

USING CASE STUDIES TO ENHANCE GUIDANCE ON OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES

**REPORT OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE IUCN-WCPA TASK FORCE ON OTHER
EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES**

VANCOUVER, CANADA

13 – 17 FEBRUARY 2017

USING CASE STUDIES TO ENHANCE GUIDANCE ON OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES: REPORT OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE IUCN-WCPA TASK FORCE ON OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES

Citation: Jonas H., K. MacKinnon (Editors) 2016. Using Case Studies to Enhance Guidance on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures: Report of the Third Meeting of the IUCN-WCPA Task Force on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures. IUCN: Gland, Switzerland

Acknowledgements: The Co-Chairs of the Task Force are grateful to: Sabine Jessen, Elizabeth Good, Rhona Govender and Alexandra Barron at Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society for their incredible level of support, including in relation to fundraising, logistics and note taking, without which the meeting would not have been possible; Carleen Thomas of the Tsleil-Waututh Nation who welcomed participants to the unceded territories and waters of the Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations; the following organizations who provided financial support: Canadian Council on Ecological Areas, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Oceans 5, and Tides Canada; and the participants and facilitators for their investment of time and effort.

Contacts: kathy.mackinnon@iucn.org and harry@naturaljustice.org

BACKGROUND

Target 11 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Strategic Plan on Biodiversity (2010) states that:

By 2020 at least 17 % of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 % o

The following individuals presented Canadian case studies and related initiatives:

Alexandra Barron (Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society (CPAWS)-BC Ocean Conservation Manager): Rockfish Conservation Areas;

Bill Wareham (David Suzuki Foundation): Rockfish Conservation Areas;

Charles Short (BC Forest and Natural Resources Lands Operations): Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures - A Provincial Context;

Christie Chute (Fisheries and Oceans Canada): Fisheries and Oceans Canada Operational Guidance for Identifying Marine Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures;

Kim Dunn (World Wildlife Fund): WWF-Canada: 30 Coral Closure - National and International Waters;

Kim Sander Wright (ICCA Consortium): OECMs: An Opportunity to Advance the Rights of Canada's Indigenous Peoples;

Linda Nowlan (West Coast Environmental Law): BC Central Coast Example - MaPP Zone and Indigenous Declared Crab Closures;

Olaf Jensen (Environment and Climate Change Canada): a) IUCN OECMs - Key Habitat Sites for Migratory Birds and Caribou Habitat; and b) Scott Islands Marine National Wildlife Area;

Satnam Manhas (Ecotrust Canada) - Ecotrust Canada and the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC);

Dave MacKinnon (Chairperson, Canadian Council on Ecological Areas): Updates on CCEA Science-based Guidance for Reporting Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures;

Steve Diggon, Chris McDougall, and Caroline Butler (Coastal First Nations): First Nations Marine Planning in the Northern Shelf Bioregion: Considerations for Identifying and Assessing OECMs.

The following people presented case studies from other countries, updates on the Task Force on Related Initiatives

Clara L. Matallana Tobón (Adjunct Researcher, Territorial Management for Biodiversity Program, Alexander von Humboldt Institute for Research on Biological Resources): Sacred Site of Jaba Taniqashkaka Sierra Nevada d2 0 Td (a)9(t)-3.984
rti(o)5ria
Mh8438(i)-1(g)1nues P

John Waithaka (Vice Chair, IUCN-WCPA): Community and Private Conservancies in Kenya;

Marc Hockings (Emeritus Professor, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, The University of Queensland, WCPA Science): Shoalwater Bay Military Training Area;

Naomi Kingston (Head of Programme, Protected Areas, UNEP-WCMC): Reporting OECM to Protected Planet;

Paul Donald (BirdLife International): The Role of OECMs in Achieving Aichi Target 11;

Rebecca Singleton (Social Research Coordinator, Blue Ventures): Antongil Bay, North-Eastern Madagascar;

Siyu Qin (Coordinator, Social Science Initiative, Conservation International): Revisit the Map: Conservation Beyond Protected Areas within the Amazon Region; and

Recognition of an area as an OECM may incentivize the application of robust conservation measures to areas of recognized biodiversity significance such as Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), Ecologically and Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs), and Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs).

Some OECMs may become recognised as protected areas over time if they meet the IUCN definition of a protected area and those responsible for their governance and management wish them to do so.

2. GEOGRAPHICALLY DEFINED SPACE

The effectiveness of the size of the site relates to the conservation values it protects e.g. restricted plant communities versus wide-ranging species. The concept of size may also depend on where the site fits within a broader landscape/seascape. Thus, a small conservancy area, of limited biodiversity value in its own right but which acts as a linking corridor between two or more protected areas, may be recognized as an OECM because of its contribution to connectivity.

3. NOT RECOGNISED AS A PROTECTED AREA

The draft guidance advises that protected areas and OECMs are mutually exclusive at any point in time. This is an important principle to avoid double counting.

4. GOVERNED

As with protected areas, OECMs can fall under four governance types (government, private, indigenous and/or community and shared). Examples of OECMs under different governance arrangements will be provided.

5. MANAGED

Under this heading, two groups focused on degree of control. The first group focused largely on terminology.

Degree of control relates to the governing authorities and the area it applies to.

The discussion also outlines the

o

e

outcomes, especially if they cannot be easily reversed or modified. The critical measure is that ~~the easure o eas should~~ be effective.

There was a strong call to increase the reference to recognition of indigenous/customary law throughout the document.

The second group made the following comments:

Communities may have effective management mechanisms, but realistically may not be able to prevent government authorities from authorising mining/forestry

On seasonal closures, life cycles of species of concern need to be taken into account to determine the appropriate length of closure. While a number of participants cautioned against the inclusion of seasonal closures as OECMs, others pointed out that the focus should be on what happens to the biodiversity during the period when the measure is not in effect. If biodiversity is negatively impacted at the site, the area should not be recognised as an OECM.

7. EFFECTIVE AND ENDURING IN SITU CONSERVATION

The group made the following po

The second group felt this question potentially lent itself to subjective responses and proposed that it might be better to ask: Does the measure lead to the conservation of some elements of biodiversity only (Goal B) or the in situ conservation of biodiversity as a whole (potentially Goal C). A small group was asked to continue working on this after the end of the meeting.

It was suggested the screening tool could benefit from being further developed along the lines of the approach adopted by the Canadian Council on Ecological Areas

- also to help identify candidate sites. 41(n)t -113a9829(t) - edlt 1.968213a982 •] 4.9038()
A4he ar38(8462)8(d21 12 Tf 3(g) -211.98.001.009menta4

Monitor process and manage adaptively.

During the discussion, additional comments included:

The crux of this issue is: know what is important, describe it, understand relationships of use, and threats to control.

During the process the governance authority must identify all of the attributes that are applicable. It does not have to be more than one, but it does have to be all the relevant criteria. **One -pi ki g is ot a epta le**

Such a framework is potentially very resource intensive, which may limit the ability of some stakeholders, including **i dige ous peoples a d local o u ities** – among others – to conduct such studies.

Examples of the evidence could include management plans and reports etc. as well as other approaches including those that are traditional knowledge-related.

Specifically on the World Database on Protected Areas, the following points were made:

Ensure clarity about who can contribute data to the WDPA and under what circumstances, including validation protocols.

Other questions included: Who gets to report? What if there are disputes? What is the particular (sub-)national **go e e ts de? Is** there an effectiveness bar in reporting? Who will be doing designation and reporting, monitoring and assessments, measuring management and effectiveness?

The WDPA currently has very little reporting on effectiveness of sites so this represents an exciting opportunity.

14. MARINE

The group identified six critical issues:

1. How to make a decision between assigning a measure to Targets 6 and 11 regarding spatial measures.
 - a. Measures may be reported under more than one target.
 - b. One cannot make these decisions without a better understanding of

18. SHORT FORM OF OECMs

Participants discussed whether the term **protected areas** could be synonymous with OECMs. **However, the issue arises that the term protected areas is already used for some pre-existing sites, which may not qualify as OECMs. So the term could lead to confusion. It was also noted that protection and protection has the same meaning in certain Chinese languages. The Task Force will continue to use the full term and refer it to OECM**

19

ANNEX I: AGENDA

Day 1: Monday 13 February Introductions and background

- 12:00 Guests Arrive at Listel Hotel
- 12:30 – Lunch at the hotel in the Impressionist Gallery
13:30
- 14:00 – Introductions, presentations of draft guidance by IUCN and CCEA
15:30
- 15:30 – Break
16:00
- 16:00 – Discussions to determine the key outstanding issues, opportunities, and needs for
17:00 ~~testi g guida ei pilot ou ties~~

Day 2: Tuesday 14 February OECMs in the Context of British Columbia and Canada

- 9:00 – 9:30 Brief introductions and presentation of draft IUCN guidance
- 9:30 – 10:30 Presentations and discussion of case studies from Canadian First Nations, DFO,
Province of BC and ENGOS
- 10:30 – Break
11:00
- 11:00 – Presentations continued
13:00
- 13:00 – Lunch at FF4TJ1T R37 91a()-7(-6.0E5783 -12.24 Td 152R499T599T599T599T599T599
14:00

- 11:30 – Working Groups continued
13:00
- 13:00 – Lunch
14:00
- 14:00 – Additional WGs on specific issues, e.g. marine issues and/or discussions on
15:30 **opportunities and needs for testing guidance and pilot activities**
- 15:30 – Break
16:00
- 16:00 – Report back and discussion of issues for further debate
17:30

Day 4: Thursday 16 February In-depth Consideration of Guidance and Field Trip

- 9:00 – 10:00 Follow up discussion based on previous discussion
- 10:00 – Break
10:30
- 10:30 – Feedback including on monitoring and reporting to WDPA
12:00
- 12:00 – Lunch at Listel Hotel
13:00
- 14:00 – Field trip to the top of Grouse Mountain and dinner at the Observatory Restaurant
20:00

Day 5: Friday 17 February Outcomes and Next Steps

- 9:00 – 10:00 Summation of key outcomes and opportunities for piloting
- 10:00 – Break
10:30
- 10:30 – Next steps – development of Vancouver Roadmap – and task allocation,
12:00
- 12:00 – Lunch at the Listel Hotel (either sit down or bag lunch for those leaving early)
13:00

ANNEX II: PARTICIPANTS

Restoration Areas	-Kathy MacKinnon to follow up – particularly relevant to wetlands -Methods -Connectivity
-------------------	--

Indonesia	-Legislation - LVVAs -Use of screening
-----------	---