



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/6  
12 February 2016

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC,  
TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE  
Twentieth meeting  
Montreal, Canada, 25-30 April 2016  
Items 4.4 of the provisional agenda\*

### **MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING AND TRAINING INITIATIVES**

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. Marine spatial planning (MSP)<sup>1</sup> is a public process of analysing and allocating the spatial and temporal distribution of human activities in marine areas to achieve agreed ecological, economic and social objectives.
2. Pursuant to decision XI/18, section C, paragraph 1 (c), the Executive Secretary convened, with financial support from the European Commission, the Expert Workshop to Provide Consolidated Practical Guidance and a Toolkit for Marine Spatial Planning, in collaboration with the United Nations Environment Programme's Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (UNEP/DEPI), the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the Global Environment Facility (GEF-STAP) and the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), in Montreal, Canada, from 9 to 11 September 2014. An overview of the results of the workshop is provided in section II of the present note. For the results of this workshop, see UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/6.
3. In subparagraph 2(g) of decision XI/18 C, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to organize training workshops closely linked to existing capacity-building efforts on marine protected areas and ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) to use marine spatial planning as a tool to enhance existing efforts in integrated marine and coastal area management, identification of EBSAs, design and establishment of conservation and management measures, including marine protected area networks and other area-based management efforts, and other marine biodiversity conservation and sustainable-use practices. Subsequently, the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting also requested the Executive Secretary to facilitate, through technical training and the information-sharing mechanism on EBSAs, the use of scientific information compiled for the description of areas meeting the scientific criteria for EBSAs to support efforts, at the regional or national level, on the use of marine spatial planning by Parties and competent intergovernmental organizations (decision XII/23, para. 19).

---

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

<sup>1</sup> Step-by-Step Approach for Marine Spatial Planning toward Ecosystem-based Management (Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission Manual and Guides No. 53, ICAM Dossier No. 6).

4. Experiences from countries at the workshop mentioned in paragraph 2 above also highlighted a critical need to build close linkages between MSP and existing initiatives for spatial assessment (e.g. description of EBSAs or vulnerable marine ecosystems) and/or spatial planning and management (e.g. integrated marine and coastal area management, marine protected areas, ocean zoning, etc.). Further work is required, however, to elaborate on approaches and available toolkits linking various spatial assessments and planning initiatives within the overall context of marine spatial planning to address this identified need.

5. At its tenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to organize an expert workshop to identify practical and innovative ways to accelerate progress on the establishment and effective management of marine protected areas (MPAs) in underrepresented areas of the marine environment, particularly areas with highly important and irreplaceable biodiversity under national jurisdiction, building on Parties' experiences and information on impediments and success factors, and involving all relevant stakeholders (decision X/29, para. 76). The Conference of the Parties, in subparagraph 1(b) of decision XI/24, invited Parties to undertake major efforts to achieve all elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, and, in particular, to improve marine protected areas in all areas within their jurisdiction. Due to lack of resources, these activities have not been undertaken to a full extent so far. As such, further work is needed to address this request from the Conference of the Parties, in particular to address all elements of Target 11 in marine and coastal areas.

6. Pursuant to paragraphs 19 and 22 of decision XII/22, the Executive Secretary convened, with financial support from the Government of Japan (through the Japan Biodiversity Fund), the Sustainable Ocean Initiative (SOI) capacity-building workshop for South America (Lima, 23-27 February 2015), and, with financial support from the Governments of Japan, through the Japan Biodiversity Fund, and France, through the *Agence des aires marines protégées* (the French marine protected areas agency), the SOI Capacity Development Workshop for East Africa (Nosy Be, Madagascar, 18-22 January 2016), with particular focus on providing training in MSP, as well as on the use of other tools that can facilitate the application of the ecosystem approach towards achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets in marine and coastal areas.

7. Likewise, pursuant to decisions X/29, XI/17, XI/18, XII/22 and XII/23, with financial support from the Government of the Republic of Korea, through the EXPO 2012 Yeosu Korea Foundation and Korea Maritime Institute, and various other in-kind contributions, the Executive Secretary convened: (a) the SOI Training of Trainers Workshop (Yeosu, Republic of Korea, 11-15 September 2015); (b) the SOI National Capacity Development Workshop for Samoa (Apia, Samoa, 28-30 September 2015); and (c) the SOI National Capacity Development Workshop for Namibia (Swakopmund, Namibia, 13-16 October 2015), with particular focus on facilitating national implementation of integrated marine and coastal area management and marine spatial planning, building on existing work under the Convention, such as the description of ecologically or biologically significant marine areas. The venue for the national workshops was determined depending on the interests/commitments of the respective host Governments as well as the availability of co-financing and technical or logistical support by respective Governments and international/regional/national partners. The replicability of national experiences in other countries was also considered. A report on activities under the Sustainable Ocean Initiative is provided in section III of the present note.

8. These activities support the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets in marine and coastal areas, addressing in particular Aichi Biodiversity Targets 6, 8, 10, 11 and 12.

## II. MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING

9. The Expert Workshop to Provide Consolidated Practical Guidance and a Toolkit for Marine Spatial Planning, referred to in paragraph 2 above, was attended by experts from Albania, Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Cameroon, China, Colombia, the European Union, Germany, Iceland, Mexico, Mozambique, Palau, Peru, the Philippines, Seychelles, the United States of America, UNEP/DEPI, the

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the Global Environment Facility (GEF-STAP), UNEP-WCMC, Duke University, the Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative (GOBI), ICCA (Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Areas and Territories) Consortium, International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the World Ocean Council, the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and an observer from Brazil.

10. At this workshop, it was noted that MSP is related closely to the work under the Convention on Biological Diversity for the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity. The fundamental principles of MSP are strongly integrated into the programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity under the Convention, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, which focus on the ecosystem approach, the precautionary approach, and area-based management and cross-sectoral approaches. In particular, scientific information related to EBSAs compiled through the regional EBSA workshop process under the Convention on Biological Diversity can support the formulation of management objectives and provide a useful scientific basis. MSP also needs to be closely linked to other area-based management measures, including marine protected areas.

11. This workshop noted that step-by-step guidance documents<sup>2</sup> were available on MSP, integrated marine and coastal area management and/or other land use management plans, but existing guidance often did not reflect the differences in scale and scope of MSP efforts and is limited in addressing challenges associated with the first-generation MSP efforts, particularly for initiatives that did not have significant long-term funding and technical assistance.

12. In this regard, this workshop highlighted a need for guidance on MSP that:

13. Offers practical advice on how to initiate an MSP process, and how to sustain an effort through implementation;

- (a) Recognizes that an incremental approach to MSP can reduce barriers to initiation;
- (b) Recognizes the difficulties of gaining formal approval for an MSP planning process, and supports an early emphasis on accessing the necessary funding and authority for implementation;
- (c) Recognizes that cross-sectoral participation needs to be emphasized at an early stage;
- (d) Addresses the challenges of successful MSP implementation, including sustaining changes in the behaviour of users and institutions;
- (e) Addresses adequate recognition of the governance structure of indigenous peoples and local communities and the application of traditional knowledge to MSP.

14. Recognizing the above-noted needs for guidance on MSP, the workshop participants articulated the following set of considerations that should be taken into account in its development and implementation:

- (a) Facilitate cross-sectoral coordination and decision-making;
- (b) Integrate the various interests, needs and perspectives of stakeholders;
- (c) Utilize the best available scientific information and link spatial mapping to planning and decision-making;

---

<sup>2</sup> Some examples are: Step-by-Step Approach for Marine Spatial Planning toward Ecosystem-based Management (Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission Manual and Guides No. 53, ICAM Dossier No. 6); CBD Technical Series 68: Marine Spatial Planning in the Context of the Convention on Biological Diversity; Compilation of information to support the discussions of the Expert Workshop to Provide Consolidated Practical Guidance and a Toolkit for Marine Spatial Planning (UNEP/CBD/MCB/EM/2014/4/INF/1); Using scientific information related to ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) to implement marine spatial planning and ecosystem based management (UNEP/CBD/MCB/EM/2014/4/INF/2); Marine spatial planning in practice—transitioning from planning to implementation (UNEP/CBD/MCB/EM/2014/4; UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/INF/23); CBD Technical Series 76: Integrated Coastal Management for the Achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

- (d) Address capacity gaps and resource needs.

14. The outcome of the above deliberations is summarized in the annex as a set of considerations for guiding the development and implementation of MSP at the national level. This set of considerations would not replace the existing step-by-step guidance documents, as referred to above in paragraph 8, but rather serve as an initial checklist for Parties and other Governments in their efforts to initiate or enhance their MSP initiatives, facilitating the efficient and effective use of existing guidance documents. It should also be noted that many of challenges associated with MSP development and implementation are country-context specific, and therefore continuous efforts are needed to compile national on-the-ground experiences.

### **III. TRAINING AND PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE SUSTAINABLE OCEAN INITIATIVE**

#### **Background on the Sustainable Ocean Initiative**

15. The Sustainable Ocean Initiative (SOI) is a global platform for building partnerships and enhancing the capacity of developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States, as well as countries with economies in transition, to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets related to marine and coastal biodiversity in a holistic manner by:

- (a) Facilitating the sharing and exchange of knowledge, information, experience and best practices;
- (b) Creating partnerships that can provide targeted capacity-building and technical assistance in support of on-the-ground implementation priorities;
- (c) Enhancing interactive communication among global policy, science and local stakeholders;
- (d) Facilitating the monitoring of progress;
- (e) Developing partnerships among different sectors and stakeholders on local, regional and global scales;
- (f) Working together to achieve a balance between the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity, and promoting flexible and diverse approaches towards this end.

16. SOI focuses on assisting Parties in achieving a balance between the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity through the application of an action-oriented, holistic and integrated capacity-building framework. SOI is committed to building bridges between biodiversity conservation and resource management sectors. In decision XII/23, paragraph 20, the Conference of the Parties welcomed the capacity-building initiatives being facilitated by the Executive Secretary through the Sustainable Ocean Initiative in collaboration with Parties and relevant organizations.

17. Further details on the mission and approaches of SOI can be found in the Action Plan for the Sustainable Ocean Initiative (2015-2020) (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/mar/soiom-2014-02/official/soiom-2014-02-actionplan-en.pdf>) and SOI website ([www.cbd.int/soi](http://www.cbd.int/soi)).

18. In its first three years (February 2013 to January 2016), SOI has provided training opportunities for 295 participants from 63 country Parties, including 7 countries that benefited from multiple training activities, and numerous regional and national organizations/initiatives. The activities described below build on the initial capacity-building workshops organized through the SOI for West Africa (Senegal, February 2013) and for East, South and South-East Asia (China, December 2013).

19. Through SOI, various partners and initiatives at the global, regional and national levels have been engaged to create synergies and enhance effectiveness in their technical and financial support to enhance the capacity of developing-country Parties. SOI has also contributed to increased awareness by high-level

senior policymakers of the need for marine biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. For example, the SOI high-level meeting, convened by the CBD Secretariat and the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries of the Republic of Korea, in Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, on 16 October 2014, in parallel with the COP 12 high-level segment, gathered 74 senior policymakers, including Ministers and their representatives, from 24 countries, and 15 representatives of 12 United Nations/international organizations, to express their commitments to achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets through partnerships and supporting capacity-development activities.

**Sustainable Ocean Initiative Capacity-building Workshop for South America (23-27 February 2015) and Sustainable Ocean Initiative National Workshop for Peru (24-25 September 2014)**

20. Pursuant to decision XII/22, paragraphs 19 and 22, the Executive Secretary convened, with financial support from the Government of Japan, through the Japan Biodiversity Fund, the Sustainable Ocean Initiative Capacity-Building Workshop for South America, which was hosted by the Government of Peru in Lima from 23 to 27 February 2015 in collaboration with the Ministry of Environment of Peru, the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific, the UNEP Caribbean Environment Programme and various other partners and resource speakers. Further details are provided in the workshop report (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/14).

21. This workshop was organized with the following objectives:

(a) To showcase regional and national experiences in addressing marine biodiversity loss, focusing on sharing experiences related to integrated management of marine resources (including marine spatial planning) and links to ongoing technical and capacity-building initiatives under other processes or initiatives;

(b) To characterize barriers, challenges and opportunities faced in achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and to emphasize the need for cross-sectoral and integrated management, including marine spatial planning;

(c) To identify ways in which participants can integrate marine spatial planning into their national or subregional contexts to enhance progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

22. The results of the Expert Workshop to Provide Consolidated Practical Guidance and a Toolkit for Marine Spatial Planning, referred to in the above section, informed the design of the workshop programme and were tested through workshop plenary discussions and group exercises, including a stakeholders' role-playing simulation exercise.

23. Workshop participants were mainly officials and experts from each of the countries and relevant organizations in the region responsible for addressing the Aichi Biodiversity Targets concerning marine and coastal biodiversity, in particular within the context of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and planning/policymaking on integrated marine and coastal area management at the national and/or regional levels. Thus, the participants were expected to be in a position to translate the knowledge and skills gained during the workshop into concrete actions, in particular with regard to the application of marine spatial planning, in support of implementation at the national and/regional levels. The workshop was attended by experts from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, French Guiana, Guyana, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay, Venezuela, and a number of relevant national, regional and international organizations. Each Party was represented by two participants—one from the environment sector and one from the fishery sector.

24. The regional workshop was preceded by the SOI national workshop for Peru, convened by the Ministry of Environment of Peru, in collaboration with CBD Secretariat, in Lima on 24 and 25 September 2014. The workshop was attended by relevant officials and experts from different sectors/government agencies and coastal provinces and from relevant academic and research institutions. Most of the participants in this national workshop also attended the above-mentioned regional workshop. As a result of this linkage, the SOI regional workshop was able to facilitate cross-sectoral and interministerial communication, collaboration and cooperation in setting in place concrete approaches and steps to initiate

marine spatial planning and to enhance the existing efforts of Peru in integrated marine and coastal area management.

**Sustainable Ocean Initiative Capacity-building Workshop for East Africa (18-22 January 2016) and SOI national workshop for Madagascar (21 January 2016) as a parallel event**

25. Pursuant to paragraphs 19 and 22 of decision XII/22, the Executive Secretary convened, with financial support from the Governments of Japan, through the Japan Biodiversity Fund, and France, through the French marine protected areas agency, the SOI Capacity-building Workshop for East Africa (Nosy Be, Madagascar, 18-22 January 2016), which was hosted by the Government of Madagascar, in collaboration with the Nairobi Convention Secretariat and the Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association as well as various other relevant United Nations/international and regional organizations and initiatives.

26. The workshop focused on providing training in marine spatial planning, together with other tools, such as strategic environmental assessment and environmental impact assessment, which can facilitate the application of the ecosystem approach towards achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets in marine and coastal areas. Likewise, the results of the Expert Workshop to Provide Consolidated Practical Guidance and a Toolkit for Marine Spatial Planning, referred to in the above section, informed the design of the workshop programme and were tested through workshop plenary discussion and group exercises, including stakeholders' role playing simulation exercise. Further details are provided in the workshop report (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/15).

27. The workshop was attended by experts from Comoros, France, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Seychelles and Somalia, and a number of relevant national, regional and international organizations.

28. Parallel to the above-mentioned SOI regional workshop, a SOI national workshop for Madagascar was held, with participants from various ministries and sectors. In line with the overall regional workshop programme, the national workshop produced overall strategies and approaches for developing a national MSP initiative, building on existing national efforts for establishing marine protected areas.

**Sustainable Ocean Initiative Training of Trainers Workshop (11–15 September 2015)**

29. Pursuant to decisions X/29, XI/17, XI/18, XII/22 and XII/23, the Executive Secretary convened the Sustainable Ocean Initiative Training of Trainers Workshop, with financial support from the Government of the Republic of Korea, through the EXPO 2012 Yeosu Korea Foundation and the Korea Maritime Institute, in Yeosu, Republic of Korea, from 11 to 15 September 2015, and in collaboration with the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries of the Republic of Korea and various SOI partners.

30. The workshop was aimed at supporting experts from national-level agencies of developing country Parties to contribute to enhanced national implementation towards achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in marine and coastal areas, in particular by strengthening national scientific, technical and managerial capacity on: (a) the application of the ecosystem approach and area-based management tools, such as integrated marine and coastal area management and marine spatial planning; (b) enhancing multi-stakeholder and cross-sectoral dialogue and coordination to support planning and management; and (c) the development and implementation of capacity development activities at the national and subnational levels.

31. In particular, the workshop focused on providing experts with the tools, guidelines and information needed to develop and implement successful training programmes on a range of issues in their respective countries at the national and/or subnational levels. It focused on (a) key elements of integrated cross-sectoral approaches to conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity, including integrated coastal management and marine spatial planning, and (b) approaches to training, capacity development and multi-stakeholder engagement. In this way, the workshop was aimed at providing the participants with knowledge and information in integrated management approaches and

to enhance their skills and understanding on means to impart this information through capacity development activities within their respective countries. Further details are provided in the workshop report (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/16).

32. The workshop was attended by experts from Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Grenada, Maldives, Nigeria, Oman, Philippines, Tonga, Centre for Sustainable Development and Environment, as well as resource speakers from relevant organizations.

**Sustainable Ocean Initiative National Capacity Development Workshop for Samoa (28-30 September 2015)**

33. Pursuant to decisions X/29, XI/17, XI/18, XII/22 and XII/23, the Executive Secretary convened, with financial support from the Government of the Republic of Korea, through the EXPO 2012 Yeosu Korea Foundation and Korea Maritime Institute, the Sustainable Ocean Initiative (SOI) National Capacity Development Workshop for Samoa, in Apia, from 28 to 30 September 2015, in collaboration with the Government of Samoa, the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation. Further details are provided in the workshop report (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/17).

34. The workshop focused on facilitating dialogue across various sectors, including the conservation, fisheries, tourism, ports and enforcement sectors, with an emphasis on:

(a) Building a common understanding of the different types of values associated with marine and coastal biodiversity in Samoa;

(b) Identifying elements of a common vision for marine and coastal biodiversity in Samoa and how different values help to achieve this vision;

(c) Identifying challenges and opportunities for initiating a marine spatial planning process in Samoa on the basis of a common vision and common understanding of the different values of marine and coastal biodiversity in Samoa.

35. The workshop was attended by experts/officials from the Samoa Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Samoa Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Samoa Ministry of Police and Prisons, Samoa Ports Authority, Samoa Tourism Authority, National University of Samoa, Samoa Conservation Society, Samoa Umbrella for Non-Governmental Organisations, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Conservation International, the French marine protected areas agency, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme.

**Sustainable Ocean Initiative National Capacity Development Workshop for Namibia (13-16 October 2015)**

36. The Executive Secretary convened the Sustainable Ocean Initiative (SOI) National Capacity Development Workshop for Namibia, jointly with the Government of Namibia, with financial support from the Government of Republic of Korea, through the EXPO 2010 Yeosu Korea Foundation and the Korea Maritime Institute, as well as the Government of Germany, through the BCC-GIZ Benguela Current Marine Spatial Management and Governance Project, in Swakopmund, Namibia, from 13 to 16 October 2015. Further details are provided in the workshop report (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/18).

37. The workshop focused on identifying the potential impacts of commodity mining activities in the context of the environmental and socioeconomic values of marine resources in Namibia. It was also aimed at enhancing the capacity of relevant policymakers and managers in Namibia to apply integrated assessment and planning tools to strengthen existing national efforts towards the long-term sustainable development of Namibian marine resources. This included the use of such tools and approaches as the application of biodiversity-inclusive impact assessments (for example, environmental impact assessment and strategic environmental assessment) and MSP, among others.

38. The workshop was attended by 47 participants, including officials/experts from the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, the Ministry of Mines and Energy, the Ministry of Works and Transport, the Benguela Current Commission and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), as well as resource speakers and Secretariat staff.

### **Future Sustainable Ocean Initiative Regional Capacity Development Workshops and National Workshops**

39. An SOI regional capacity development workshop for the South Pacific will be convened, with financial support from the Government of Japan, through the Japan Biodiversity Fund, in collaboration with the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, the French marine protected areas agency and various other SOI partners. The workshop dates and venue are to be determined.

40. An SOI regional capacity development workshop for the Wider Caribbean and Central America will be convened, with financial support from the Government of Japan, through the Japan Biodiversity Fund, in collaboration with the UNEP Caribbean Environment Programme, the French marine protected areas agency and various other SOI partners. The workshop dates and venue are to be determined.

41. In addition to regional capacity development workshops, the CBD Secretariat continues to seek financial resources from potential donors and technical partnerships with various SOI partners to further facilitate the national implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, through the organization of additional training-of-trainers workshops, subregional or national capacity-development workshops or other training initiatives.

### **Information-sharing through the SOI website and publications**

42. In order to facilitate the sharing of knowledge, information and experiences; increase visibility of SOI activities; ensure easy access to meeting materials; and promote further support and partnerships for capacity-development activities through the SOI framework, the CBD Secretariat prepared a SOI website ([www.cbd.int/soi](http://www.cbd.int/soi)), which is linked to the Convention's webpage on the programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity (<https://www.cbd.int/marine/>).

43. The website consists of the following pages: (a) About, (b) Events, (c) Training, (d) Resources, (e) Partners, and (f) Aligned Initiatives. Webpages requiring the inputs by SOI partners remain to be finalized and updated.

44. The Secretariat's efforts, in partnership with SOI partners, to facilitate sharing of experiences in the application of tools for marine biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, include the publication of CBD Technical Series 76, *Integrated Coastal Management for the Achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets: Practical Guidance for Implementation Based on Experiences and Lessons Learned from Coastal and Ocean Governance in the Seas of East Asia*.<sup>3</sup> Information for the above-mentioned SOI regional and national workshops was provided by this document together with various other reference materials, which have been compiled and made available on the websites of the respective meetings and on the SOI website (<https://www.cbd.int/soi/resources>).

### **Facilitating the monitoring of progress in the implementation of Target 6**

45. Pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of decision XI/18 A and building on the previous joint work, as contained in UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/13, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the Fisheries Expert Group of the Commission on Ecosystem Management of the International Union for Conservation of Nature, jointly organized, in collaboration with the European Bureau on Conservation and Development, an expert meeting on improving progress reporting and working towards the implementation of Aichi Biodiversity Target 6, in Rome, from 9 to 11 February, 2016. The meeting prepared a draft conceptual framework that

---

<sup>3</sup> Available at <https://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-76-en.pdf>.

could be used as guidance in support of Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations in reporting on their implementation towards the achievement of Target 6. The meeting identified a set of actions and potential indicators related to the achievement of Target 6 and discussed ways to further improve collaboration and cooperation among Parties, other Governments, FAO, and regional fishery bodies for their effective implementation. Further details are provided in the report of the workshop (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/27).

### **Sustainable Ocean Initiative partnership activities**

46. Drawing on the work described in paragraph 42 above as well as the other work of the Convention related to marine biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, and in partnerships with various relevant United Nations/international and regional organizations within the framework of the Sustainable Ocean Initiative, the Executive Secretary will convene, jointly with the Ministry of Ocean and Fisheries of the Republic of Korea, the National Marine Biodiversity Institute of Korea, and Korea Maritime Institute, an international meeting on Sustainable Ocean Initiative Global Dialogue with Regional Seas Organizations and Regional Fisheries Bodies on Accelerating Progress Towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, with financial resources from the Japan Biodiversity Fund, the National Marine Biodiversity Institute of Korea, the Korea Maritime Institute, and the European Commission, in Seoul, from 26 to 29 September 2016.

## **IV. SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS**

47. The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice may wish to recommend that the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting adopt a decision along the following lines:

### **Marine spatial planning**

#### *The Conference of the Parties*

1. *Welcomes* the report of the Expert Workshop to Provide Consolidated Practical Guidance and a Toolkit for Marine Spatial Planning, held in Montreal, Canada, from 9 to 11 September 2014,<sup>4</sup> and *expresses its gratitude* to the European Commission for its financial support;

2. *Takes note* of the set of key considerations for the development and implementation of marine spatial planning, as contained in the annex to the present draft decision, and *invites* Parties and other Governments to apply marine spatial planning to their marine and coastal areas or enhance existing marine and spatial planning initiatives, taking into account the above-mentioned set of considerations and linking closely to existing efforts for integrated marine and coastal management, marine protected areas, or other area-based management initiatives, by engaging relevant stakeholders and sectors as well as indigenous peoples and local communities, as an effective tool for expediting their progress towards achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets in marine and coastal areas, also linking closely with other management tools, such as strategic environmental assessments, environmental impact assessments, pollution management measures or fisheries management measures, as appropriate, and for sharing their experiences through the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention or relevant online information-sharing mechanism;

3. *Recalling* paragraph 18 of decision XII/23, *requests* the Executive Secretary and *invites* relevant organizations, in particular the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the United Nations Environment Programme, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Maritime Organization, regional seas conventions and action plans, and regional fisheries management bodies, to support the national implementation of marine spatial planning through collaboration on, among other things, the following activities:

---

<sup>4</sup> See UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/6.

(a) Further consolidate and complement existing guidance on marine and spatial planning, building upon the results of the workshop referred to in paragraph 1 above, including the set of considerations listed in the annex to the present draft decision, through online communication, expert workshops, compilation of case studies, informal interaction among experts and/or expert peer review;

(b) Communicate with Parties and relevant organizations on the results of the workshop referred to in paragraph 1 above;

(c) Develop linkages with other work on marine and coastal biodiversity under the Convention or other relevant international/regional agreements and programmes;

(d) Explore opportunities to test guidance and facilitate capacity development opportunities, including through capacity development workshops being convened through Sustainable Ocean Initiative or other relevant initiatives, as well as on-the-ground implementation;

(e) Compile national, subregional or regional experiences in the implementation of marine spatial planning, in collaboration with Parties and other Governments, and disseminate them through the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention or relevant online information-sharing mechanism;

4. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to report on progress in the cooperation referred to in paragraph 3 above to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at a future meeting held prior to the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

5. *Recalling* paragraph 19 of decision XII/23, *requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to available financial resources:

(a) To invite Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations, including the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, the International Maritime Organization, the International Seabed Authority, the United Nations Environment Programme, regional seas organizations, regional fisheries bodies, indigenous peoples and local communities, and other relevant organizations and initiatives, to submit information on national, subregional and regional experiences and lessons learned in the application of marine spatial planning or other measures for enhanced conservation and management, in support of achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets, in particular Targets 6, 10, 11, and 12, in marine and coastal areas meeting the criteria for ecologically or biologically significant areas;

(b) To compile and synthesize submissions by Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations, along with additional scientific and technical information, as input to an expert workshop;

(c) To organize an expert workshop to consolidate scientific and technical information on the types of human activities or environmental stressors that may have adverse impacts on a range of different ecosystem features, functions and processes in areas meeting each of the criteria for ecologically or biologically significant areas; different types of conservation and management measures that have been shown to prevent or mitigate these potential adverse impacts; environmental factors that have been found to amplify or reduce the potential adverse impacts; and the effectiveness of different types of the prevention and mitigation measures, drawing on compilation and synthesis of submissions as described in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above;

(d) To submit the compilation/synthesis referred to in subparagraph 5(b) above, and the report of the expert workshop referred to in subparagraph 5(c) above, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body at a future meeting held prior to the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

6. *Recalling* paragraph 76 of decision X/29 and subparagraph 1(b) of decision XI/24 and *recognizing* the importance of building linkages among existing efforts on various area-based conservation measures within the framework of cross-sectoral and integrated marine spatial planning and implementation in support of achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets, in particular Targets 6, 10, 11, and 12, *requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to available financial resources, drawing on the existing work by

the Executive Secretary, in partnership with relevant organizations, pursuant to paragraph 10 of decision XI/24:

(a) To compile, in collaboration with Parties, other Governments, the World Commission on Protected Areas, relevant organizations, and indigenous peoples and local communities, national experiences and lessons learned on the development, and effective and equitable management, of ecologically representative and well connected systems of marine protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and their integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes, as an input to an expert workshop;

(b) To organize an expert workshop to consolidate scientific and technical information on various approaches for, and their effectiveness in, assessing the contribution to the achievement of Target 11 of marine protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures as well as their integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes;

(c) To submit the compilation of information referred to in subparagraph 6(a) above and the report of the expert workshop referred to in subparagraph 6(b) above to the Subsidiary Body for its consideration at a future meeting prior to the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

### **Capacity-development and partnership activities**

7. *Welcomes* the capacity-building and partnership activities being facilitated by the Executive Secretary through the Sustainable Ocean Initiative at the regional, national and global levels in collaboration with Parties and relevant organizations, and *expresses its gratitude* to the Governments of Japan, France, and the Republic of Korea and many other partners for providing financial and technical support to the implementation of activities related to the Sustainable Ocean Initiative;

8. *Invites* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to cooperate for the timely and effective implementation of capacity development activities through the Sustainable Ocean Initiative, and *encourages* Parties to designate, where appropriate, an operational focal point on marine and coastal biodiversity, and provide the name and contact details to the Secretariat, in order to facilitate communication and timely submission of nominations or information;

### **Facilitating the monitoring of progress in the implementation of Target 6**

9. *Welcomes* the report of the Expert Meeting on Improving Progress Reporting and Working Towards Implementation of Aichi Biodiversity Target 6, held in Rome, from 9 to 11 February 2016,<sup>5</sup> and *encourages* Parties, other Governments, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and regional fishery bodies to use the results of this meeting as a basis for their collaboration and cooperation to accelerate and monitor the progress in the implementation of Target 6, in line with the decision on mainstreaming biodiversity in fisheries.

---

<sup>5</sup> UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/27.

*Annex***KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING****I. CROSS-SECTORAL COORDINATION AND DECISION-MAKING IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING****Social, political and economic dimensions and enhancing cross-sectoral engagement**

1. The social, political and economic dimensions of marine spatial planning (MSP) need to be addressed from the initial phase of the MSP development (existing MSP efforts tend to focus on the biophysical context). This can be supported by mapping and assessing qualitative and quantitative socioeconomic data and processes.

2. Engagement of all relevant sectors is essential for MSP, and the focus should be given on the following:

- (a) Gaining political support and integration across sectors;
- (b) Collaborating across cultures, recognizing their needs;
- (c) Involving governmental institutions and stakeholders that are anticipated to play significant roles in gaining formal approval for MSP and in its implementation;
- (d) Engaging different stakeholders in the issue analysis and planning process, including identifying barriers to enforcement and achieving voluntary compliance;
- (e) Resolving stakeholder conflicts by demonstrating fairness, transparency and inclusiveness and building trust;
- (f) Taking a long-term historical perspective on how current conditions and issues have evolved in a given area to provide relevant stakeholders with a comprehensive context for defining goals and objectives;
- (g) Taking an adaptive management approach, by considering likely future changes in socioeconomic and environmental conditions.

**Complexity in spatial and temporal scales**

3. MSP addresses complex issues in the context of the ecosystem approach and should be undertaken at a range of temporal and spatial scales. This may present challenges, especially when capacity is limited.

4. Thus, the following considerations should be taken into account:

- (a) Understanding the context and scope of MSP initiatives and learning from MSP initiatives with similar characteristics;
- (b) Identifying how different institutional and governance structures influence engagement over the range of scale and scope of MSP initiatives;
- (c) Stressing that MSP initiatives should be undertaken in an iterative manner that begins by addressing relatively simple issues and proceeding to tackling the more difficult issues, noting that this approach supports enhanced capacity and, if successful, builds constituencies and governmental commitment for MSP practices;
- (d) Using case studies that include the perspectives and contributions of stakeholders from as many sectors as possible.

### **Understanding stakeholder perceptions, roles and needs**

5. It is important to identify and understand the roles, interests, aspirations and needs of stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities, and their dependence on ecosystem services and the benefits they provide, to enable their effective engagement in planning and implementation. Simple mapping techniques can be used to visualize the roles of decision makers and stakeholders. Stakeholder mapping can include characterization of different uses of ecosystem services, authorities, rights and equity aspects, and include information on stakeholder inter-connection in national or local economies. Understanding the relationship between direct and indirect stakeholders is also important.

6. Stakeholder baselines may be developed in order to describe past and future anticipated use of ecosystem services, expectations of future roles, traditional use of resources and access to ecosystem services.

### **Organizing effective stakeholder input**

7. It is important to create realistic perceptions among stakeholders of their roles and influence in the decision-making process. It is also necessary to provide clarity and transparency in political decisions. It may be useful to consider when stakeholder input is particularly essential and when it may be less important in order to avoid process “fatigue” among stakeholders. Larger-scale processes often entail less direct stakeholder input and influence. In some areas, the planning process can be largely initiated and driven by users and local stakeholders with limited initial government engagement. It is important to ensure transparency about who makes decisions at different planning stages, and how and when stakeholders can provide input at relevant stages.

8. Certain tasks during the planning process can be delegated to a subset of experts or planners charged with undertaking specific studies or background analyses. Guidance on undertaking such tasks should be clearly defined at the outset of the planning process, including outlining methods and data to be used in technical analyses, and outlining when stakeholders should be consulted. Stakeholder trust and buy-in into the MSP planning process may be enhanced using common data collection protocols, ethical codes for the use of traditional knowledge and information, and standardized approaches for monitoring and assessment of ecosystem health or valuation of ecosystem services (including non-use services, such as cultural, social and aesthetic values).

9. It is critical to learn from past experiences, good practices and mistakes. It is useful to ensure that diverse inputs and experiences from previous planning and management activities (such as existing efforts on integrated marine and coastal area management or other area-based management initiatives) are incorporated in MSP processes.

10. Behaviour or perceptions among stakeholders of their roles can be shifted due to external, unforeseen drivers and new users.

### **Effective stakeholder communication**

11. Stakeholder communication strategies are useful in ensuring consultative planning. This can outline the use of non-technical terms or customization of language towards specific audiences and purposes. Communication should be tailored and disseminated using different relevant media targeted at specific stakeholders. Moreover, it is important to consider carefully sociological and cultural aspects in stakeholder communication and remain sensitive to local customs, norms and traditions.

## II. UTILIZING THE BEST AVAILABLE SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION AND LINKING SPATIAL MAPPING TO PLANNING AND DECISION-MAKING

### Different stages of the MSP process

12. There is a clear distinction among countries regarding the need for information/data at different stages of their MSP process. Those countries just embarking on MSP have data concerns that are significantly different from those with maturing MSP processes. Examples of challenges identified include:

- (a) In the initial stages of the MSP process:
  - Deciding what data is needed and how is it selected
  - Determining who should be in charge of MSP information (for example, should it be held centrally or by individual sectors?)
  - Gathering historical, socioeconomic and cultural data
  - Securing sustainability of data/information compilation/analysis/mapping process
- (b) As the MSP process progresses:
  - Establishing a protocol on how to agree on common datasets combining information held by different stakeholders
  - Establishing a clearing-house mechanism to validate national baseline data
  - Acquiring resources to maintain long-term datasets
  - Dealing with a large amount of information, establishing priorities and being selective about which information to use
  - Incorporating information on new and emerging issues (such as resilience to climate change)
  - Deciding which tools are best for individual situations
- (c) Moving to MSP implementation:
  - Recognizing that data for MSP implementation are different from those needed for planning
  - Defining agreed-upon targets
  - Recognizing variability in data quality among different sectors and providing support for sectors with data shortcomings
  - Establishing transparency of government data standards
  - Maintaining financial and human resources to ensure the sustainability of MSP implementation

### Availability of scientific information

13. Not all types of data are available spatially. Furthermore, limited information is available on cumulative impacts.

14. Several practical data management issues need to be addressed to ensure efficient use of existing scientific data. Data discovery helps maximize the utility of existing data. Well-developed metadata is required to drive this discovery process, in addition to addressing data comparability, appropriate scale of use and describing the context of the data that is collected.

15. In general, biophysical data is more accessible in a spatial format than socioeconomic data and can be available as long-term time series and associated metadata. Planners can take advantage of this data and supplement it with data produced by industry (for example, through environmental impact assessments). MSP data should include both state and process data. Collaboration with industry and non-governmental organizations during the planning process can help fill data gaps. Open access to such information is an incentive to promote stakeholder dialogue and build trust. Data providers need to know

where, how and in what form the data they supply will be used. Exchange must also be facilitated to connect data from different areas.

16. MSP can benefit from coherent data protocols. Further discussion is needed on the most appropriate information systems, data repositories, custodianship and incentives to share scientific information. Scientific information collected by projects of limited duration is not always passed on or subsequently made available. Reasonable levels of generalization can be acceptable for MSP, but spatial accuracy is essential.

17. Use of proxies and analogue data as well as modelling projections can provide solutions for initiating MSP in data-poor regions.

#### **Ensuring the use of the best available scientific information**

18. Quality assurance of information for MSP can be achieved through expert validation in different range, e.g. advisory committee to validate data quality or expert peer review processes. Grey literature can be also useful in many cases, noting that public information is not always up to date and that comprehensive scientific information is not always available.

19. Countries in the early stages of MSP require guidance to consider the full implications of cost-effective, high-quality data collection. Transboundary projects, which share data with neighbouring countries, require specific arrangements to ensure data quality, reliability and compatibility.

#### **Integrating biological data and human use data**

20. Transparency regarding the use of data can enhance support from various stakeholders in integration of different datasets and can build consensus about shared data utility. Multisectoral data development and participatory mapping can improve transparency from the outset of the MSP process.

21. Data complexity should match the stage of the MSP process to date. The integration approach for disparate data types should also match the maturity and complexity of the MSP process and use appropriate formats, scale and representation for intended audiences.

22. It is also important to develop expertise in participatory mapping, capturing socio-cultural values and using maps as a conflict resolution tool (that is, visualizing the consequences of various courses of action).

#### **Linking with global and regional assessment and monitoring**

23. Open global databases and global-scale assessment have a value for national MSP, while globally aggregated data products can pose complications for direct use by national process without adequate national-level interpretation process. Likewise, regional state of the environment reports and their national components are useful.

24. There is an opportunity to use data synthesized through CBD regional workshops to facilitate the description of ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) in informing MSP. There is a need to evaluate areas described as meeting the EBSA criteria in terms of their ecosystem values in order to inform trade-offs within the MSP process as well as pressures and stressors to areas meeting the EBSA criteria in order to identify necessary measures for enhanced management, if necessary.

#### **Incorporating traditional knowledge**

25. Traditional knowledge can contribute to MSP processes by providing information in its own right or validating and adding value to existing scientific information. Traditional knowledge may not always fit the conventional division between biological and human uses, but rather, represents a more holistic perspective on marine and coastal areas and resources. Valuing a plurality of knowledge systems by integrating traditional and local with scientific knowledge provides a better knowledge foundation for MSP. Respecting ownership of traditional knowledge is important to reassure stakeholders that their knowledge will be used in an appropriate manner.

### Using sensitive information

26. Access to scientific information can be restricted by commercial confidentiality, military/security issues, cultural issues or reluctance to share resource information. In some cases, data sensitivities can also prove informative by highlighting where stakeholder conflicts may exist. There are also opportunities to link with industry for collection of new data across their footprint of activity. There is a need to demonstrate to policymakers that investment in access to data, together with scientific assessment and monitoring, is worthwhile.

### Measuring the progress of a successful MSP initiative

27. In developing the MSP programme/initiative, it is important to identify and track the anticipated outcomes associated with each phase of an MSP initiative.<sup>2</sup> Outcomes can be tracked at various levels:<sup>6,7,8</sup> the assembly of the enabling conditions (“1<sup>st</sup> order outcomes”); implementation of activities (“2<sup>nd</sup> order outcomes”); the generation of desired changes in social and environmental conditions (“3<sup>rd</sup> order outcomes”); and contribution to the ultimate goal of sustainable development (“4<sup>th</sup> order outcomes”). Existing monitoring and evaluation protocols that have adopted the ecosystem approach focus primarily upon 3<sup>rd</sup> order outcomes. Tracking 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> order outcomes is necessary to provide earlier feedback on progress, since 3<sup>rd</sup> order outcomes take many years, and often decades, to appear.

## III. ADDRESSING CAPACITY GAPS AND RESOURCE NEEDS TO ENSURE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION AND SUSTAINABILITY OF MSP

28. Developing capacity and meeting resource needs to ensure effective implementation and sustainability of MSP is a complex and difficult task. Since MSP is as much a socio-political process as a scientific-technical process, capacity needs to be developed in equal terms for both of these realms. Assessing context-specific capacity gaps and financing needs is an essential element to guide investments according to priorities as well as the stage and complexity of the MSP initiative. The focus should be given to the followings:

- (a) Enhancing formal education systems (such as universities and research bodies) in order to create in situ capacities at multiple levels and within a variety of disciplines to support MSP processes;
- (b) Learning from the past and capitalizing on both successful experiences and failures as well as lessons learned;
- (c) Pursuing regional-scale learning and peer-to-peer networks;
- (d) Building on existing traditional management capacities and governance regimes and scaling-up community-level efforts to appropriate and ecologically relevant scales;
- (e) Accessing and making use of the capacities of international and regional organizations mandated to support Parties in addressing capacity gaps at national levels;
- (f) Facilitating enhanced coherence and exchange of best practices in training programmes relevant to MSP, including through the development of “training of trainers” programmes in order to enhance the capacities of individuals within different sectors and stakeholder groups;
- (g) Developing the communication skills of MSP planners and within resource-use sectors to communicate the outcomes, benefits and costs of MSP clearly and effectively;
- (h) Fostering champions and cross-sectoral learning exchanges.

---

<sup>6</sup> Olsen, S. (2003). Frameworks and indicators for assessing progress in integrated coastal management initiatives. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 46, 347-361.

<sup>7</sup> UNEP/GPA (2006). *Ecosystem-based management: Markers for assessing progress*. UNEP/GPA, The Hague.

<sup>8</sup> Olsen, S.B.; Page, G.G. & Ochoa, E. (2009): *The Analysis of Governance Responses to Ecosystem Change: A Handbook for Assembling a Baseline*. LOICZ Reports & Studies No. 34. GKSS Research Center, Geesthacht, 87 pages.