions made under Australia's environmental protection laws. Table provided				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			compares different marine value criteria sets showing links between KEFs, BIAs and EBSAs.				
Bosnia and Herzegovina	The possible new scientific approach to describe other possible EBSA areas is to monitor a quantitative and qualitative abundance of plankton communities.	1.)Bosnia and Herzegovina so far do not have newer scientific data of their coastal water except the data of the shark population conducted by the researches from the Sharklab int.			The scientific information on these areas will certainly help the different stakeholders: the fisheries, State water and environmental protection Agencies. This data will help in construction of marine spatial plans for those areas and also for establishing the special management purposes.	Active collaboration with fisheries and local communities is necessary in order to obtain the best possible scientific data which can help in previous EBSA areas descriptions as well as the determination of other possible EBSAs.	1. The basic consideration that must be taken into account is the fish migrations (from the sea into the rivers and back). 2.Some areas on the land (like rivers and swamps) also can be included in EBSA because of their important role in life cycle of some fish species.
Canada		Canada has developed national guidance for the identification of EBSAs [http://www.dfompo.	1.Applying the three primary criteria of uniqueness, aggregation, and fitness	1. Guidance is provided on approaches to ensure consistency in use of information layers used	1.) There is currently very little guidance on how to use	1.) EBSA identification processes must also	1. The EBSA criteria are generally applicable to freshwater and coastal habitats, just as they are

		gc.ca/csas/Csas/status/2004/ESR2004_006_E.pdf] and Canada has endorsed the similar (CBD) EBSA criteria.	consequences has worked well in the past and can be expanded to other areas. 2. The fitness consequences criterion has been more challenging to apply; due to insufficient information to be sure all areas important to fitness were identified. 3. Simply reporting fixed boundaries for EBSAs loses information that may be valuable, so advice should indicate the number and type of ecosystem properties/components contributing to each spatial geographic unit at which the evaluation was done. 4. Participation by the full breadth of interests is essential for credibility and legitimacy. 5. Report outlines guidelines for data/knowledge-poor	for identification of EBSAs, and for collection and use of SEK/TEK/LEK. 2. Data and information used to identify EBSAs within each Canadian region have traditionally been compiled from a number of available sources (e.g., designed monitoring studies and remote sensing, modeling and spatial extrapolation of data from parts of the area or other similar areas, opportunistic or targeted local scientific studies, Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) and Local Ecological Knowledge (LEK) on many scales, and expert opinion). 3. Previous guidance noted the value of geo-referenced information for the application of the EBSA criteria. However, it is recognized that making use of the best information available	EBSAs in policy and management. To date, most EBSAs applications have been in the development of MPAs and MPA networks. Some managers have used EBSAs as part of a systematic process to establish the ecosystem basis for management ensuring consistency and efficiency in the development of management measures.	be revisited when something relevant is known to have changed and when new relevant types of information become available. 2.) Databases must be “living” – ongoing time series existing in the database must be kept up to date and the database reviewed every 5 years. This should not limit a more rapid inclusion of new data when they become available	in the offshore applications. However, some ecological functions and processes in these systems differ from comparable ones in marine systems, and guidance is provided on how these differences should be accommodated in the EBSA evaluation process. 2.Guidance is needed for the application of EBSAs in a consistent and efficient manner for the diversity of management situations in different sectors.
--	--	---	--	--	---	---	---

			EBSA situations 6. Once the boundaries of the study area have been defined, areas meeting the uniqueness criterion remain at the same pixels, locations, and size regardless of the scale at which the map is portrayed (geographic extents) causing problems with representation.	will not always allow this standard to be met due to constraints in time and resources.			
Columbia (Original submission In Spanish)	Besides using global classification systems (GOODS, MEOW and LMEs) they considered marine jurisdiction of each country in the region, information on ocean currents and natural biological corridors (marine mammals, fish and birds) and connectivity between coastal and deep-sea habitats, among other criteria.	One of the criteria used to try to define the boundaries of the EBSAs both in the Caribbean Region and the Pacific, was the use of physiographic features of the sea floor (p. Axis. Malpelo underwater ridge, which led to the EBSA).	For each object of conservation, four ecological criteria were applied: (1) if the object was an ecological system, (2) the abundance of the object, (3) its present condition as a substitute of viability (evaluation of size attributes, and landscape) context and (4) the vulnerability	Promote capacity-building in 1) biological, physical and chemical oceanography; 2) taxonomy and coastal pelagic fish and marine invertebrates; 3) Coastal benthos fauna and deep-sea fauna; 4) modeling of currents, among others; 2.) Promote the exchange of experiences among research teams from different countries and optimize financial and technical resources; This coordinated approach is even more complex where jurisdiction is shared with 27 countries in the Caribbean region. The		No efforts have been undertaken aimed at reducing uncertainty in EBSA's beyond those areas that overlap on them , such as the National Natural Park Corales depth that is superimposed on the north with the EBSA Higher Sinu Continental Slope and monitoring actions on the National Park Malpelo on the EBSA underwater Malpelo Ridge	Progress in understanding of the biodiversity of deep marine environments at regional level for both the Caribbean and the Pacific Region . However, still no progress in the definition of clear scientific basis on which to establish conservation priorities.

				decision for the selection of EBSAs, necessarily corresponds to an area within Colombian jurisdiction who had almost a third of the extension in the area.			
EU	A methodological approach similar to that applied for identifying Natura 2000 sites could also be considered to support the EBSA process . Information on establishing Natura 2000 sites: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/marine/index_en.htm and http://bd.eionet.europa.eu/activities/Natura_2000 Need a more systematic exchange of experience among organisers and participants of		The criteria, guidelines and approaches related to the following EU Directives, and the ways in which EU Member States have been implementing them, can act as a useful set of experiences and practices that could be considered in the present context: Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD – Dir. 2008/56/EC, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/marine/index_en.htm) or the Habitats Directive (Dir. 92/43/EEC) and Birds Directive (Dir. 2009/147/EC), which underpin the Natura 2000 is network of important ecological sites. A methodological approach similar to that applied for				

	regional EBSA workshops, drawing in particular on the experiences gained from workshops held in the past. For example, although workshops have generally been well prepared in terms of gathering and making available many layers of relevant data, the link between those data and the actual description of areas in some cases appears less than entirely clear, which could lead to an inconsistent approach to the identification of EBSAs between regions. The Secretariat should play an important role in ensuring the consistency of application of criteria at regional workshops. The reports from		identifying Natura 2000 sites could also be considered to support the EBSA process: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/marine/index_en.htm and http://bd.eionet.europa.eu/activities/Natura_2000 and http://bd.eionet.europa.eu/activities/Natura_2000				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	regional workshops contain a lot of information on gaps in the knowledge base and needed work, but this has so far not been analysed across regions and workshops. SBSTTA 20 and COP 13 could also usefully look into options for making use of this information towards enhancing the scientific process.						
Mexico	.	Gap Analysis has been adopted as a general framework for marine conservation actions and to some extent for the research agenda. It is a reference to strengthen and broaden the current PA system by providing guidelines to help the proposition and creation of new areas, as well as other alternatives of sustainable	Mexico organized a national process: Gap Analysis for the Determination of Marine and Coastal Priority Sites for Conservation, in 2005, attended by experts from all over the country. They did NOT use the CBD EBSA methodology, but did use the EBSA criteria. Priority sites were delimited based on	It integrates information on geomorphologic, physical and biological characteristics, as well as the main anthropogenic impacts and existing conservation and managements programmes. It is associated with a map of the insular territory which includes 1 365 insular elements	Map and poster presentations provided for gap analysis to show to other interested groups	Marine priority sites are not sufficiently represented in protected areas (PA) and we must multiply efforts in our endeavor to manage the sustainability of the Mexican coasts, islands and oceans in the MPS with other conservation tools. Periodic	It is associated with a map of the insular territory which includes 1 365 insular elements: 1 218 islands, 75 reefs and shoals, 31 islets, 17 cays, 12 rocks, eight bars, three mounds and one bank. It contains information about the occurrence of 2 450 marine and 1 937 terrestrial species, registered in 151 insular elements (15%).

		management.	digital cartography and then were validated with the aid of an internet site, which served, in addition, as a gateway for the exchange of opinions and information among participants and specialists			updates of gap analysis are necessary to include new knowledge and data for biodiversity and particularly human threats.	
New Zealand (Clark et al. 2014)		1.) This paper proposes a new method that could complement this process by adding more objective and transparent analyses. There are four main steps: 1) identify the area to be examined, 2) determine appropriate datasets and thresholds to use in the evaluation, 3) evaluate data for each area/ habitat against a set of criteria, and 4) identify and assess candidate EBSAs. 2.) This option selects seamounts that meet any one of the 5 “biological” criteria (i.e. unique/rare,		1.) The method can be applied to any habitat, but offshore seamounts were chosen as a test habitat to develop and evaluate it.			1.) The method can be applied to any habitat, but offshore seamounts were chosen as a test habitat to develop and evaluate it.

		diverse, productive, threatened species, critical habitat) and which contain environmental features that are vulnerable to human activities .					
Norway	Regarding EBSAs in ABNJ, SBSTTA/CBD should now consider the need for developing further guidance to be used in the EBSA process to ensure that new EBSAs are based on the best available scientific and technical information and that existing EBSAs are updated. Quality assurance for national EBSAs would be up to the respective national authorities, unless involvement of the SCBD is requested. <u>Preparations for</u>	It is not always clear what is comprised by which criteria, and some criteria can overlap. The scientific basis for the workshops should primarily be peer-reviewed literature. Also, if available, scientific knowledge gathered and maintained by established regional scientific advisory fora should be regarded as particularly relevant. This is especially important if there is no review process following the workshop. Secondly, other types of knowledge could be used, such as reports from national and international processes	In Norway, we have used the EBSA criteria, or similar, on two levels of valuation: <i>1. "Particularly valuable and vulnerable areas" - qualitative approach, based on existing knowledge."</i> The concept of "Particularly valuable and vulnerable areas" was developed between 2002 and 2006 and included in the first management plan for our oceans in 2006. The main focus was on areas with special importance for biological productivity or diversity. The set of criteria for identifying such areas has many similarities with the EBSA criteria. Large-scale areas were	Arctic Council working groups have on several occasions referred to the Helsinki Arctic EBSA workshop and the results from this, including in connection with a project on an Arctic MPA network and a project on Integrated Ecosystem Assessment for the Central Arctic Ocean.	The information generated by the process is potentially useful for research, planning and management purposes, especially in regions where access to scientific information may be generally limited or difficult. Identified EBSAs may lead to prioritization of management activities.	For an EBSA to be used as basis for further management actions and priorities, it is likely that comprehensive updating will be needed at the regional and local level before any measures can be developed and implemented. It would therefore be desirable if opportunities for updating EBSA descriptions with new significant knowledge existed. The more updated the EBSA information is, the more relevant the EBSAs will be as basis for development of	It might be useful for workshops to obtain better guidance on what are the most useful criteria for different features, perhaps even what criteria should preferably be used. A special challenge is areas with dynamic borders varying throughout the year and between years (example the Marginal Ice Zone in the Arctic

	<u>workshops:</u> Clear guidance to be provided before the workshop regarding the purpose of the workshop, the area to be considered, and how to describe areas meeting the criteria to help participants to prepare. Before the workshop starts it should be made clear whether the workshop will consider only ABNJ, only national areas or both. For areas under national jurisdiction, including extended continental shelves, national authorities should give consent that these areas are included in the process. Clarification on this point in advance	and local knowledge. Proposed EBSAs tend to be large and based on generalities rather than information on relevant spatial scales. Under such circumstances model outputs and expert judgment may be given too much weight.	qualitatively identified by scientific experts. 2.”Environmental value – semiquantitative and more detailed in time and space, based on existing and new knowledge from extensive mapping programs”. Extensive mapping programs were carried out, e. g. seabed mapping (www.mareano.no) and seabird mapping (www.seapop.no) and form the basis for management decisions on human activities, which would aim to ensure that the activities carried out were adapted to the features of the areas. During a three-year period, central scientists and managers worked out a method for using the EBSA criteria to analyze environmental values with differentiation in time, space and value			management measures by competent authorities. Prior to collecting new information, including traditional knowledge, from relevant organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities, including fishers, we should agree on a process (analyze what kind of information we would seek (e.g peer-reviewed literature about identified knowledge gaps), and be clear on how the collected information will be processed (e.g a new regional workshop?)	
--	---	---	--	--	--	---	--

	will help the further process, both in the workshop, in SBSTTA and CBD COP. Competent organizations and regional initiatives, such as FAO, RSOs/RAPs, RFMOs should be involved. An EBSA workshop needs to have participants with expert competence covering various themes/ disciplines relevant for the geographical region and also participants who have a good knowledge about the CBD EBSA process. To mitigate the lack of time and relevant expertise at the workshops, it should be consider whether it is possible to be more		level. The analysis was made public available in a web-based interactive system. See method and results described in www.oceanvalues.org CBD EBSA criteria are similar to the FAO criteria to identify vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs). CBD should consider whether there is something to learn from the VME process regarding data collection, data handling and quality control.				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

	flexible with regard to the number of participants from each country and also to extend the duration of the workshop with one or two days to ensure time for consideration of major proposed changes. We would also suggest that some kind of review process is included before the report is presented to SBSTTA. Outputs from single and often rather hectic regional workshops will inevitably be diverse, and to nominated experts and subsequent users it is unsatisfactory that the candidate EBSAs are not being thoroughly considered again by peers before submission to						
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

	SBSTTA.						
International Maritime Organization			IMO has several mechanisms to protect the biodiversity of marine areas, which may be vulnerable to damage by international shipping. Each area is identified and established according to internationally agreed processes using scientific criteria. Submission of information on: Special Areas under MARPOL; Particularly sensitive sea areas (PSSAs) "Special areas" are those that, for technical reasons relating to their oceanographical and ecological condition and to their sea traffic, the adoption of special mandatory methods for the prevention of sea pollution is required. Under MARPOL, these special areas are provided with a higher level of protection than other areas of the sea. Submission contains the 2013 guidelines for the designation of Special				

			Areas under MARPOL; A PSSA is a marine area that needs special protection through action by IMO because of its significance for recognized ecological or socio-economic or scientific reasons and which may be vulnerable to damage by international maritime activities. The identification and establishment of PSSAS is guided by the criteria outlined in the Revised Guidelines for the Identification and Designation of Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas (2006 and amended in 2015). There are currently 14 PSSAs designated by IMO.				
GOBI (1)	When participants met prior to the regional workshop (nationally or through the Sustainable Ocean Initiative), they were better prepared to propose			Progress in identifying local datasets and describing new EBSAs in national waters will depend heavily on national level data collation and capacity building. As such, GOBI underscores the	Risk assessments for MSP and area-based management can benefit from knowledge of	Further iterations of the EBSA process should make a concerted effort to include the deep pelagic in the description of new	The incredible range in sizes of EBSAs reflect attempts to apply the EBSA criteria to vastly different ecosystems. Coastal benthic systems and oceanic pelagic systems require different

	and discuss EBSAs, especially in national waters. The expert-opinion site selection process, which was based on the merit of individual sites, not their relative ecological importance within a given regional, has led to fundamental geographic and thematic gaps which will need to be addressed. Need to evolve more systematic processes to build upon and enhance the description of EBSAs currently in the Repository and underpin the description of further potential EBSAs. A first step toward a more comprehensive description of EBSAs is a review			strong need for the Parties to the CBD to continue funding of SOI and national and regional data warehouses and the use of OBIS regional nodes to support this capacity development.	the properties of EBSAs and help guide the selection of measures that ensure the EBSAs receive a relatively higher level of precaution. EBSAs or portions thereof could also influence the design of any representative system of marine protected areas in order to provide more comprehensive and long-term protection for their underlying values. GOBI would	EBSAs and in the review of existing EBSAs, using new data from the Census of Marine Life (Williams et al. 2010), and other national and international efforts. Provisions should be made for the ongoing acquisition of data, as well as the ongoing description of potential EBSAs. GOBI also urges the CBD to undertake a regular review of EBSAs (possibly every five years) allowing for updated data, boundaries, and further elaboration of key ecological and biological characteristics in need of enhanced management. Such a regular review should be complimented by biannual reporting by Parties and International bodies	approaches. Future iterations of the EBSA process should revisit the large pelagic EBSAs and describe the heterogeneity within those systems that may help competent authorities understand where and when enhanced management may be necessary.
--	---	--	--	---	---	---	---

and gap analysis of existing EBSAs. The holders of traditional knowledge will make a critical contribution to the expert-based approach. Traditional knowledge will be the primary source of information for many areas that meet EBSA criteria, especially in coastal areas. There is a need for a formal process for data submission and review, engaging the broader scientific community. This may include a common data network and global standard for data exchange that would allow easy aggregation of data. GOBI strongly urges the Parties to					like to see EBSAs used in the decision-making processes of other international bodies and competent authorities. EBSAs or portions thereof could also influence the design of any representative system of marine protected areas. To facilitate the use of EBSAs in this context, GOBI urges support for consideration of decision IX/20 Annex II including through an expert workshop and consideration of the results of ongoing research into this area by GOBI and	on the implementation of management measures within EBSAs and decadal assessments of the state of described EBSAs. GOBI recommends a series of workshops in direct coordination with RFMOs, UNESCO and the ISA <u>focused on ABNJ</u> or straddling these areas, because the vast majority of EBSAs thus far are in national waters.	
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	the CBD to financially support and call for contributions of data and knowledge to national and global data warehouses (e.g. OBIS), particularly by those projects and organization that receive government funding. Further, we urge the development of a full-fledged Repository that includes information, methods and experiences related to the description of EBSAs, not solely the EBSA templates that are to be transmitted to competent authorities and other relevant organizations.				other entities.		
GOBI (2)	Considerations should continue to be given as to how to complete the 'first round' of EBSA workshops to include those regions so far not	We encourage: i. a review of the gaps identified by each EBSA workshop; ii. further consideration of biodiversity values in politically conflicted	It will be important to incorporate national EBSA-like processes and new or revised information relevant to the EBSA Repository;	Translating EBSA results from global advice to regional implementation will require further support for regional and national capacity-building exercises to deliver,			

	covered by the process – SW Atlantic, Southern Ocean – or not yet in a position to submit information for consideration by CBD.	zones not included within the EBSA process at the request of States; iii. further work to identify ‘science on shelves’ (i.e. additional data not invited, unwilling or unknown); iv. better incorporation of predictive modelling, use of proxies and analogues – particularly in deep-sea areas where biological data is limited; and v. means to incorporate traditional knowledge into previous EBSA descriptions using social science methodologies.		strengthen and apply EBSAs.			
SEAFO	The Scientific Committee has not undertaken any new research pertaining to EBSA since the workshop in Swakopmund	As a general observation the Sub-Group noted that the physical data layers provided by the technical team for these open ocean areas were much more comprehensive than the			The data used consists of environmental and biological data that could be used for the planning of scientific surveys.		

		biological layers. The group also considered other sources of information from published literatures, but the amount and quality of information on biodiversity and ecology for this area is sparse compared to those of other oceans and the coastal zones.					
MMPATF		The Marine Mammal Protected Areas Task Force (MMPA Task Force) is creating a new tool to be called Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs) The selection criteria for IMMAs is being devised by key CBD EBSA partners and participants, as well as by leading marine mammal experts, to align closely with both the EBSA criteria and the new IUCN standard for the identification of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), and will be finalized in 2016. Much of the motivation for devising the IMMA				We envision that our work will be partly a basis for re-evaluating EBSAs with regard to marine mammals — both in terms of checking whether the ideal areas have been chosen, or indeed left out, as well as evaluating strategic boundaries to be set for EBSAs and MPAs as well as determining zones where enhanced recognition or possibly further protection could occur. Knowing where marine mammals are on the map will be of great	

		tool has to do with creating a standardized process for presenting data as well as expert analysis to the EBSA process. We envision that the IMMA tool will provide a more consistent, streamlined and authoritative process for bringing marine mammal data and expertise to the table, similar to the BirdLife marine IBA process.				value to shipping, fishing and other industries that overlap with marine mammals, as well as to the many countries that are embarking on a process of marine spatial planning (MSP). We also envision evaluation workshops that would look specifically at marine mammals and the existing CBD EBSAs to look at gaps and opportunities to (a) expand the rationale with more evidence for some EBSAs, (b) make recommendations to adjust the boundaries for or suggest expansion of some EBSAs, and (c) to make recommendations to create new	
--	--	---	--	--	--	---	--

						EBSAs in some cases.	
Taranto et al 2012		This paper identifies seamount EBSAs and threats considering different ecological groups in both pelagic and benthic communities. Therefore, this framework may represent an important tool to mitigate seamount biodiversity loss and to achieve the 2020 CBD goals			This framework will allow managers to identify seamount EBSAs and to prioritize their policies in terms of protecting undisturbed areas, disturbed areas for recovery of habitats and species, or both based on their management objectives. It also identifies seamount EBSAs and threats considering different ecological groups in both pelagic and benthic communities.	1.) Propose a framework for applying the CBD criteria to locate potential ecologically or biologically significant seamount areas based on the best information currently available. The framework combines the likelihood of a seamount constituting an EBSA and its level of human impact and can be used at global, regional and local scales.	
Yamakita et al. 2015			This paper reviews previous and current			Regarding methods for the quantitative	

			ideas as well as the methods used, for the identification of EBSAs. In particular, the following issues are addressed: problems associated with different types of marine ecosystems in the Japanese Archipelago, such as seagrass and seaweed beds, coral reefs, offshore pelagic plankton, and deep-sea benthic ecosystems; and problems associated with the integration of multiple criteria that are not totally exclusive.			evaluation of each criterion and their integration, application of these methods to help forest ecosystems in Hokkaido, Northern Japan is presented as a case study.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--
