

## **Break-out group on themes - EUROPE (Boris, Jana, Marie, Stig, and theme presenters)**

### **First and foremost:**

- Review the consistency and accuracy of existing WDPA / 6<sup>th</sup> Report data
- Focus on the pipeline (starting new establishment processes is a waste of time)
  - Finland has >765 areas covering 340,000 ha in the legal designation pipeline
  - Identify clear cut OECM categories or sites and address them
- Identify and focus on projects which may contribute to delivering on AT 11 in the next 12 months.
- Use CBD and other organizations with leverage (EU, Council of Europe) to urge/push governments to speed up areas where advances can be made in the next year.
- Create national pressure by engaging NGO and civil society to highlight the need to achieve the Aichi Targets such as 11 which is within reach of being achieved
- Use important and highly visible events such as the IUCN WCC Marseilles to propose constructive action.

### **Representativeness**

- Check which PA designation processes (governments, projects) are underway and how they affect representativity and connectivity and do the same with clear cut OECM cases and sites.
  - Use CBD and other organizations with leverage (EU, Council of Europe) to urge/push governments to speed up any potential areas that can be designated within the next year.
  - National civil society and NGO pressure to highlight the need to achieve the targets
  - IUCN WCC Marseilles.
    - (Governments making commitments on PAs, OECMs or any of the qualitative aspects of AT 11 - more impact beyond 2020)

### **Connectivity**

- Use the updated data generated by JRC
- Do a national ProtCon analysis on connectivity if there are interest, resources and capacity to do this.

### **Management effectiveness**

- Check and bring potentially missing MEE information to the WCMC-WDPA (talk about management effectiveness and feedback systems rather than assessments)
  - E.g. UK, Finland etc.
- Check projects and on-going processes if any MEE exercises can be conducted within the coming year.

### **Governance and equity**

- No clear metric to address the issues in a uniform way.
  - Is there anything CBD Sec. or the Partnership can do to have a simple survey?
    - CBD secretariat to send a Notification, with a simple format of issues to report beyond just reporting on governance types
  - Else much of the more systematic approach and metrics (scorecards, METT-like assessments) will probably be a Post 2020 issues

- Check to what extent e.g. Akwe Kon and other participatory methodologies and efforts have been used in PA management planning, operations and stakeholder interactions
- There are several actions that speak to part of the governance and equity guidance:
  - Help to develop and introduce the tool; if possible
  - Quantitative benefits e.g. local economic benefits, job creation by park visitation
  - Are there co-governance arrangements, management and governance committees or similar institutional systems to inclusive efforts.
  - co-governance arrangements in Finland?
  - MAB and other areas with inclusive and stakeholder engaging arrangements
  - PPAs require consultation with owners
- Do we have case studies where we can clearly show conservation benefits from a more inclusive governance approach?

### ***Areas important for biodiversity***

Check which designation processes (governments, projects) are underway and if and how they cover and affect *Areas important for biodiversity*, and the same with clear cut OECM cases and sites.

- Use CBD and other organizations with leverage (EU, Council of Europe) to urge/push governments to speed up any potential areas that can be designated within the next year.
- National civil society and NGO pressure to highlight the need to achieve the targets
- IUCN WCC Marseilles.
- (Governments making commitments on PAs, OECMs or any of the qualitative aspects of AT 11 - more impact beyond 2020)

### **OECMs**

- Translation of the guidance
- Start the national discussion on the identification of OECMs
  - Which will be processes and the responsibilities
  - How to deal with the IPLCs
- Identify clear cut cases and report them to the
  - Does countries have regulatory, set aside PAs which have yet not gone through the legal establishment process
- CBD and other organizations with leverage (EU, Council of Europe) to urge/push governments to speed up any clear cut OECM areas that can be designated within the next year.
  - National civil society and NGO pressure to highlight the need to achieve the targets
  - IUCN WCC Marseilles.
- Pilot the use of the screening tool
- Do some comprehensive pilots in the identification, establishment and reporting of OECMs

### ***Ecosystem services***

- No clear metrics or established focus on which ES we consider
- Mainly a Post 2020 issue - requires a lot of thinking to be able to come to something that's realistic, feasible and measurable in the P2020 context
  - Metrics for ES
- Ecosystem-based management of areas could be clear-cut or potential OECMs
- TEEBs have been done for many countries and sectors in Europe.
- In Europe the MAES report will provide a comprehensive picture of ecosystems services in Europe

- There are research projects such as MAIA Mapping and Assessment to Integrated ecosystem Accounts; a Horizon 2020) project which will provide information going forward
- Identifying and pushing for private sector NC assessment Natural Capital Protocol, which are risk assessment of NC dependent companies value chains.