



WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT

Carried out in coordination with Stream 1

Events' co-leaders:	Thora Amend and Ashish Kothari
Time and date:	14 November 2014, 13:30-17.00 (double session)
Rapporteurs:	Melissa Arias, Katherine Heller and Michael Painter
Presenters:	Part I (OECMs): Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Sarat Babu Gidda, Harry Jonas, Ro Hill, David MacKinnon, Heather Bingham, Mariko Abe, David Aron, Pedro Solano and Mike Jones Part II (management effectiveness & diversity of governance): Theresa Mundita Lim, Johanna Eklund, Yingyi Zhang, Edgard Yerena, Marian Vernon, Daryl Bosu, Diane Russell, Michael Painter and Mike Jones

In 2010, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as part of the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020*; target 11 refers to protected areas and "other effective area-based conservation measures" (OECM). More than four years after their adoption, parties to the CBD and other rights- and stakeholders have not received guidance about either what kinds of arrangements do and do not constitute OECMs, or how best to appropriately recognize and support them. The dilemma: on one hand, OECMs may allow important conservation areas, such as the territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and community (ICCAs) to be recognized. However, taken out of context, OECMs can raise expectations that many kinds of areas may qualify for reporting under Aichi Target 11, including those that do not significantly contribute to Strategic Goal C to improve the status of biodiversity safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity.

The 3-hour workshop had two key objectives, which were attended in two subsequent sessions:

1. to discuss the question of what kinds of areas should be counted under the Target 11 clause of "other effective areas based conservation measures", since there is considerable confusion about what types of lands and waters should be reported by countries.
2. to develop an understanding of the potential of recognising and supporting diverse types of governance of protected areas for the appropriate expansion, consolidation and

effectiveness of conservation coverage in general, and the achievement of Aichi Target 11.

Key emerging lessons:

- “Different perspectives” on specific natural areas are an integral part for the management of resources and landscapes. They determine the interest of the involved people and institutions as well as the type, quality and vitality of governance in a given space.
- Conservation initiatives can’t be targeted to where they are most needed, unless the contribution of “other effective area-based conservation measures” to global conservation is known.
- Conservation initiatives deserve recognition, where recognition is wanted, regardless of governance type or whether they qualify as protected areas.
- Protected areas that take the needs of local people into appropriate account are good - not just for people but for conservation.
- Recognition of diverse forms of governance can enhance the coverage, effectiveness, societal acceptance and overall socio-ecological resilience of protected areas and their systems – both, within and beyond “conventional” protected areas, including ‘other effective conservation measures’ (OECM).

PART I: Specific lessons on OECMs & diversity of governance

- OECM can be found under different constellations and with a range of development and conservation goals. Their definition (and thus identification) is not easy but cannot be bypassed either, as it is a source of confusion for protected area managers, system administrators, governments and international “accounting” of conservation measures alike.

To illustrate the complex situation that requires guidance for CBD, some examples:

- a given area-based measure may be a protected area for IUCN (e.g., fit its PA definition) but not for the concerned government (in this case the IUCN recommends that it be considered an OECM),
- or it may be a protected area for the country but not for IUCN - then it *could* be considered an OECM, but not necessarily,
- or the indigenous organization that governs may not *wish* for it to be recognized as a protected area... etc.

If we do not engage with this issue there will continue to be inadequate or inappropriate recognition of areas that are not PAs, but which are effective in conserving biodiversity and contain a significant amount of the world’s remaining biodiversity.

- OECM can provide positive environmental benefits while also providing social and community benefits - making them even more effective in some cases than traditional 'protected areas'.

- Without a win-win situation where the community also benefits, the establishment and long-term security of OECMs cannot be guaranteed. Approaching OECM from a purely conservationist point of view is a less effective means of achieving actual conservation goals.
- Without proper empowerment of individuals from a 'bottom-up' perspective with support, not control, from governmental or other agencies the OECM approach cannot succeed.
- Recognizing ICCAs is human rights imperative; supporting ICCAs also contributes to other Aichi Targets (not only target 11).
- OECM's are best established as part of an informal network of protected areas within land and seascapes, rather than being drawn into the hierarchical structures of bureaucratic management.
- OECM's will become vitally important for the creation of refuges of bio-cultural diversity, and as nodes and corridors across a network of protected areas that supports the movement of wild species. Some of these OECM may become important refuges for people seeking to avoid the extreme weather associated with climate change.
- As the effects of climate change increase, rapid response through informal connections across a network of protected areas (i.e. via OECMs) will be more effective than individual protected areas managed within "bureaucratic stovepipes".
- The definition of OECM and development of standards has been based on the Aichi mandate: all areas should "improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity" (Goal C, Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020).
- Manifold questions have to be addressed to define OECM, i.e.:
 - **Other:** what/where/how? (criteria: not a PA but also effective for conservation)
 - **Effective:** effective – by which standard, over what time frame?
 - **Area-based:** must the area be fixed? or could it include i.e. migration routes, places of importance for connectivity or ecological process?
 - **Conservation:** are we agreed about this definition?
 - **Measure:** does this exclude other, i.e. not area-based 'conservation measures'?
 - And how should we **define OECMs** as a catch-all definition, a set of criteria, or an exhaustive list of forms of areas that can be included?
- In the marine context, OECM's might best be established under the following condition:
 - government entities decide upon the location of important marine areas (e.g., EBSA: Ecologically or Biologically significant Marine Areas, including management of their habitats, ecological processes, endangered species etc.),
 - local people could set up autonomous MPAs, i.e. using spillovers sustainably.
- In the future, OECM's will become important for both: conservation of biological and traditional/cultural diversity. However, monitoring in these potentially sensitive settings with traditional knowledge and multiple interest groups needs to be clarified (who

monitors what, how?); management of data requires informed and transparent decisions (who reports to whom, with which intention or potential implication?).

- Threats:
 - the OECM discussion might lead to the reopening of the definition of a 'protected area';
 - filling Target 11 with areas of limited conservation effectiveness risks not achieving the intended outcomes of the SPFB 2011-2020.
 - lack of standards for OECMs could, in effect, create new low standards, and undermine existing well-conserved areas.
 - Governments may attempt to 'achieve Aichi Target 11' by recognizing large-scale OECMs without 'doing anything';
 - Companies may claim that their operations are OECMs, e.g. monoculture plantations; recognition of OECMs might thus lead to unintended consequences for conservation...

PART II: Specific lessons on management effectiveness & diversity of governance:

- Diversity of governance is essential to build sound and sustainable systems of protected areas.
- Local and indigenous communities, individuals, profit organizations and NGO should have the power to manage their areas as "protected areas" and have the right to get them formally recognized and protected by Law.
- Governments must not discourage or impede individuals and communities to manage their own areas as for conservation, when they have decided to do so.
- Voluntarily conserved areas are probably the most powerful tool to spread not only the idea of "protected areas" (there's always someone "protecting" there) but also the idea of "sustainable society", or "human and nature".
- Forestry and marine landscape planning tools should be seen as excellent allies for AICHI target mission, if based on securing biodiversity or species conservation.
- Concessions for conservation (as developed in Peru and in some other countries) are proving to be long lasting, enduring, focused and effective tools for both protection and research. The idea is basically to grant forestry areas for non-timber activities to non-public organizations, in exchange for maintaining forest coverage and ecosystem services. Biodiversity conservation is a key element of these concessions.
- Treat all management interventions as opportunity for social learning.
 - Practice "statesmanship" to build coalitions of landholders for "polycentric" governance of land/seascapes.
 - Address equity issues and start earning trust NOW.
- PA managers of all PA types need to be open to the beliefs, knowledge and management practices of others. This provides a diversity of management "experiments" in different PAs across a land or seascape; and reduces conflict.

- We need a paradigm shift in the way we believe that ecosystems work: from simple cause and effect to complex and unpredictable. Management interventions will result in positive and negative outcomes in relation to management goals; positive and negative outcomes are both valuable sources of new knowledge about ecosystem change processes.
- Management of habitats needs to focus on the slow changing components of ecosystems such as soils, water catchments, wetlands, forests and woodlands to maintain their integrity; this is more important than managing species.
 - Think about maintaining the large slow changing components of the landscape (especially soil and water systems) and manage the smaller components accordingly.
- Rich diversity and flexibility of governance will be able to meet the needs of complex conservation circumstances in various social-economical contexts and natural landscape/seascape, and they will provide sufficient resilience to challenges and threats from climate change, globalization and social transformation.
- Build the link and increase mutual understanding between indigenous knowledge/traditional culture with scientific knowledge to enhance management effectiveness.
- Form a regional/national/global constituency for a coherent and supporting policy and implementing environment for the better recognition and promotion of ICCAs and OECMs

Key recommendations:

1. CBD Secretariat with support from IUCN should develop until next CBD-COP policy / guidance for governments on “other effective area-based conservation measures” (OECM), as included in Aichi target 11, using science-based, consensus-based standardization in definition and management criteria for OECMs to make reporting meaningful - this should precede recognition in global accounting by WCMC, and clearly link to the objectives of the CBD and Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (this may imply the establishment of a trans-commission task force).
2. Governments should develop guidelines for their conservation planning and management authorities on national levels in order to:
 - a) devolve the management authority and right to benefit to the OECM levels,
 - b) grant secure land tenure to OECM residents,
 - c) resist the temptation to manage from above.

Recommendation 1 was directly instrumental in developing the following final recommendations:

Rec#	Title
11	CBD guidance

18	Governance data and analyses
----	------------------------------

Recommendation 2 was directly or indirectly instrumental in developing the following final recommendations:

Rec#	Title
1	Enhancing governance
2	Standards and guidance
3	Voluntary conservation
4	Collective rights and responsibilities
5	Governance overlaps
7	Shared governance
15	Governance capacity
16	Innovative legal guidance

Exemplary case/s and other useful links:

Participants brought cases from Canada, Japan, Peru, Zimbabwe, Venezuela, Philippines, Finland, USA, Ghana, Romania. In particular, the Canada example provided a concrete and innovative tool for the OECM context:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B1YaoPZInsGhLUZFSWd5dU9GOGM/view?usp=sharing>

Other selected images and pictures from the workshop:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B1YaoPZInsGhX1NiMF81UWF3YVE/view?usp=sharing>

Original presentations and report are available in the event's folder (see link in annexed "Repository of original Powerpoint presentations and Rapporteur reports").