

Overview of Terrestrial and Marine Protected Areas in Canada

To develop a comprehensive response to the Thematic Report/Questionnaire on Protected Areas developed by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, those federal departments and the federal agency with major responsibilities for protected areas - Environment Canada and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Parks Canada Agency- were asked to respond to the questionnaire from their respective perspectives. In addition to federal input, the Parks Canada Agency took a lead role through the Canadian Parks Council in obtaining input from the thirteen provincial and territorial parks jurisdictions that manage terrestrial parks and protected areas. Twelve of the thirteen jurisdictions participated in this process. With all this input, and given the questions asked, it was decided to complete one report on terrestrial protected areas - synthesizing all the information received, and a second report on marine protected areas.

The Canadian approach to in-situ conservation and protection of biodiversity is not centrally planned and encompasses a wide range of protected areas mechanisms and approaches, including National Parks, National Historic Sites, Migratory Bird Sanctuaries, National Wildlife Areas, National Marine Conservation Areas, Marine Protected Areas, and approximately 8 different types of provincial parks, ranging from wilderness areas and ecological reserves to heavily-used recreational parks. As well, a variety of partners is engaged in protected areas including all levels of government, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), private citizens, and industry. The use of a particular approach is dependent upon the jurisdiction, the resources, and the planned use of the area.

Protected lands and waters under federal authority currently represent about 45% of areas set aside for biodiversity conservation objectives in Canada, while the remainder is managed by provincial and territorial governments and NGOs.

As noted, the Parks Canada Agency, Environment Canada, and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans are the three main federal departments with mandates for the establishment and management of various types of federal protected areas – both terrestrial and marine.

The Parks Canada Agency is responsible for the establishment and management of National Parks, National Marine Conservation Areas (NMCAs) and over 140 National Historic Sites. National Parks are created under the Canada National Parks Act, which provides a legislative framework for protecting representative examples of Canada's 39 terrestrial natural regions. NMCAs are created under the Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act, which is concerned with the establishment and management of areas representative of Canada's twenty-nine marine regions.

Environment Canada's Canadian Wildlife Service is responsible for Migratory Bird Sanctuaries, which are created under the Migratory Birds Convention Act and National Wildlife Areas (NWAs) which are created under the Canada Wildlife Act (CWA). The CWA also calls for the establishment of Marine Wildlife Areas (MWAs) with the Exclusive Economic Zone (12-200nm). The intent of protected areas under the Canadian Wildlife Service is to protect critical wildlife habitat, and unique and productive ecosystems for wildlife protection and conservation.

The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has the authority for Marine Protected Areas (MPA's) under the Oceans Act. Under the Oceans Act MPA's can be established for a variety of purposes, including the conservation and protection of: endangered or threatened marine species and their habitats; unique habitats; and areas of high biodiversity or high biological productivity.

Other departments such as the Department of National Defense (DND), Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC), and Revenue Canada also play a role with protected areas. Some land owned by DND for military purposes has important ecological value. An example is the Suffield Military Reserve in Alberta, which has been recognized as an area of ecological value, and is being proposed as a National Wildlife Area under the Canada Wildlife Act. INAC is responsible for managing land use planning, land claims and treaty negotiation processes that can result in lands being set aside for protected areas. Revenue Canada, through its tax regime, influences private stewardship efforts and the donation of lands to protected areas.

The ten Canadian provinces and three territories also have the mandate to create their own protected areas within their jurisdictions. Each province and territory has its own system of protected areas ranging from wilderness areas to parks with high recreational use. In some provinces responsibilities for the establishment and management of protected areas is shared between two agencies with the division of responsibilities occurring either along lines of establishment vs. operational responsibilities or management of highly protected areas residing in one agency and operation of recreational parks in another. As well, in some provinces management of parks and protected areas is contracted to the private sector.

There are many factors that influence the conservation of private lands. Stewardship is one such factor. Simply stated, stewardship means that landowners, individual citizens, private companies and volunteers are caring for our land, air and water, and sustaining the natural processes on which life depends. The donation by private individuals and corporate landowners of ecologically sensitive land is emerging as an important tool in conserving

sensitive ecosystems and biodiversity across Canada. The 2000 federal budget tax reforms simplified the donation of ecological gifts, and made donations more economically favourable. NGOs, such as the Nature Conservancy of Canada, also play a key role in the establishment of protected areas by acquiring private lands to add to existing protected areas, by helping to secure conservation easements to protect the land, and by holding and managing lands for conservation. Other organizations involved in conservation agreements include the Southern Alberta Land Trust Society, the Manitoba Wildlife Federation and the Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation. In some cases, the conservation of private land is encouraged by Canada's commitment to various international agreements and programs including: Ramsar Sites, World Heritage Sites and United Nations Biosphere Reserves. While the federal government plays a lead role in the coordination of these international programs, their implementation is often at least partially dependent on the voluntary actions of private landowners.

Efforts to protect marine biodiversity are not as advanced as the protection of terrestrial biodiversity, and this is an area of increasing attention by the federal government.

While each jurisdiction has its own objectives and planning process for the establishment and development of a system of protected areas, the key perspective is to treat the collective mechanisms and sources of protection in Canada as a complementary integrated approach. For example, a Federal Protected Areas Strategy is to be developed to enhance collaborative efforts of the two primary federal departments and agency. Efforts are also being made, through mechanisms such as the Canadian Parks, Wildlife, Fisheries and other councils, to exchange information and encourage cooperation amongst federal, provincial and territorial jurisdictions and relevant stakeholders. When considered collectively, the various types of protected areas in Canada provides a sound basis for the conservation of biological diversity. For example, Parks Canada establishes its protected areas based on the principle of representing each of the 39 natural regions and 29 marine regions it has identified as being significant and typical of Canada. Most provincial and territorial jurisdictions also focus on representivity within a smaller geographic area. Other approaches in Canada that account for areas important for biological diversity include: the protection of critical wildlife habitat (including habitat that exists in the working landscape); protection of unique and productive ecosystems/habitats; and the protection of habitat for endangered or threatened species; protection of unique marine habitats. There is a growing realization, however, that more attention needs to be focused on linkages between protected areas and managing for biodiversity in the broader landscape. The National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy is finalizing a report entitled, "Securing Canada's Natural Capital: A Vision for Nature Conservation in the 21st Century". The report promotes a coordinated landscape approach with direction for all segments of society to cooperate in the establishment and maintenance of protected areas.

The provincial and territorial jurisdictions also have processes in place to protect areas that are identified as being important for the conservation of biological diversity. Legislation, guidelines, criteria and targets have been adopted to support selection, establishment and management of protected areas in all jurisdictions except of Nunavut and the Yukon. However, some view the Nunavut Land Claim Agreement (1993) as providing a protected areas strategy for Nunavut, since it includes two articles (Articles 8 and 9) that deal with national and territorial parks, and other protected areas. In the Yukon, a protected areas strategy has been completed but is not being implemented at this time due to outstanding land claims.

The concept of taking a collective view of protected areas has resulted in transboundary cooperation and management of protected areas. Several agreements have been made between the United States and Canada for transboundary responsibilities for the in-situ conservation of biological diversity. For example, as early as 1932 Waterton Lakes National Park (Alberta, Canada) was linked with the Glacier National Park (Montana, United States) to form the world's first International Peace Park. There are also large corridor initiatives underway (e.g. Yukon to Yellowstone Initiative - Y2Y, the Appalachian/Adirondacks Initiative, etc.) that are designed to link entire ecosystems between provinces, territories and nations.

At the international level, several jurisdictions in Canada are members of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas. Many of the provinces have provided information to the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, however, more participation in this effort is needed.

While a great level of effort and enthusiasm exists at many levels within the country, overall, the human, institutional and financial resources are insufficient for the full implementation of protected areas within each jurisdiction. In addition to capacity constraints, many jurisdictions have conducted socio-economic assessments that identify other constraints to the implementation and management of an adequate system of protected areas. These include land ownership issues and zoning laws.

The Canadian Biodiversity Strategy recognizes that protected areas play an integral role in the effort to conserve biodiversity. Through the various programs and initiatives that are described in the attached Thematic Reports on Terrestrial and Marine Protected Areas, Canada is demonstrating its commitment to the establishment and management of protected areas as one way of conserving Canada's abundant biodiversity. Each of these reports will provide greater detail on the status of protected areas in Canada and the associated legislation, initiatives and programs that are in place.

*Roll-up of **Terrestrial** Protected Areas Questionnaires*

Thematic report on protected areas or areas where special measures need to be taken to conserve biological diversity

Please provide the following details on the origin of this report.

Contracting Party:	Canada
National Focal Point	
Full name of the institution:	Biodiversity Convention Office Environment Canada
Name and title of contact officer:	Krista Blackborow
Mailing address:	Place Vincent Massey - 9 th Floor 351 St. Joseph Blvd. Hull, QC K1A 0H3
Telephone:	(819) 953-4374
Fax:	(819) 953-1765
E-mail:	john.herity@ec.gc.ca
Contact officer for national report (if different)	
Full name of the institution:	Parks Canada Agency
Name and title of contact officer:	Elaine Peebles
Mailing address:	
Telephone:	(819) 997-6330
Fax:	
E-mail:	
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting national report:	
Date of submission:	

Please provide summary information on the process by which this report has been prepared, including information on the types of stakeholders who have been actively involved in its preparation and on material that was used as a basis for the report.

The following summarizes the information received from the Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS) of the Department of the Environment, from the Parks Canada Agency, and from twelve provincial and territorial parks departments in response to the Questionnaire developed by the Secretariat on the Convention on Biological Diversity. Only one province did not respond to the questionnaire. This roll-up focuses on terrestrial protected areas in Canada.

Alberta (Alta) Prepared by Alberta Community Development – Parks and Protected Areas Division..

British Columbia (B.C.) Prepared by the Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection, Environmental Stewardship Division, Parks and Protected Areas Branch.

Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS) Department of the Environment prepared the information on National Wildlife Areas and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries

Manitoba (Man.) Prepared by Parks and Natural Areas Branch, Manitoba Conservation, the lead government agency responsible for implementation of the Protected Areas Initiatives in Manitoba

New Brunswick (N.B.) Prepared by Crown Lands Branch. Based its report on a government-wide inventory of actions taken by departments towards meeting commitments under the CBD. Also references protected areas stakeholder process carried out in N.B. in 2000. Results are reflected in the questionnaire (see web reference).

Newfoundland (NFLD) Prepared by Parks and Natural Areas Division, Department of Tourism, Culture and Recreation. Based on policies and documents of Parks and Natural Areas Division.

Northwest Territories (NWT) Prepared by Parks and Tourism Division of the Department of Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development. Process used NWT Protected Areas Strategy and Territorial Parks Act. List Stakeholders who were probably consulted for those documents – not for the Questionnaire (see reference)

Nova Scotia (N.S.) Prepared a joint submission from the Department of Environment and Labour which has management responsibilities for Wilderness Areas and Nature Reserves and the Department of Natural Resources with management responsibilities for Provincial Parks and Protected Beaches

Nunavut (NU) Prepared by the Department of Sustainable Development, Parks Conservation Areas and Tourism.

Ontario (Ont.) Prepared by Ontario Parks, Ministry of Natural Resources

Parks Canada (PC) Prepared by National Parks Directorate, Protected Areas Cooperation Branch, Parks Canada.

Prince Edward Island (PEI) Prepared in consultation with representatives from the Department of Fisheries, Aquaculture and the Environment, Protected Areas and Biodiversity Conservation PEI. Natural Areas Protection Act/ Regulations were primary materials used.

Saskatchewan (Sask)- Prepared by Saskatchewan Environment, Parks and Special Places Branch

Yukon (YK) Prepared by Parks Branch, Yukon Department of Environment

*Protected areas or areas where special measures need to be taken
to conserve biological diversity*

System of protected areas

1. What is the relative priority afforded to development and implementation of a national system of protected areas in the context of other obligations arising from the Convention and COP Decisions?

(Note: This question assumes there is one park system in a country and that is not true for Canada. Most jurisdictions that responded assumed they were being asked to assess the priority of the parks within their own provincial or territorial jurisdiction. Some agencies may not have fully understood the question, as at least one noted it was unsure of how the Convention related to provincial protected areas. A second jurisdiction, however, indicated that it had just completed an inventory of actions taken to meet commitments under the Convention and it rated the priority given to protected areas as high.)

Answer: Six jurisdictions (46%) including Parks Canada, reported that their protected area system was considered to have high priority relative to other CBD obligations. Another five jurisdictions (38.5%) consider their protected areas as having medium priority, while lastly two jurisdictions (15%) did not know.

a) High	B.C., N.B., NWT, N.S. (See attached electronic/hard copies), Sask, P.C.	b) Medium	Alta., Nfld., Ont. PEI, YU	c) Low	Man. Undecided, NU. No answer
---------	--	-----------	-------------------------------	--------	-------------------------------------

2. Is there a systematic planning process for development and implementation of a national system of protected areas?

(Note: This question was also answered from the perspective of the individual jurisdiction.)

Answer: Though it has been suggested in the past, there is no one national systems planning process used collectively by all Protected Areas Agencies in Canada. There are, however, individual systems plans for each protected areas jurisdiction in Canada – including the federal parks system and the Canadian Wildlife Service, which manages Wildlife Management Areas (WMA’s) and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries (MBS).

The National Round Table for the Environment and the Economy (NRTEE) is finalizing a report for the Finance Minister entitled, “ Securing Canada’s Natural Capital: A Vision for Nature Conservation in the 21st Century”. The report identifies the key barriers to conservation in Canada including: the lack of a national vision for conservation; the lack of conservation planning at the ecosystem level which has led to uncoordinated approaches both within and between governments; and the limited engagement of some of the key players including industry, Aboriginal peoples and communities. This report, if endorsed by the government, will provide a national planning tool to advance the protected areas agenda in Canada because it provides direction for all segments of society to cooperate in the establishment and maintenance of protected areas.

Integrated federal approaches to protected areas planning and management have been suggested in the past, but departments with responsibilities in this area, have generally “done their own thing”, while respecting the mandates of other departments. Often cooperation, between the departments, has been incidental, sporadic and regionally based rather than regular, strategic and national. Although, recently legislative initiatives related to marine conservation have resulted in increasing cooperation in that domain.

Central agencies have suggested the need for a coordinated federal protected areas strategy. Environment Canada (EC), Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) and the Parks Canada Agency (PCA) manage complementary marine and terrestrial protected area programs that have many common opportunities and challenges. The long-term objective of a federal strategy would be to enhance its collaborative efforts in order to accelerate the protection of Canada’s and the world’s biodiversity and representation of ecosystems. The strategy would reflect and build upon directions set in recent Speeches from the Throne and Budgets. Guidance would be provided implementing the national level strategy to the regional level.

<p>a) No</p> <p>b) In early stages of development</p> <p>c) In advanced stages of development</p> <p>d) Yes, please provide copies of relevant documents describing the process</p>	<p>Yukon – Protected Area Strategy has been placed on hold by two successive governments until First Nations Land Claims Agreements are in place. Some Special Management Areas coming out of individual Land Claim Agreements may meet criteria of protecting a core area of an ecoregion.</p> <p>Nunavut N.B., PC. (See web ref.)</p> <p>Alta Special Places; B.C. Prot Areas Strategy for B.C.(see refs electronic/hard copy); Manitoba- Action Plan (see web ref.); NWT - Protected Areas Strategy; Ont – Gap analysis used to select areas to be protected; Sask. Representative Area Network (see web ref.); Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS) – use selection criteria and select sites on ecological importance for wildlife (NWA’s) and or migratory bird (for MBS) at regional and national scales. See also Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and PEI . PC National Park Systems Plan and Web site.</p>
<p>3. Is there an assessment of the extent to which the existing network of protected areas covers all areas that are identified as being important for the conservation of biological diversity? (Note: Again the responses to this question are from the perspective of the individual jurisdiction – not the national level.)</p> <p>Answer: All parks jurisdictions are involved in this type of assessment: 31% (4/13) of jurisdictions report that they have completed the assessments; 58% (7/13) are undertaking the assessments; and 15% (2/13) are planning an assessment.</p>	
<p>a) No</p> <p>b) An assessment is being planned for</p> <p>c) An assessment is being undertaken</p> <p>d) Yes, please provide copies of the assessments made</p>	<p>CWS- The EC system does not have a limitation on numbers or types of sites within an ecoregion, province, etc. More than one site in an area is a reflection of the ecological significance of that region not a case of over-representation.</p> <p>NWT, Yukon N.B., Nfld., N.S., Nunavut, Ont. -Undertaking assessment of gaps in representation of biodiversity (see ref. notes). PEI, Sask, Alta- (See details enclosed); B.C. Protected Areas System Overview (see reference electronic/hard copy); Man (see web ref.), PC State of Parks 99 (See web ref., pp 30-35)</p>

4. Is there a policy framework and/or enabling legislation in place for the establishment and management of protected areas?

Answer: 85% of parks jurisdictions report they have policy/legislation for their protected areas and 15% (2) report that their policy/legislation is in the early stages of development. CWS also has developed policy and legislation for their protected areas. Migratory Bird Sanctuaries (MBS) are created under the Migratory Birds Convention Act (MBCA) and National Wildlife Areas (NWA) are created under the Canada Wildlife Act. There is no requirement of federal land ownership or long-term control to establish a MBS as there is for NWA's.

a) No	
b) In early stages of development	Nunavut, Yukon
c) In advanced stages of development	
d) Yes, please provide copies of relevant documents	Alta notes 4 Acts; B.C.(see web ref. for legislation); Man (see web ref.); NB Protected Natural Areas Act passed Feb.2003 (see web ref.); Nfld., NWT; N.S. sent copies, Ont Prov. Parks Act or Public Lands Act (Conservation Reserves). Policies for Prov. Park Planning and Mgmt, Conservation Reserves Policy (see ref. Notes). Parks Canada (PC)- (see web ref) PEI Sask – Ecological Reserves Act and Parks Act Legislation CWS – Migratory Birds Convention Act, Canada Wildlife Act

5. Have guidelines, criteria and targets been adopted to support selection, establishment and management of protected areas?

Answer: 85% (11/13) of parks jurisdictions have developed or almost developed these tools, while 15% have not. The newly created Nunavut has not yet developed criteria and guidelines, while the protected areas strategy of the Yukon is currently on hold pending the resolution of aboriginal land-claim issues. The selection of NWA/MBS sites is based on ecological importance for wildlife (for NWA's) and/or migratory bird populations at regional and national scales (for MBS's). In contrast to the national parks system, which designates parks on a representative basis with a goal of at least one park in each "ecoregion" of Canada, the DOE system of protected areas does not have a limit on numbers or types of sites within an ecoregion or province.

a) No	Nunavut, Yukon
b) In early stages of development	
c) In advanced stages of development	N.B., Sask
d) Yes, please provide copies of guidelines, criteria and targets	Alta -(see ref. notes); B.C. (see refs. For Protected Areas Strategy electronic/hard copy) Man. -(see web ref.); Nfld., NWT, N.S. (see enclosed hard copy of Systems Plan) Ont. -has class targets for representation of various classes of prov. parks. Using gap analysis Parks Can- Included as part of PC Guiding principles and Operational Guidelines (See web ref.) PEI, CWS

6. Does the management of protected areas involve the use of incentive measures, for instance, of entrance fees for park visitors, or of benefit-sharing arrangements with adjacent communities and other relevant stakeholders?

(Note: It is not clear what is meant by “incentive” measures or why entrance fees are considered an incentive. An incentive for whom?)

Answer: Some parks organizations (e.g. Parks Canada) are able to retain the fees they collect to offset operating and maintenance expenditures. In this case, fees can be considered as an “incentive” for the organization. In other parks jurisdictions, all fees or a percentage of them are returned to a consolidated revenue fund where they are reassigned to government priorities. In this situation, there is little incentive for the parks jurisdiction to collect the fees, as they are not retained.

23% of Parks jurisdictions have indicated they do not use incentive measures, while an additional 46% (6) do provide incentive measures such as fees, (e.g. entrance, camping, interpretive centers, fees for grazing, hunting, fishing, leasing cottage properties, etc.) and incentives for research and ecosystem monitoring. In addition, some jurisdictions have leased out entire parks to private operators. Four jurisdictions (30%) charge fees at all protected areas. A few jurisdictions, such as Parks Canada and Nunavut, have benefit sharing arrangements (IIBA’s) whereby aboriginal communities derive direct economic and other benefits from the presence of the park. Similarly with the Cooperating Associations program, (e.g. in Parks Canada, Ontario etc.) local organizations benefit from start-up funding to provide various services (gift shops, etc.) at the parks. CWS charges fees at some of its sites such as the Cap Tourmente NWA.

a) No

N.S., PEI, Yukon

b) Yes, incentive measures implemented for some protected areas (please provide some examples)

Man. -Entrance fee some places with road access. No benefit sharing yet but approach under development
 N.B. -developing local advisory committees for 10 new protected natural areas. Scientific advisory committee to provide incentives to use protected areas for research and ecosystem monitoring.
 Nfld.- entrance fees for parks and interpretation centers; Ecotourism business opportunities
 NWT – No notes.
 Ont- fees charged in 20% of protected areas. Some operated by not for profit partners as a way to maintain tourism benefits from parks that might otherwise be closed
 Sask – Entry charged at most prov. parks and major recreation sites. Fees paid by resource users for grazing and hunting and by lessees who pay fees to park system for certain facilities.
 CWS – Because of lack of resources many sites are not actively managed, enforced or maintained.

c) Ys, incentive measures implemented for all protected areas (please provide some examples)

Alta -fees for various services. Guides, outfitters, local communities, benefit; B.C. no examples
 Nunavut -offers example of Nunavut Parks IIBA (See ref. Notes).
 PC – Entrance fees (see ref. Notes). Certain park agreements provide for benefit sharing arrangements with communities. E.g. IIBA’s for Auyuittuq, Quttinirpaaq, Sirmilik, N. P. (see web ref.),
 National Park- Economic Opportunity Fund provides Inuit with financial assistance to pursue economic opportunities related to park.

Management approach

7. Have the principal threats to protected areas and the biodiversity that they contain been assessed, so that programmes can be put in place to deal with the threats, their effects and to influence the key drivers?

(Note : Question 7 is actually two questions – have threats been assessed (a,b,c,d) and are programs in place to deal with these threats (see e)? While 30% (4) of the parks jurisdictions reported that the threat assessment had been completed, of these only three (23%) reported that programs and policies were in place to deal with the threats. It is not clear whether the other jurisdiction has no program or failed to see it should also answer question e). Similarly one jurisdiction noted it had programs but indicated that a threat assessment was still being planned.)

Answer: The over-all statistical results are: 5% (2) of jurisdictions have no assessment of threats to protected areas and biodiversity; 23% (3) are planning one; in 38% (5) of the jurisdictions an assessment is underway; in 30% (4) of the parks jurisdictions the assessment is completed; and for e) 30% (4) of jurisdictions, indicated that there are programs and policies to deal with threats are in place. CWS reported that an assessment has been partially completed.

a) No

b) An assessment is being planned for

c) An assessment is in process

d) Yes, an assessment has been completed

e) Programs and policies to deal with threats are in place (please provide basic information on threats and actions taken)

Nunavut, Yukon

N.B., Nfld., Sask (b & c)

Alta -management plans (See refs)

provide guidelines; NWT, N.S., Ont.,

Sask -Assessments planned for Ecol.

Res. And other department crown lands.

Some parks have had plans prepared that

include this assessment. Other parks will

get plans as resources allow.

B.C. -Conservation. Risk Assessment

Process (See refs electronic/hard copy).

Parks Canada (PC)- e.g. climate change,

pesticides, waste, human disturbance,

park mgmt practices, urbanization,

forestry etc. (See web refs & notes).

PEI; CWS- yes (partially), Manitoba

B.C. -Analysis of Process underway;

Man.- Heavy industrial uses precluded

thru legislation;

Nfld. – e.g. policies on visitation and

tour boat operations in Seabird Reserves.

P. C. – Various initiatives underway

8. Are protected areas established and managed in the context of the wider region in which they are located, taking account of and contributing to other sectoral strategies?

Answer: 77 % of parks jurisdictions (10) report that some of their protected areas are established and managed in this way, while 23% (3) of jurisdictions state that this approach is used in all areas. An initiative launched by the Canadian Parks Council in the fall of 2002 resulted in most jurisdictions submitting case studies reflecting the different approaches they have used to integrate protected areas into the wider landscape. The value of this approach appears to have widespread acceptance amongst Canadian parks jurisdictions although there are many challenges limiting its use (e.g. finances, shortage of expertise, time required, etc.). CWS reports that it utilizes this approach in some areas, but restricted resources limit the amount of active management that can be done. However, current plans are being established for more effective integration of EC sites into the wider landscape. The selection and management of sites are to be more outward looking.

a) No

b) Yes, in some areas

Alta - consultation with resource sector, regional planning strategies, some areas there are problems; Man – candidate PA’s designed in a natural region context; B.C., Nfld., NWT, N.S. Ont., PC, PEI, Yukon ; CWS- Plans are for more effective integration. Selection and management of sites are to be more outward looking.

<p>c) Yes, in all areas (please provide details)</p>	<p>N.B., Nunavut – parks contribute to tourism and econ development (See ref. Notes).; Sask. – Mgmt of department lands undertaken with an integrated ecosystem approach (See web ref.).</p>
<p>9. Do protected areas vary in their nature, meeting a range of different management objectives and/or being operated through differing management regimes?</p>	
<p>Answer: Three or 23% of jurisdictions report that most of their areas are established under similar objectives and management regimes and 15% (2) of jurisdictions report that their protected areas are under similar regimes but there are some exceptions. However, 69% (9) of the jurisdictions report that they have different types of protected areas with different uses.</p>	
<p>a) No, most areas are established for similar objectives and are under similar management regimes</p>	<p>N.B., Yukon P.C. – IUCN cat. II. National parks are managed for Ecological Integrity (E.I.) and appropriate public benefit. All NP’s are managed under Canada National Parks Act, National Marine Conservation Areas, when established, are managed as IUCN V. CWS, PEI</p>
<p>b) Many areas have similar objectives/management regimes, but there are also some exceptions</p>	
<p>c) Yes, protected areas vary in nature (please provide details)</p>	<p>Alta -8 types with different uses, (see ref. Notes); B.C. -based on meeting 2 conservation/recreation goals and/or 4 recreation goals (See ref. Electronic/hard copy); Man. -Different designations (parks, wildlife mgmt areas, ecological reserves) with different mgmt agencies, Nfld.- Different types include Wilderness Reserves, Ecol. Reserves, Wildlife Reserve provincial parks, , National Parks, NHS, Migratory Bird Sanctuaries and Public Reserves. Different types of mgmt and restricted activities associated with different designations. NWT. N.S. (see refs. Hard copy for Systems Plan). Nunavut – All territorial parks are managed in accordance with the Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement (IIBA) for Territorial Parks, the Nunavut Land Claim Agreement and Territorial Park Policy. Management objectives in parks are distinctive. Also responsible for co-management of a Wildlife Sanctuary and 3 Heritage Rivers Ont. – 6 classes of parks - wilderness, nature reserve, natural environment, recreation, waterway, historical and six management zones each with a set of policies under the Prov. Park Planning and Mgmt. Policies. Sask – (See refs notes).</p>
<p>10. Is there wide stakeholder involvement in the establishment and management of protected areas?</p>	
<p>Answer: Some jurisdictions are required by law to carry out extensive stakeholder involvement. 46% of jurisdictions (6) reported that they <u>always</u> carry out wide stakeholder involvement and 46% indicated they involve stakeholders <u>in some but not all</u> of their protected areas. One jurisdiction is not involving stakeholders because its protected areas strategy is on hold. CWS reports there is wide stakeholder involvement in the establishment/management of <u>some</u> of their areas.</p>	

<p>a) No</p> <p>b) With some, but not all protected areas</p>	<p>Yukon – There was with initial protected area strategy that has now been placed on hold.</p> <p>B.C. -Over ½ of PA’s developed through land use planning tables of stakeholders and public;</p> <p>Man – aboriginal, local community, mining, logging, petrol and hydro groups usually involved; broader groups involved in selected sites; Nfld. N.S. Public Review Report</p> <p>Ont. Extensive consultation re location and boundaries of new PA’s’, also during mgmt plan. Little formal consultation about operations some informal with local communities</p> <p>CWS, PEI</p>
<p>c) Yes, always (please provide details of experience)</p>	<p>Alta.</p> <p>NB - Major consultation on protected areas strategy; to recommend boundaries and to get input on other issues. Local advisory committees being formed.</p> <p>NWT -See Stakeholders lists for those always consulted.</p> <p>Nunavut – reps of gov’t of Nunavut, various Inuit Associations, Nunavut Wildlife Board and Planning Commission mining industry, community committees, tourism associations, hunters etc.</p> <p>Sask - Always with First Nations and affected stakeholders</p> <p>Parks Canada – Stakeholder involvement req’d by Policy and Legislation at various stages – park feasibility assessments, management plans, etc. (See ref. Notes).</p>
<p>11. Do protected areas established and managed by non-government bodies, citizen groups, private sector and individuals exist in your country, and are they recognized in any formal manner?</p> <p>Answer: Seven jurisdictions (54%) report that some of their protected areas are established and managed by NGO’s but are not formally recognized. Five parks jurisdictions (38%) and CWS report that protected areas managed by NGO’s, citizens, etc. exist and are formally recognized. Examples include: Alberta Nature Conservancy, Ontario Federation of Naturalists; PEI agreement with private citizens, the Island Nature Trust, Ducks Unlimited, Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, etc. As well, some protected areas come out of First Nations Claims settlements, and only one jurisdiction reported that this type of area does not exist.</p>	
<p>a) No, they do not exist</p> <p>b) Yes, they exist, however are not formally recognized</p>	<p>Nunavut</p> <p>Man. -at early stage of recognizing NGO land thru legal mechanism</p> <p>B.C., N. B., Nfld., NS, PC</p> <p>NWT -note that Aboriginal groups are considered government</p>

<p>c) Yes, they exist and are formally recognized (please provide further information)</p>	<p>Alta Nature Conservancy, Alberta Conservation, . Ont. -FON, Nature Conservancy hold title to their own protected areas. Some have been leased and protected in regulation as prov. Parks. If not regulated not formally recognized as part of PA system PEI -Under the Natural Areas Protection Act, PEI, by order of the Minister, can designate protected areas, which are not Crown Land. Province has several of these types of agreements with private landowners. Also PEI has similar arrangements with the Island Nature Trust on various land holdings the Trust maintains and owns on the Island Sask – MOU, agreements and conservation easements have been entered with private sector – Redberry biosphere reserve, Ducks Unlimited, Potash Corporation of Sask, Nature Conservancy Yukon- Some protected areas come out of First Nation Land Claim Agreements CWS</p>
--	---

Available resources

<p>12. Are the human, institutional and financial resources available adequate for full implementation of the protected areas network, including for management of individual protected areas?</p>	
<p>Answer: 39% of parks agencies (5) report that resources are severely limiting while 46 % of agencies reported that resources are limiting. One jurisdiction noted its budget was one-quarter of what was required to complete its protected areas network. Infrastructure studies identifying the need for major repair and replacement of infrastructure in all jurisdictions, auditors’ reports, closures of parks, and facilities are all indicators of budget limitations. Only one jurisdiction reported that it had good resources available. CWS has reported that resources are severely limiting. As an example it indicated that in FY 2001-02, the budget was \$1.9M or approximately \$.16/ha of property. This budget has essentially been static since 1984. Financing has improved for the national parks system. Following the Prime Minister’s announcement in Johannesburg and his subsequent national message in October 2002, \$220 million over 5 years has been approved for the establishment of 10 new national parks and 5 new national marine conservation areas and to improve the ecological integrity in Canada’s 40 existing national parks.</p>	
<p>a) No, they are severely limiting (please provide basic information on needs and shortfalls)</p>	<p>Man.-Resources approx ¼ of req’ts to complete network in 10 yrs. No resources for inventory/mgmt of new protected areas; Nfld..NWT Nunavut- No resources for research and developing protected areas system plan; lack of resources to implement the PA network and manage individual areas. There is support for development of Nunavut park program, system plan and revision to legislation and establishment of strong wildlife mgmt programs (See ref. notes). Yukon- Protected Area Strategy is on hold. PEI - Main factor affecting full implementation of a protected areas network is lack of Crown land held by provincial government and lack of resources to acquire land from private landowners CWS- Budget has been relatively static since 1984 and equates to approximately \$.16 per hectare of property as compared to the US Fish and Wildlife Service which operates on a budget of \$12/ hectare.</p>

b) No, they are limiting (please provide basic information on needs and shortfalls)	<p>Alta, little funding and staff. Ont. - Auditor has recognized issues; and inability to achieve all objectives and policies. Resources required not yet assessed B.C.-since 80's resources decreased and protected areas more than doubled risk assessment used to determine highest risks to be resourced. N.S., Ont. Sask- Shortage of qualified staff and funding to do field work and mgmt plans. PC- Recent budget approvals will improve the funding situation for establishment of new parks and for maintenance of ecological integrity. Adequate funding for aging infrastructure is still a concern.</p>
c) Available resources are adequate (please provide basic information on needs and shortfalls)	N.B.
d) Yes, good resources are available	N.B.
13. Has your country requested/received financial assistance from the Global Environment Facility or other international sources for establishment/management of protected areas?	
<p>a) No</p> <p>b) Funding has been requested, but not received</p> <p>c) Funding is currently being requested</p> <p>d) Yes, funding has been received (please provide copies of appropriate documents)</p>	<p>Alta, BC, N.B., Nfld., N.S., CWS: Question does not apply to Canada.</p>

Assessment

14. Have constraints to implementation and management of an adequate system of protected areas been assessed, so that actions can be initiated to deal with these constraints?	
(Note: This question actually contains two queries - Have constraints been identified; and are actions being taken to deal with constraints? Some jurisdictions appear to have overlooked the second question.)	
Answer: 54% of parks agencies and CWS have identified constraints; 38% of parks agencies (5) indicate they have not identified constraints. However, only one parks jurisdiction reported putting actions in place to deal with constraints. It is likely that some of the 54% who have identified constraints have also taken some action to deal with them but perhaps did not notice this question. The NRTEE has also identified constraints and recommended specific actions in their national report to be tabled in June 2003.	
<p>a) No</p> <p>b) Yes, constraints have been assessed (please provide further information)</p>	<p>B.C., NWT, Nunavut, Sask Alta lack of remaining natural areas, commitments made to industry. Man. –informal assessment: Nfld. N.S. Ont.- Auditor has recognized; resources required not yet assessed PC – An assessment of the financial resources required to address ecological integrity/mgmt issues has been prepared as well as an estimate of funding required to compete the NP system. Resource assessment has been prepared identifying costs to re-capitalize deteriorated park assets. PEI - Main factor affecting full implementation of a protected areas network is lack of Crown land held by provincial government and lack of resources to acquire land from private landowners; CWS</p>

<p>d) Yes, an assessment has been made (please provide further information)</p>	<p>Alta- did economic evaluation of PA's that compared value of PA with other land uses. N.B- has socio econ study on impacts of establishment of protected natural areas on web. Also 1997 CEA conferences in N.B. on Protected Areas and the Bottom Line. Nunavut- is eco-tourism attraction. Parks visitors spend twice as much as average visitor (See ref. notes). Ont- Canadian Parks Council has worked on benefits assessment methodology also benefits assessments are being undertaken for new parks i.d. by Ontario's Living Legacy planning process. Sask- (See web ref. For Draft Biodiversity action Plan). PC – At present this is limited to material benefits (See web ref.) All parks agencies have contributed to this work through the CPC sponsoring of the Economic Benefits Study.</p>
---	---

Regional and international cooperation

<p>17. Is your country collaborating/communicating with neighbouring countries in the establishment and/or management of trans-boundary protected areas?</p>	
<p>Answer: 46% (6) of parks jurisdictions report they are not working on trans-boundary protected areas. However, Parks Canada is engaged with the US National Parks Service and with state governments in initiatives such as the Roosevelt-Campobello International Park, Waterton –Glacier, and Kluane-Wrangell-St. Elias. Several provinces (Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta) are involved in inter-provincial protected areas initiatives.</p>	
<p>a) No</p> <p>b) Yes (please provide details)</p>	<p>Nfld., NWT, N.S., Nunavut, PEI Yukon Alta –Cypress Hills with Sask & P.C., co-operates with PC in Rocky Mtns B.C.-share adjacent parks with Washington, Tatshenshini WHS with Yukon/Alaska; Rocky Mountain WHS (see ref. Electronic/hard copy) Man.- Discussions underway with Ont. re joint management of adjacent Parks NB- Roosevelt-Campobello International Park; St. Croix –NB, Maine, US and Can. Ont. – no (possible co-operative initiative) Sask – Agreement re Cypress Hills with Alta. Other areas have been informally discussed.</p> <p>PC -Waterton/Glacier; Kluane- Wrangell-St. Elias. Arrangements are in place with USNPS regarding Management of trans-boundary protected areas. CWS</p>

18. Are key protected areas professionals in your country members of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, thereby helping to foster the sharing of information and experience?

Answer: 46% (6) jurisdictions responded “no” to this question, 38% (5) said key professionals were members of WCPA and 23% (3), and CWS indicated the information was not available.

- a) No Alta, Man, N.B., N.S., Nunavut, Yukon
- b) Yes BC, Nfld., NWT, Ont, PC
- c) Information is not available Sask , CWS, PEI

19. Has your country provided information on its protected areas to the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Center in order to allow for a scientific assessment of the status of the world’s protected areas?

Answer: 62% (8) of parks jurisdictions have provided information, 23 % (3) have not, and 15% (2) are unsure.

- a) No Nunavut, no answer
- b) Yes BC, N.B. Yukon, Sask doesn’t know, CWS not sure
Alta, Man, Nfld., NWT, N.S., Ont., PC, CWS, PEI N/A

20. If your country has protected areas or other sites recognized or designated under an international convention or program (including regional conventions and programs), please provide copies of reports submitted to those programs or summaries of them.

Answer: There are 36 Ramsar sites in Canada of which 15 are included in National Wildlife Areas (NWA) or Migratory Bird Sanctuaries (MBS). In addition, there are 13 World Heritage Sites in Canada located in B.C., Yukon, Alberta, Newfoundland/Labrador, Que., NWT, N.S.; nine of these form part of national parks or national historic sites. There are also 12 biosphere reserves located in B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, and Nova Scotia. Of these, five contain national parks as part of their protected core. The biosphere reserves also contain provincial parks, NWA’s, and/or MBS’s. In the survey very few provinces reported the existence of these sites.

Alta- 2 World Heritage Sites – Head Smashed in Buffalo Jump and Dinosaur Provincial Parks, 2 Ramsar, Sites; 2 Globally significant Bird Areas – WH reports for Jasper Wood Buffalo. Many provinces have not reported their Ramsar , World Heritage or Biosphere reserve sit

21. Do you think that there are some activities on protected areas that your country has significant experience that will be of direct value to other Contracting Parties?

Answer: Parks jurisdictions identified a wide range of experience they thought would be of value to others, including: expertise with oil, gas, mining and forestry sectors; planning protected areas systems and individual protected areas; governance; land claims and aboriginal policy; fire management, innovative governance arrangements and consultation.

- a) No Yukon
- b) Yes (please provide details) NWT, N.S.,
Alta- expertise dealing with oil and gas to minimize impacts on PA’s.
BC- Tools such as: Protected Area System Overview, Conservation Risk Assessment, Annual Mgmt Plan
Man. – Work with mining sector to establish PA’s nationally recognized as examples of successful work.
NB- strong in assessment of representation and identification. of candidate sites.
Nunavut- protected areas research, planning, development and management under Land Claim Agreement would be valuable to others in similar circumstances
Ont.- Ontario Forest Accord, Prescribed Fire, Geological Conservation, Park Planning and Mgmt Policies (See ref. notes)
Sask – Conservation Action Plan; Representative Areas Network; Policies for First Nations, Land Use Planning, Parks in 21st Century (see web ref.).
PC – Innovative governance arrangements for protected areas agencies. Consultation with stakeholders; managing for ecological integrity, Value based mgmt of cultural resources
Nova Scotia – Community economic development, partnerships in science, land acquisition using NGO’s

Further comments

NWT – We are currently planning for an assessment of Core Representative Areas under Goal 2 of the NWTPAS. Selected Areas will be identified with local communities and regional aboriginal governments, to begin the PA's process for each. Our common goal with our partners is a representative system of protected areas in the Northwest Territories.

Thematic Report on Terrestrial Protected Areas

References, Website Links and Attachments

Information on protected areas in New Brunswick is available at: <http://www.gnb.ca/0399/index-e.asp>

Material Used:

1. Northwest Territories Protected Areas Strategy (NWTPAS)
 - a. Website: <http://www.gov.nt.ca/RWED/pas/index.htm>
 - b. Signed by the Government of the Northwest Territories (GNWT) and the Government of Canada on September 27, 1999.
 - c. Two Main Goals:
 - i. To protect Special, Natural, and Cultural Areas, and
 - ii. To protect Core Representative Areas within each Ecoregion
 - d. Key Stakeholders:
 - i. Regional Aboriginal Organizations,
 - ii. Conservation Organizations
 - iii. Resource Development Organizations,
 - iv. The Government of Canada
 - v. The Government of the Northwest Territories
2. The Territorial Parks Act, Regulations, and Related Policies and Procedures
 - a. Website: <http://www.lex-nt.ca/>
 - b. Key Stakeholders:
 - i. Residents of the Northwest Territories
 - ii. All Aboriginal, and Political Organizations in the northwest Territories
 - iii. Parks and Conservation Organizations
 - iv. Chambers of Commerce and Development Organizations
 - v. The Department of Resources, Wildlife, and Economic Development of the GNWT.

System of protected areas

1. What is the relative priority afforded to development and implementation of a national system of protected areas in the context of other obligations arising from the Convention and COP Decisions?

NS: See Attached hard copy.

2. Is there a systematic planning process for development and implementation of a national system of protected areas?

BC: Protected Areas Strategy for British Columbia – See electronic/hard copy.

Manitoba: Action Plan on Web:

Parks Canada Agency:

http://parkscanada.gc.ca/docs/pn-np/nation/nation1_E.asp

http://parkscanada.gc.ca/progs/amnc-nmca/system/index_E.asp

Saskatchewan: See web site describing Representative Areas Network initiative:
<http://www.se.gov.sk.ca/ecosystem/sran/>

3. Is there an assessment of the extent to which the existing network of protected areas covers all areas that are identified as being important for the conservation of biological diversity?

Alberta: See hard copy attached for details.

BC: A comprehensive assessment system has been developed for British Columbia Protected Areas. The tool, Protected Areas System Overview, is a GIS and spreadsheet based data system that analyzes the contribution towards representation of ecosection and biogeoclimatic units. The tool can quickly analyze what ecological units have adequate protection and what units are not fully represented.

Manitoba: Web reference

Ontario: Ontario is currently undertaking an assessment of gaps in representation of biodiversity. During the course of the Ontario's Living Legacy land use planning process (1997 to 1999), there was an assessment of gaps in presentation in the area covered by the land use planning process.

Parks Canada Agency:

http://www.parkscanada.gc.ca/docs/pc/rpts/heritage/prot30_e.asp (Pages 30-33)

Regulatory framework

4. Is there a policy framework and/or enabling legislation in place for the establishment and management of protected areas?

BC: Legislation and policy for managing conservation and recreation values can be found at: <http://wlapwww.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/index.htm>

Manitoba: Web reference

New Brunswick: The Protected Natural Areas Act will soon be posted online at <http://www/gnb.ca/0062//deplinks/ENG/Nre.htm>

Ontario: Ontario's protected areas are regulated under the Provincial Parks Act (e.g. provincial parks) or the Public Lands Act (e.g. conservation reserves). The Provincial Park Planning and Management Policies provide a framework for managing provincial parks. A Conservation Reserves Policy provides a framework for managing conservation reserves.

Parks Canada Agency: http://www.parkscanada.gc.ca/docs/pc/poli/princip/index_E.asp

Saskatchewan: See Ecological Reserves Act and Parks Act legislation on line at: <http://www.qp.gov.sk.ca/documents/English/Statutes/Statutes/E0-01.pdf>

<http://www.qp.gov.sk.ca/publications/index.cfm?fuseaction=details&c=1878&id=2>

5. Have guidelines, criteria and targets been adopted to support selection, establishment and management of protected areas?

Alberta: See attached hard copy.

BC: Criteria for representation and special feature areas is found in the publication Protected Areas Strategy for British Columbia – see attached electronic/hard copy.

Manitoba: Web reference

NS: See Attached hard copy of Systems Plan.

Parks Canada Agency: http://www.parkscanada.gc.ca/docs/pc/poli/princip/part2/part2a3_E.asp

6. Does the management of protected areas involve the use of incentive measures, for instance, of entrance fees for park visitors, or of benefit-sharing arrangements with adjacent communities and other relevant stakeholders?

Nunavut: The Nunavut Land Claim Agreement details the need for the negotiation of an Inuit Impact and Benefits Agreement (IIBA) for all Parks and Conservation Areas in Nunavut. An IIBA specifies the method/framework in which parks and conservation areas are established, developed and managed. The Nunavut Parks IIBA, negotiated by the Government of Nunavut with the Territorial and Regional Inuit Associations, includes 17 articles providing for Territory-wide and local involvement of Inuit in the development and management of Territorial Parks. The agreement also provides for significant Inuit participation in economic activity associated with parks, including building tourism expertise and supporting business development associated with parks. The Nunavut Parks IIBA assures continued Inuit access to park lands, while establishing the foundation for a park system that will contribute to the conservation of the natural and cultural heritage of the Territory. A Conservation Areas IIBA still needs to be negotiated for Nunavut.

Parks Canada Agency: Main Fee's page: http://www.parksCanada.gc.ca/apps/tarifs-fees/index_E.asp , or Fees list for all NP's: http://www.parksCanada.gc.ca/apps/tarifs-fees/1st_E.asp?ParkName=&ParkType=1&Province=AllProvinces

Examples:

Auyuittuq National Park of Canada

ENTRY/EXCURSION FEE

Day Use / \$15.00

Short-term (up to 3 nights) / \$40.00

Annual Backcountry-Use Permit / \$100.00

Valid in any national park or national park reserve in Nunavut and the Northwest Territories as well as in Ivvavik National Park in the Yukon Territory.

ENTRY FEE

Daily

Adult / \$6.00

Senior (65 years and over) / \$4.50

Youth (6 to 16 years) / \$3.00

Child (under 6 years) / Free

Adult - Group (up to 7 people) / \$12.00

Senior - Group (up to 7 people) / \$9.00

Commercial Group, per person \$3.00

A 50% discount will apply for commercial groups with over 50% children (children 16 years and under).

In terms of community benefits, as an example, the Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement for Auyuittuq, Quttinirpaaq and Sirmilik National Parks provides as follows:

PART 3: NATIONAL PARKS ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES FUND

10.3.1 Upon signing this Agreement, the Government will provide to the Kakivak Association a one-time grant of three million dollars to establish a National Parks Economic Opportunities Fund (Opportunities Fund).

10.3.2 The purpose of the Opportunities Fund is to provide Inuit who reside in the adjacent communities, particularly Inuit who reside in Grise Fiord, Arctic Bay and Qikiqtarjuaq, with financial assistance to enable them to take advantage of economic opportunities related to the Parks

Management approach

7. Have the principal threats to protected areas and the biodiversity that they contain been assessed, so that programmes can be put in place to deal with the threats, their effects and to influence the key drivers?

Alberta: ?

BC: A Conservation Risk Assessment Process has been developed and implemented for all protected areas in B.C. An analysis of this process is currently underway.

Parks Canada Agency: http://www.parksCanada.gc.ca/docs/pc/rpts/heritage/prot79_e.asp

Example:

STRESSOR NAME AND STATUS (refer to above Parks Canada web-link)

8. Are protected areas established and managed in the context of the wider region in which they are located, taking account of and contributing to other sectoral strategies?

Nunavut: In addition to conservation and protection, Nunavut Territorial Parks contribute to Economic Development Strategy for the territory through Tourism. It is estimated that 39% of tourists to Nunavut report visiting a Territorial or National Park. It was also found that visitors to parks stay longer in Nunavut and tend to spend more money in the territory.

Saskatchewan: Management of department lands is undertaken with an ecosystem and integrated approach. See web site for further details: **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

9. Do protected areas vary in their nature, meeting a range of different management objectives and/or being operated through differing management regimes?

Alberta: 8 Types with different uses (see details- hard copy)

BC: Protected areas are designated to meet two conservation goals (representation and special features) and/or four recreation goals (backcountry, local/regional recreation opportunities, destination sites, tourism travel corridor sites). Front country recreation is generally managed through permit with the public sector. Some agreements in place for management by local stewardship groups or other stakeholders such as First Nations groups.

NS: See Attached hard copy for Systems Plan

Nunavut: All Nunavut Territorial Parks are managed in accordance with the Inuit Impact and Benefits Agreement for Territorial Parks, the Nunavut Land Claim Agreement and Territorial Park Policy. Management Objectives within Nunavut Parks are distinctive including the management of a community campground to act as a service area for visitors, to the preservation and interpretation of a historic/archaeological site to the management of a pristine wilderness park. Nunavut Parks is also responsible for the co-management of a Wildlife Sanctuary and three National Heritage Rivers.

Saskatchewan: See diversity of categories by IUCN categories in the attached document:



Table 1.doc

10. Is there wide stakeholder involvement in the establishment and management of protected areas?

North West Territories: See Stakeholders List

NS: 1995 Public Review Report (hard copy)

Saskatchewan: Consultation is always undertaken with First Nations groups and with affected stakeholders

Parks Canada Agency:

National Park Policy provides as follows:

1.3 Assessing National Park Feasibility

1.3.1

Parks Canada, in conjunction with provincial or territorial governments, will undertake an assessment of the feasibility of a new park proposal; where there are opportunities, this will be undertaken as part of other processes such as regional land use planning, provincial protected area strategies or Aboriginal comprehensive land claim negotiations.

1.3.2

As part of the feasibility assessment, there will be consultations to seek the views of local communities, Aboriginal peoples, non-government organizations, relevant industries, other government departments and the interested public. Parks Canada will provide information regarding the purpose and the environmental, social and economic implications of the national park proposal.

2.1 Management Plans

2.1.5

Parks Canada will inform and involve a broad spectrum of the Canadian public in the preparation, review and amendment of park management plans.

The Canada National Parks Act provides as follows:

12. (1) The Minister shall, where applicable, provide opportunities for public participation at the national, regional and local levels, including participation by aboriginal organizations, bodies established under land claims agreements and representatives of park communities, in the development of parks policy and regulations, the establishment of parks, the formulation of management plans, land use planning and development in relation to park communities and any other matters that the Minister considers relevant.

Available resources

12. Are the human, institutional and financial resources available adequate for full implementation of the protected areas network, including for management of individual protected areas?

Nunavut: There are no human and financial resources available to research and develop an overall protected areas system framework and plan for Nunavut, in addition to the lack of human and financial resources for the full implementation of the protected areas network, including the management of individual protected areas.

However, there is human, institutional and financial support for the development of a Nunavut Territorial Park program, Park System Plan, and revisions to the Parks Legislation and Policy, and the establishment of strong wildlife management programs. Collectively, these initiatives will provide the basis for protected areas planning and development, and will provide the community and industry support and interest necessary for a successful Nunavut Protected Areas Strategy.

13. Has your country requested/received financial assistance from the Global Environment Facility or other international sources for establishment/management of protected areas?

Assessment

15. Is a programme in place or in development to regularly assess the effectiveness of protected areas management and to act on this information?

BC: BC Parks implemented an Annual Management Plan process, which is designed to review the status of protected area issues and management annually. See attached electronic/hard copy.

Parks Canada Agency: This information is provided in the Parks Canada Agency Annual Report 2001 – 2002: http://www.parkscanada.gc.ca/docs/pc/rpts/ann00-01/annu00-01_toc_e.asp

16. Has any assessment been made of the value of the material and non-material benefits and services that protected areas provide?

Parks Canada Agency: Economic Impacts of Parks Canada - Currently not on our Web site, likely on-line again within 1-2 months at the following address: <http://www.parkscanada.gc.ca/retombées-impact>

Nunavut: Benefits can be divided into two kinds: economic benefits and social benefits. Economic benefits include such impacts as jobs and income for Nunavummiut. Social benefits include cultural support, improved community quality of life, protection and conservation of significant natural and cultural resources/historic sites; and operators, guides and others serving as important role models.

Breathtaking scenery in a fragile environment makes Nunavut a popular eco-tourism destination. It is estimated that 20% of the 18,000 visitors to Nunavut experience the territory through its parks and this value increases to over 40% in the Baffin region.

Parks and tourism makes a valuable contribution to our economy. According to a 1996 report¹, the average tourist spends about \$2,200 within Nunavut. The same report stated that Parks visitors tend to spend twice as much (about \$2,700) during their stay in Nunavut – which tends to be twice as long. In addition, parks visitors tend to spend twice as much on arts and crafts and accommodations as the average visitor. The recently completed 2000 Visitor Exit Survey suggests that tourists continue to spend \$2,000 on average per visit

Saskatchewan: This has been addressed on pages 7,8,9 in Saskatchewan's Draft Biodiversity Action Plan available at: <http://www.sw.gov.sk.ca/ecosystem/biodiversity/default.htm>

¹ *Tourists Visiting Nunavut: A Profile*. Policy, Planning and Human Resources Division, Department of Economic Development and Tourism, Government of the Northwest Territories; 1996, p. 21.

Regional and international cooperation

17. Is your country collaborating/communicating with neighbouring countries in the establishment and/or management of transboundary protected areas?

BC: Some protected areas are located adjacent to other provincial, federal or international protected areas. Examples include the Manning/Cascade complex (shared with Washington State), the Kluane/Glacier Bay/Tatshenshini complex (a World Heritage Site shared with Yukon Territory and the State of Alaska) and the Rocky Mountain parks complex (another World Heritage Site shared with Parks Canada). Communications regarding management of these areas with partners are ongoing.

Saskatchewan: Saskatchewan has existing agreement regarding the Cypress Hills with Alberta Parks and Parks Canada. Additional areas have been informally discussed with Alberta.

18. Are key protected areas professionals in your country members of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, thereby helping to foster the sharing of information and experience?

19. Has your country provided information on its protected areas to the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre in order to allow for a scientific assessment of the status of the world's protected areas?

20. If your country has protected areas or other sites recognised or designated under an international convention or programme (including regional conventions and programmes), please provide copies of reports submitted to those programmes or summaries of them.

21. Do you think that there are some activities on protected areas that your country has significant experience that will be of direct value to other Contracting Parties?

Ontario: Some Ontario initiatives of possible interest to other jurisdictions include

- 1 The Ontario Forest Accord – this is an initiative involving the forest industry, environmental groups and government that is aimed at identifying additional protected areas and promoting ecologically sustainable management of the broader landscape.
- 2 Prescribed Fire – Ontario has had a program to employ prescribed fire in selected parks as a means to protect prairie and savannah ecosystems. This program is being expanded to include use of prescribed and natural fires to protect boreal and mixed deciduous ecosystems.
- 3 Geological Conservation – Ontario includes geological features in its protected areas system and has a comprehensive system in place to identify features to be protected.
- 4 Ontario's Provincial Park Planning and Management Policies (first approved in 1978) provide a comprehensive policy framework for management of provincial parks. This includes a classification and zoning system.

Saskatchewan: The programs referenced earlier, such as the Conservation Action Plan; and The Representative Areas Network; may be of interest. Also policies governing the department's relationships with First Nations; Land Use Planning (see:); Parks in the 21st Century may be of interest. See: <http://www.se.gov.sk.ca/ecosystem/land%20use/default.asp>

<http://www.se.gov.sk.ca/saskparks/common/21st%20Century%20Final.pdf>

Further comments

Thematic report on marine protected areas or areas where special measures need to be taken to conserve biological diversity

Please provide the following details on the origin of this report.

Contracting Party:	Canada
National Focal Point	
Full name of the institution:	Biodiversity Convention Office Environment Canada
Name and title of contact officer:	Krista Blackborow
Mailing address:	351 St. Joseph Blvd. Place Vincent Massey - 9 th Floor Hull, QC K1A 0H3
Telephone:	(819) 953-4374
Fax:	(819) 953-1765
E-mail:	john.herity@ec.gc.ca
Contact officer for national report (if different)	
Full name of the institution:	For marine protected areas programs in Canada: Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Name and title of contact officer:	Mary Jean Comfort
Mailing address:	Marine Ecosystem Conservation Branch Fisheries and Oceans 200 Kent St, Ottawa, ON K1A 0E6
Telephone:	(613) 991-5935
Fax:	(613) 993-6414
E-mail:	<u>Comfortm@dfo-mpo.gc.ca</u>
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting national report:	
Date of submission:	

Please provide summary information on the process by which this report has been prepared, including information on the types of stakeholders who have been actively involved in its preparation and on material which was used as a basis for the report.

This report is for **Canada's federal marine protected areas programs** only (i.e. separate from the overall terrestrial protected areas).

Two departments and one agency of the federal government of Canada are responsible for establishing marine protected areas through different legislative mandates:

The **Department of Fisheries and Oceans** has the federal lead in seacoast and inland fisheries; fishing and recreational harbours; hydrography and marine sciences; and coordination of the policies and programs of the Government of Canada respecting oceans. Through the *Oceans Act*, DFO can designate Marine Protected Areas (MPA): the overall purpose of the DFO MPA program is 1) to conserve and protect marine ecosystems, species and habitats and, 2) to lead and coordinate a national system of marine protected area on the behalf of the government of Canada.

Parks Canada Agency (PCA) has the federal lead in government activities related to establishing and managing places representative of Canada's natural heritage and places of national historic importance and in protecting and presenting these places to the public. Through the *Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act*, PCA can designate National Marine Conservation Areas (NMCA): the overall purpose of the NMCA program is to protect and conserve marine areas representative of Canada's oceanic and Great Lakes environments for the benefit, education, and enjoyment of the people of Canada and the world.


Environment Canada (Canadian Wildlife Service), has the federal lead in the preservation and enhancement of the quality of the natural environment, including the conservation, management and protection of nationally significant marine habitats and wildlife, especially migratory birds. Through the *Canada Wildlife Act* and the *Migratory Bird Convention Act*, the CWS/EC can designate Marine Wildlife Areas, National Wildlife Areas and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries: the overall purpose of the CWS/EC protected areas are 1) to conserve and protect wildlife and habitats and 2) to conserve and protect migratory birds.

The two federal departments and the agency (DFO-CWS/EC-PCA) are currently working together and are in the early stages of developing a federal strategy to achieve and manage a comprehensive network of federal marine protected areas.

The following questionnaire was answered for each department/agency marine protected areas program separately, and when applicable for the Federal marine protected areas strategy.

Protected areas or areas where special measures need to be taken to conserve biological diversity

System of protected areas

<p>1. What is the relative priority afforded to development and implementation of a national system of protected areas in the context of other obligations arising from the Convention and COP Decisions?</p>	
<p>a) High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b) Medium <input type="checkbox"/> c) Low <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>2. Is there a systematic planning process for development and implementation of a national system of protected areas?</p>	
<p>a) no</p>	
<p>b) in early stages of development – The Federal marine protected areas network/strategy: DFO-PCA-CWS/EC are in the early stages of developing a federal strategy to achieve a national network of marine protected areas.</p>	<p>DFO/PCA/CWS/EC</p>
<p>c) in advanced stages of development</p>	
<p>d) yes, please provide copies of relevant documents describing the process</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><u>Fisheries and Oceans Canada:</u> - National Framework for Establishing and Managing Marine Protected Areas, DFO March 1999. http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/canwaters-eauxcan/infocentre/publications/docs/newmpa/index_e.asp</p>	
<p><u>Parks Canada Agency:</u> - National Marine Conservation Area Policy, Parks Canada http://www.parksCanada.gc.ca/docs/pc/poli/princip/part2/part2b_E.asp - Sea to Sea to Sea: Canada’s National Marine Conservation Areas System Plan (1995) http://www.parksCanada.gc.ca/progs/amnc-nmca/system/index_E.asp</p>	
<p><u>Canadian Wildlife Service:</u></p>	
<p>- Environment Canada Protected Areas Strategic Plan DRAFT, July 2002</p>	
<p> Environment Canada Protected A..</p>	
<p>3. Is there an assessment of the extent to which the existing network of protected areas covers all areas that are identified as being important for the conservation of biological diversity?</p>	
<p>a) no</p>	<p>x</p>
<p>b) an assessment is being planned for</p>	
<p>c) an assessment is being undertaken</p>	
<p>d) yes, please provide copies of the assessments made</p>	

Regulatory framework

4. Is there a policy framework and/or enabling legislation in place for the establishment and management of protected areas?

- a) no
- b) in early stages of development
- c) in advanced stages of development
- d) yes, please provide copies of relevant documents

Yes

Canadian Wildlife Service:

- **Canada Wildlife Act** - <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/W-9/>
- **CWA Regs** - <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/W-9/C.R.C.-c.1609/index.html>
- **Migratory Bird Convention Act** - <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/M-7.01/>
- **Migratory Bird Sanctuary Regs** - <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/M-7.01/C.R.C.-c.1036/>

Fisheries and Oceans Canada:

- **Oceans Act** - <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/O-2.4/index.html>
- **Canada's Oceans Strategy, DFO** - <http://www.cos-soc.gc.ca/>
- **National Framework for Establishing and Managing Marine Protected Areas, DFO (1999)** http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/canwaters-eauxcan/oceans/mpa-zpm/index_e.asp
- **Marine Protected Areas Policy, DFO (1999)** – same as above

Parks Canada:

- **Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act**
<http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-7.3/index.html>
- **National Marine Conservation Area Policy, Parks Canada**
http://www.parksCanada.gc.ca/docs/pc/poli/princip/part2/part2b_E.asp

5. Have guidelines, criteria and targets been adopted to support selection, establishment and management of protected areas?

- a) no
- b) in early stages of development
- c) in advanced stages of development

Management approach

<p>7. Have the principal threats to protected areas and the biodiversity that they contain been assessed, so that programmes can be put in place to deal with the threats, their effects and to influence the key drivers?</p> <p>a) no</p> <p>b) an assessment is being planned for</p> <p>c) an assessment is in process</p> <p>d) yes, an assessment has been completed</p> <p>DFO : ecological, social and economic assessments are undertaken for each proposed MPA (Area of Interest).</p> <p>CWS/EC: partially</p> <p>Parks Canada: NMCA legislation requires that a report on the state of NMCAs be tabled in Parliament every two years – Part of Parks Canada’s “State of Protected Heritage Areas Reports”</p> <p>e) Programmes and policies to deal with threats are in place (please provide basic information on threats and actions taken)</p>	<p>DFO-Yes CWS/EC-Yes PCA - Yes</p>
<p>8. Are protected areas established and managed in the context of the wider region in which they are located, taking account of and contributing to other sectoral strategies?</p> <p>a) no</p> <p>b) yes, in some areas –</p> <p>DFO : where applicable, MPAs will be established and managed within the context of Large Ocean Management Areas (e.g Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (IM) and Central Coast IM planning initiatives). Integrated Management planning fora includes representation from all relevant/affected/interested stakeholders and allows for MPAs to be selected and managed within the context of broader sectoral strategies.</p> <p>c) yes, in all areas (please provide details)</p> <p>Parks Canada: by policy, NMCA feasibility studies include an assessment of mineral and energy potential so that sectoral interest is not overlooked. With respect to management, NMCA management plans are developed in consultation with stakeholders, including those involved in fishing and managing fishing.</p>	<p>CWS/EC DFO PCA</p>
<p>9. Do protected areas vary in their nature, meeting a range of different management objectives and/or being operated through differing management regimes?</p> <p>b) no, most areas are established for similar objectives and are under similar management regimes</p> <p>b) many areas have similar objectives/management regimes, but there are also some exceptions</p> <p>c) yes, protected areas vary in nature (please provide details)</p> <p>DFO : each OA MPA has its own unique set of conservation goals and objectives (i.e. conservation purpose). Management regimes may vary between MPAs, depending on the specific conservation objectives of the area.</p>	<p>PCA CWS/EC DFO</p>
<p>10. Is there wide stakeholder involvement in the establishment and management of protected areas?</p> <p>a) no</p> <p>b) with some, but not all protected areas</p>	<p>CWS/EC</p>

<p>c) yes, always (please provide details of experience)</p> <p>DFO: yes. Stakeholder involvement is a critical component of the MPA establishment and management process. Stakeholders, through participation in MPA Advisory Committees established at each proposed MPA, may assist the Department with the facilitation of broader stakeholder consultations, the development of regulations, and the formulation and implementation of a management plan for the area.</p> <p>Parks Canada: The <i>Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act</i> requires extensive stakeholder consultation during the establishment process of national marine conservation areas (NMCA), as well as the development of regulations, and also requires the establishment of an management advisory committee for each NMCA to advise the Minister on the formulation, review and implementation of the management plan.</p>	<p>DFO PCA</p>
<p>11. Do protected areas established and managed by non-government bodies, citizen groups, private sector and individuals exist in your country, and are they recognized in any formal manner?</p> <p>a) no, they do not exist</p> <p>b) yes, they exist, however are not formally recognized</p> <p>c) yes, they exist and are formally recognized (please provide further information)</p>	<p>X</p>

Available resources

<p>12. Are the human, institutional and financial resources available adequate for full implementation of the protected areas network, including for management of individual protected areas?</p> <p>a) no, they are severely limiting (please provide basic information on needs and shortfalls)</p> <p>CWS/EC: Refer to the Attachment for Question 2. It includes a section that discusses the limitations and challenges for EC's protected areas network.</p> <p>b) no, they are limiting (please provide basic information on needs and shortfalls)</p> <p>DFO : both human and financial resources are required to effectively establish and manage OA MPAs.</p> <p>c) Available resources are adequate (please provide basic information on needs and shortfalls)</p> <p>Parks Canada: recent budgetary measures will ensure that new NMCAs are adequately resourced upon being established, but broad institutional support for the NMCA program must be developed further in the years ahead to approach that available to other Parks Canada programs.</p> <p>d) yes, good resources are available</p>	<p>CWS/EC DFO PCA</p>
<p>13. Has your country requested/received financial assistance from the Global Environment Facility or other international sources for establishment/management of protected areas?</p> <p>a) no</p> <p>b) funding has been requested, but not received</p> <p>c) funding is currently being requested</p> <p>d) yes, funding has been received (please provide copies of appropriate documents)</p>	<p>X</p>

Assessment

14. Have constraints to implementation and management of an adequate system of protected areas been assessed, so that actions can be initiated to deal with these constraints?

a) no

b) yes, constraints have been assessed (please provide further information)

CWS/EC
DFO PCA

CWS/EC:

We have assessed the state of the protected areas network and additional resources will be allocated to the protected areas network. The Canadian Nature Federation produced a report that captures some the challenges that our Protected Areas network faces:

http://www.cnf.ca/media/sep_23_02.html

DFO : Yes, the situation has been assessed. Additional resources to support the implementation of Canada's Oceans Strategy (2002) have been sought and approved, pending available funding. (Note: The MPA program is identified in the Oceans Strategy as a key implementation tool)

CWS/EC/DFO/Parks Canada: have undertaken an informal review of institutional constraints that are common to all of them and have begun development of a proposed Federal MPAs Strategy.

c) yes, actions to deal with constraints are in place (please provide further information)

15. Is a programme in place or in development to regularly assess the effectiveness of protected areas management and to act on this information?

a) no

b) yes, a programme is under development (please provide further information)

CWS/EC
DFO
PCA

DFO : Ecosystem Objectives and Marine Environmental Quality indicators are being developed to measure the effectiveness of ocean management regimes. A "State of the Oceans" reporting system is also under development.

Parks Canada: The federal auditor general has requested that management effectiveness indicators be prepared for the national marine conservation area program. In support of this objective, Parks Canada is participating in an international effort to test a draft MPA management effectiveness indicators guidebook that will be submitted to the World Commission on Protected Areas for endorsement during the World Parks Congress in September 2003.

c) yes, a programme is in place (please provide further information)

16. Has any assessment been made of the value of the material and non-material benefits and services that protected areas provide?

a) no

b) an assessment is planned

c) an assessment is in process

d) yes, an assessment has been made (please provide further information)

CWS/EC/DFO/PCA

Regional and international cooperation

17. Is your country collaborating/communicating with neighbouring countries in the establishment and/or management of transboundary protected areas?

a) no

b) yes (please provide details)

Yes

CWS/EC : We are members of the Protected Areas table of the Trilateral Committee. We are also Canada's Administrative Authority for Ramsar's Convention on International Wetlands.

DFO: DFO contributes to the collaborative efforts of the Commission for Environmental Cooperation to establish a North American Network of Marine Protected Areas. DFO also communicates regularly with US partners, including the National Oceanic Atmospheric Association.

Parks Canada: Communicating with the US for areas of mutual interest along our borders (such as Georgia Basin (British Columbia/Washington State), Gulf of Maine (Nova Scotia, New Brunswick/Maine)). Parks Canada also participates with other federal protected areas agencies in the work of the NAFTA Commission on Environmental Cooperation's Marine Protected Areas Network program, and in the Circumpolar Protected Areas Network program of the Arctic Council.

18. Are key protected areas professionals in your country members of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, thereby helping to foster the sharing of information and experience?

a) no

b) yes

PCA, DFO –yes
a number are
members

c) information is not available

19. Has your country provided information on its protected areas to the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre in order to allow for a scientific assessment of the status of the world's protected areas?

a) no

b) yes

CWS/EC (Not sure)
DFO
PCA

20. If your country has protected areas or other sites recognised or designated under an international convention or programme (including regional conventions and programmes), please provide copies of reports submitted to those programmes or summaries of them.

CWS/EC : http://www.wetlands.org/RDB/Ramsar_Dir/Canada_.htm

DFO : not so far.

Parks Canada : none so far for NMCAs

21. Do you think that there are some activities on protected areas that your country has significant experience that will be of direct value to other Contracting Parties?

a) no

b) yes (please provide details)

CWS/EC : Managing Protected areas for migratory birds, endangered species and wildlife in general.

Parks Canada: System planning for marine protected areas, management planning, operations, visitor services and interpretation programs

DFO: establishing offshore protected areas

CWS/EC

PCA

DFO

Further comments
