

Report
on the Expert Meeting in Preparation of
the First Meeting of the
Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on
Protected Areas
May 17 - 22, 2005

Convened by the
German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation
at the International Academy for Nature Conservation,
Isle of Vilm

Horst Korn, Rainer Schliep & Jutta Stadler (Eds.)

- **Cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction**
- **Mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas**
- **Further development of “tool kits” for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas**
- **Review of implementation of the programme of work**

Report
on the Expert Meeting in Preparation of
the First Meeting of the
Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on
Protected Areas
May 17 - 22, 2005

Convened by the
German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation
at the International Academy for Nature Conservation,
Isle of Vilm

Editors:
Horst Korn
Rainer Schliep
Jutta Stadler

Editors' addresses:

Horst Korn Bundesamt für Naturschutz
Jutta Stadler Insel Vilm
 18581 Lauterbach/Rügen, Germany
 E-Mail: horst.korn@bfm-vilm.de
 jutta.stadler@bfm-vilm.de

Rainer Schliep Offenbacher Str. 17 a
 14197 Berlin, Germany
 E-Mail: rainer.schliep@alumni.tu-berlin.de

BfN-Skripten are not available in book-trade.

An electronic version of this volume is available on the internet at <http://www.bfn.de/09/090203.htm>

Publisher: Bundesamt für Naturschutz (BfN)
 Federal Agency for Nature Conservation
 Konstantinstraße 110
 53179 Bonn, Germany
 Tel.: +49 228/ 8491-0
 Fax: +49 228/ 8491-200
 Internet: <http://www.bfn.de>

All rights reserved by BfN.

The publisher takes no guarantee for correctness, details and completeness of statements and views in this report as well as no guarantee for respecting private rights of third parties.

Views expressed in the papers published in this issue of BfN-Skripten are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the publisher.

No part of the material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system without written permission from the copyright owner.

Printed by the printing office of the Federal Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety.

Printed on 100% recycled paper.

Bonn, Germany 2005

Contents

1 Introduction	5
2 Marine Protected Areas in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction	7
General remark of the Vilm Workshop.....	7
Document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/2: Options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction	8
3 Mobilizing Financial Resources	17
General remark of the Vilm Workshop.....	17
Document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/3: Options for mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas.....	18
4 Development of Tool Kits	25
General remark of the Vilm Workshop.....	25
Document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/4: Further development of tool kits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas.....	27
5 Review of Implementation	53
General Remarks from the Vilm Workshop on the Implementation Review	53
Document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/5: Consideration of the process for the review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas.....	54
Glossary of Acronyms	67
List of Participants.....	69
Programme of the Vilm Expert Meeting	74
Annex I: Provisional agenda of WG-PA1	77

1 Introduction

The expert meeting in preparation of the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas (WG-PA1) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was an informal scientific workshop, **aiming to exchange information and opinions on the topics to be discussed at the upcoming first meeting of WG-PA1**. The 42 participants from 16 European countries (EU member states, Norway and PHARE countries) attended in their personal capacity as biodiversity experts. Mr. Marcel Alers, member of UNDP-GEF, took part in the meeting as well as Mr. Sheldon Cohen as representative of The Nature Conservancy (USA), who presented an overview of the financial resources paper by the CBD Secretariat. Further experts introducing their respective topics were Mr. Christian Pusch (German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation), Ms. Tomme Young (IUCN Environmental Law Centre), Mr. Joshua Bishop (IUCN), Mr. Martin Lok (Dutch Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality), and Mr. Stefan Leiner (European Commission, DG Environment).

The participants of the preparatory meeting to WG-PA1 were welcomed by Dr. Horst Korn from the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation, who also chaired the meeting. The topics were introduced briefly by the above named specialists in their field and discussed extensively in plenary. In this report the main points of discussion are summarised and general comments on the Secretariat's documents are given. In addition, amendments to the recommendations given in the Secretariat's documents are suggested. Topics of the Secretariat's documents not mentioned specifically in this report were widely agreed on by the workshop. The major points raised during the discussion are represented in this report. **The aim of the workshop was not to reach a consensus on the individual points but rather to have an exchange of opinions and ideas.** A high degree of similar points of view was apparent.

This report is intended to help individuals and delegations in their preparation of the topics on the agenda of WG-PA1.

How to read the report

Amendments and additions to the original WG-PA1 documents are marked as follows throughout the report:

~~Text~~ = text is suggested to be deleted

Text = suggestion for new text

[(Text)] = comment

Only those passages of the Secretariat's documents to which amendments are proposed are reproduced in the report.

2 Marine Protected Areas in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction¹

Item 3.1. of the provisional agenda

- **Document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/2: Options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction**

Introductory remark

Mr. Christian Pusch introduced the document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/2 regarding the scientific aspects of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (in the following in short: International Marine Protected Areas/IMPAs) to the participants of the workshop. He emphasised that the approach of the present study is too narrow and that further research is needed. Ms. Tomme Young presented some considerations concerning the legal aspects of the establishment of IMPAs. She proposed a two-way approach towards IMPAs: the application of existing instruments and tools while in parallel develop new measures and carry on with research on the marine environment.

General remark of the Vilm Workshop

It is clear that the CBD does not have the power to establish protected areas beyond national jurisdiction – that power exists in other bodies. It does, however, have a responsibility for providing scientific information which other competent bodies can use to select areas requiring protective measures, i.e. the CBD should identify the areas which need to be protected while other bodies have the responsibility to establish and manage marine protected areas beyond national jurisdiction.

The existing framework has proven ineffective in conserving and promoting the sustainable use of biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction. For this reason there is an urgent need to take action to prohibit destructive fishing and other practices in certain areas and to better use existing mechanisms for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. There is also the need to develop a specific legal instrument under UNCLOS in order to ensure conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction.

Criteria which can be used to identify areas beyond national jurisdiction requiring protection within an ecologically representative system, based on the results of an ongoing process providing relevant scientific information, are contained in Annex II of this document. This Annex is based on existing criteria already being utilized on a regional scale to identify protected areas beyond national jurisdiction but could be globally applicable.

¹ The participants of the Vilm workshop proposed the acronym IMPAs (International Marine Protected Areas) for "Marine Protected Areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction"

Document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/2:

Suggestions on the text:

OPTIONS FOR COOPERATION FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF MARINE PROTECTED AREAS IN MARINE AREAS BEYOND THE LIMITS OF NATIONAL JURISDICTION

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. BACKGROUND

(abridged; continued)

II. SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group may wish to adopt a recommendation along the following lines:

“The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas,

Recalling paragraphs 29 and 30 of decision VII/5 of the Conference of the Parties, which note that there are increasing risks to biodiversity in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction and that marine and coastal protected areas are extremely deficient in purpose, numbers and coverage in these areas, and agreeing that there is an urgent need for international cooperation and action to improve conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, including the establishment of further marine protected areas consistent with international law, and based on scientific information, including areas such as seamounts, hydrothermal vents, cold-water corals and other vulnerable ecosystems,

Recalling also paragraph 29 of decision VII/28, by which the Conference of the Parties suggested that the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas should explore options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, consistent with international law, including the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, and based on scientific information,

Recommends that the Conference of the Parties:

1. *Welcomes the scientific and legal studies prepared for the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Protected Areas (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/INF/1 and UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/INF/2), and expresses its appreciation to the European Union Community for its financial assistance in commissioning these studies;*

2. *Notes that in accordance with the objectives stated in the WSSD Plan of Implementation and in Decisions VII/5 and VII/28, systems of ecologically representative marine protected areas, covering all habitats listed in Annex 1 table 1 would need to be established in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. Further notes that this requires the establishment of criteria for identification of areas as well as the development of a biogeographical framework for oceans management and recommends the criteria for identification set out in Annex VII as a basis for the scientific research required for selecting sites for marine protected areas;*

3. Recognizing that best available scientific information shows that seamounts and cold water coral reefs are the habitats under most severe threat particularly by deep sea bottom trawling, recommends that the findings of the study mentioned in paragraph 1 serve as a first indication of regions that should be used to select sites for immediate conservation action, which include:

~~2. Takes note of the priority biodiversity areas identified in the scientific study, which include:~~

(a) Marine areas beyond national jurisdiction ~~of~~ **in** the Indo-Pacific region, specifically centred ~~on~~ **in** South-East Asia, northern Australia and the Tasman Sea;

(b) Seamounts beyond national jurisdiction in the north and south Atlantic, and the Southern Ocean convergence zone;

(c) Marine areas beyond national jurisdiction adjacent to islands in the southern ocean; and

(d) Small shelf areas beyond national jurisdiction in the North-East and North-West Atlantic, ~~as a preliminary set of priority sites for conservation;~~

34. Notes that, in some cases, data on ecosystems, habitats and species in areas beyond national jurisdiction is still lacking, and requests research organizations, ~~and funding agencies~~ **and other relevant organisations to collaborate in filling the identified data gaps, including:**

(a) The distribution of all Red-Listed species, ~~especially for fish;~~

(b) Information on **the distribution of** seamounts and cold-water coral **reefs, their ecosystem functioning and the ecology of associated** species from a range of **different** depths, ~~and in particular from poorly sampled areas such as the Indian Ocean;~~

(c) Information on the distribution of other habitats as listed in Annex 1, table 1, and the ecology of associated species;

~~(e) Associations between cold-water corals and seamounts including underwater features especially of seamounts, so that inferences on cold-water corals can be drawn from seamounts; and~~

(d) Studies ~~of the features of animals~~ **on the ecology of high seas species** and their behaviours that makes them vulnerable to fishing **human activities including those listed in Annex I, table 1, columns 3 and 4;**

5. Notes that in most cases data about human activities and their impacts is lacking and requests e.g. research organizations and agencies to collect and analyze such data.

~~46. Notes that~~ **Recognizes that the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea provides the primary legal framework for regulating activities in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction and notes that** there are a large number of ~~relevant~~ **other** global and regional legal instruments ~~that collectively~~ **and together they** constitute the existing international legal framework ~~for~~ **for regulating activities that impact on** biodiversity in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (see annexes II and III below); that within this framework there are significant opportunities for promoting the establishment of marine protected areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction; ~~and that the establishment of such areas could be facilitated by enhanced coordination among various instruments;~~

~~57. Further notes~~ **Notes** the following gaps in the existing international legal framework in relation to **that the current legal framework has not been effective in providing an integrated approach to the conservation of biodiversity beyond the limits of national jurisdiction including** the establishment of marine protected areas; ~~in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction;~~

8. Notes that INF/2 identified the following gaps in the effectiveness of the existing legal framework:

(a) It does not adequately address multiple threats to biodiversity in an ecosystem and precautionary context;

- (b) It does not provide for sufficient regulation of certain high-seas fisheries;
- (c) It lacks an integrated approach to marine protected areas and networks within a biogeographic framework; and
- (d) It lacks a mechanism to respond to emerging and intensifying high seas activities;

69. *Notes* that the establishment of marine protected areas in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, consistent with international law, **is currently being considered in several international fora and could foster be a catalyst** for coordination among existing specialized regimes through application of protective measures available under different instruments, and ultimately provide the basis for a comprehensive integrated approach to managing different threats, including emerging threats;

Cooperation and coordination under existing legal instruments

10. Urges States to take measures to implement United Nations General Assembly resolution 59/25, paragraph 66, and as a matter of urgency request the United Nations General Assembly to adopt interim prohibitions of destructive fishing practices to all seamount areas and identified cold water coral reefs beyond national jurisdiction where no regional fisheries management organizations exists or where they have insufficient management and regulatory powers to effectively conserve vulnerable ecosystems;

11. Urges Parties to establish regional fisheries management organizations where there are currently none and strengthen the powers of conservation of existing regional fisheries management organizations where these powers are inadequate to effectively secure the conservation of vulnerable ecosystems;

712. *Urges Parties and other States to cooperate* **on an urgent basis** within the **existing legal framework of existing international legal instruments or arrangements** to establish marine protected areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, ~~focusing in particular on the priority biodiversity areas identified in the scientific study, including those referred to in paragraph 2 above,~~ taking into account also the need to include areas representing **that** the full range of biodiversity **is represented and using a biogeographical approach, focusing initially on the regions that should be used to select sites for immediate conservation action as referred to in paragraph 3 above;**

813. *Invites the governing bodies of* **Urges Parties and the Executive Secretary to promote the further development of mechanisms for coordination and co-operation amongst relevant organisations (including the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the International Seabed Authority, the International Whaling Commission, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and, the International Maritime Organization, Antarctic Treaty, IOC/UNESCO, regional fisheries management organizations, regional seas programmes, regional agreements under the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals) and with the Convention on Biological Diversity, in order to:**

a) ~~as well as those of other relevant global and regional legal instruments and arrangements, to develop mechanisms for coordination amongst themselves and with the Convention on Biological Diversity, in order to effectively implement existing legal instruments and enhance their capacity to respond to key threats to biological diversity in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, and invites the General Assembly of the United Nations to address the gaps identified in paragraph 5 above and to enhance coordination among relevant agencies;~~

b) facilitate the development of a framework for a more comprehensive approach to integrated ocean management to ensure conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction, including the development of procedures for establishing marine protected areas based on the scientific information provided by the process described in paragraph 2 [(former paragraph 13 with amendments)];

9-c) *Invites the governing bodies of regional fisheries management organizations, regional seas conventions and regional agreements under the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals to initiate and/or strengthen coordination among themselves and with the*

Convention on Biological Diversity, including undertaking **undertake** cooperative action towards the establishment of marine protected areas and towards other ways and means to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction;

d) exchange information and personnel;

~~4014.~~ *Invites **Parties that are** members of the International Maritime Organization to consider further extending **within the framework of the International Maritime Organization to apply** Particularly Sensitive Sea Area designations to marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction and, in proposing Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas for approval by the International Maritime Organization, to take **taking** into account areas of importance for biodiversity;*

15. Requests the Executive Secretary to apply for observer status at the International Maritime Organization and, if granted, to participate in the process of considering Particularly Sensitive Sea Area issues at the International Maritime Organization;

~~11.~~ *Also invites parties to the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10th December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks (“the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement”) to consider the expansion of the scope of the Agreement to include all high-seas fish stocks;*

~~12.~~ *Further invites the governing bodies of regional seas agreements to consider, where appropriate, expanding their mandate to cover adjacent marine areas beyond national jurisdiction, and to implement, consistent with international law and based on scientific information, appropriate conservation and sustainable use measures in these areas;*

~~4316.~~ *Requests the Executive Secretary to collaborate with other relevant organizations and processes, to facilitate the development of a framework for a more comprehensive approach to integrated ocean management to ensure conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction, including developing **criteria procedures** for selecting sites **and establishing (see paragraph 4)** for marine protected areas **using the selection system as mentioned in paragraph 4** and establishing priorities on a scientific basis;*

~~4417.~~ *Also requests the Executive Secretary to ~~contribute to~~ **take an active role in** the work of the General Assembly of the United Nations and its ~~the~~ Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group established by paragraph 73 of General Assembly resolution 59/24 to study issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction;*

New mechanisms and instruments

~~4518.~~ *Invites the **Parties to propose to the** General Assembly of the United Nations and ~~Parties to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea~~ to consider the development and adoption of an implementing agreement to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea for the **conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity (including the** establishment and management of marine protected areas) in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction;*

Other options

~~16.~~ *Considers the desirability and feasibility of the following additional options for new mechanisms and instruments regarding the establishment of marine protected areas in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, and invites Parties to submit views on these options to be compiled by the Executive Secretary for the consideration of the Working Group:*

(a) ~~An implementing agreement to the Convention on Biological Diversity, which would require the amendment of the Convention given its jurisdictional limitations with regard to components of biological diversity beyond national jurisdiction;~~

(b) ~~A new mechanism under the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, to enable the recognition and protection of sites of outstanding universal~~

value in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction, which would require amendment of the Convention;
or

(c) ~~A global agreement that provides for a network of subsidiary instruments in which groupings of States working within regional organizations are appointed to manage particular areas beyond national jurisdiction, subject to oversight by an international management body.~~

Further scientific research

~~1719.~~ **In order to improve the scientific basis for the identification of areas requiring immediate conservation action** *Further requests* the Executive Secretary to work with relevant international and regional organizations, including research organizations, to **develop**, update and build upon the Geographic Information Systems of **geo-referenced spatial data on** biodiversity in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction **using Geographic Information Systems and ensuring the better coordination of scientific research. Further data on all habitats listed in Annex I, Table 1, data on non-exploited species and data on human activities (as outlined in paragraphs 5 and 6) should be included in the scientific study (INF 1). This updated study shall serve as a first step towards the full identification of areas contributing to a** initiated as part of the scientific study, with a view to supporting, on a scientific basis, the establishment of representative systems of marine protected areas **taking into account a bio-geographical approach. Further requests the Executive Secretary,** and to report on progress made to the next meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group;

~~1820.~~ *Requests* the Executive Secretary to transmit this decision to all relevant international and regional organizations.”

(abridged; continued)

Annex I

STATUS AND TRENDS OF, AND THREATS TO, ECOSYSTEMS AND SPECIES IN MARINE AREAS BEYOND NATIONAL JURISDICTION

Table 1: Status and Trends: High Sea and Deep-Sea Habitats (modified from Baker et al. 2001)

Habitat	Status	Trend and immediate threats	Potential threats
Seamounts	Less than 200 seamounts have been studied; high endemism on studied seamounts; some seamounts are heavily exploited for fisheries resources, trawling damages benthic habitats. Few seamounts protected by MPAs	High seas fishing on seamounts to continue especially in the Southern Ocean; impacts are not monitored; it is anticipated that heavily exploited stocks will be threatened with over exploitation - therefore fish biodiversity threatened; attention to managing and protecting seamounts is increasing (e.g. Bowie Seamount (Canada), and fishing restrictions on EU vessels in the Azores)	Mining of ferromanganese oxide and polymetallic sulphides, climate change

Habitat	Status	Trend and immediate threats	Potential threats
Deep-water corals	Limited knowledge, they may be more widespread than currently known; high diversity, except for fish and molluscs compared to tropical reefs; easily damaged by trawling, but spatial extent unknown	Fishing on coral or adjacent to coral reefs with consequential damage still occurs, especially in areas outside of exclusive economic zones. As fisheries continue to move further offshore and into deeper waters the threat to these habitats will continue since these areas are often now in the high seas and outside of national jurisdictions. Many countries are identifying coral areas and initiating action to protect them from fishing.	Biotechnology, bioprospecting and climate change; gas and oil platforms can damage corals
Hydrothermal vents	Limited disturbances – currently due to limited research on vents, low number of species, but high endemism and high abundance. Two vent areas (Canada and Azores) are declared MPAs.	Research community is initiating self-policing activities regarding impact of research activities so it is anticipated in the short-term that impacts from research will decline; in the long-term commercial exploitation is a concern.	High potential for biotechnology, mining, energy and high-end tourism
Open ocean pelagic	Highly dynamic and diverse ecosystem is heavily exploited globally Also increasing levels of pollution and eutrophication impacting on biodiversity	Overall continuing decline in biodiversity as fishing further offshore and deeper continues; the impact of climate change may exacerbate decline.	Climate change, expansion of aquaculture into the open ocean/high seas
Deep-sea trenches	Unique 'hadal' fauna, much of it associated with soft sediments and holothurians; high endemism; diverse and abundant bacterial community; no known disturbances	Research is increasing in these areas, but, it is anticipated that based on experience of hydrothermal vents, appropriate guidelines will be developed to minimize the impacts of research on these ecosystems.	Research, biotechnology and waste disposal
Cold seep and pockmarks	Limited knowledge; high endemism; limited disturbances except for Gulf of Mexico (trawling and oil exploitation) or research sites	As fishing and gas and oil operations continues to go further offshore and deeper, anticipate that disturbance may increase.	Biotechnology and mineral exploitation
Submarine canyons	High diverse flora and fauna with commercial important species such as lobsters; important nursery areas; areas impacted by fishing and oil exploitation	As fishing and gas and oil operations continues to go further offshore and deeper, anticipate that disturbance may increase.	Gas and oil developments
<u>Upwelling areas</u>	<u>Upwelling areas are characterized by an increased primary production and high standing stocks of zooplankton and fish</u>	<u>Upwelling areas are threatened by overexploitation by fisheries</u>	<u>Increased fishing effort</u>

(abridged; continued)

Annex VII

CRITERIA WHICH CAN BE USED TO IDENTIFY AREAS BEYOND NATIONAL JURISDICTION REQUIRING PROTECTION WITHIN AN ECOLOGICALLY REPRESENTATIVE SYSTEM

[(Introductory explanation: The participants of the workshop choose the following set of criteria because this is the most recently developed system for the identification and selection of marine protected areas which is built upon existing systems, and is currently applied by an existing legal instrument² also in areas beyond national jurisdiction.)]

Ecological criteria/considerations for the identification and selection of Marine Protected Areas³

An area qualifies for selection as an MPA if it meets several but not necessarily all of the following criteria. The consideration and assessment of these criteria should be based on best available scientific expertise and knowledge.

1. Threatened or declining species and habitats/biotopes

The area is important for species, habitats/biotopes and ecological processes that appear to be under immediate threat or subject to rapid decline.

2. Important species and habitats/biotopes

The area is important for other species and habitats/biotopes.

3. Ecological significance

The area has:

- **a high proportion of a habitat/biotope type or a biogeographic population of a species at any stage in its life cycle;**
- **important feeding, breeding, moulting, wintering or resting areas;**
- **important nursery, juvenile or spawning areas; or**
- **a high natural biological productivity of the species or features being represented.**

4. High natural biological diversity

The area has a naturally high variety of species (in comparison to similar habitat/biotope features elsewhere) or includes a wide variety of habitats/biotopes (in comparison to similar habitat/biotope complexes elsewhere).

² OSPAR Convention

³ Based on the guidelines for the identification and selection of Marine Protected Areas in the OSPAR Maritime Areas; Meeting of the OSPAR COMMISSION in Bremen June 23-27, 2003 (Reference number: 2003-17)

5. Representativity

The area contains a number of habitat/biotope types, habitat/biotope complexes, species, ecological processes or other natural characteristics that are representative for marine areas beyond national jurisdiction globally or for different biogeographic regions and sub-regions.

6. Sensitivity

The area contains a high proportion of very sensitive or sensitive habitats/biotopes or species.

7. Naturalness

The area has a high degree of naturalness, with species and habitats/biotope types still in a very natural state as a result of the lack of human-induced disturbance or degradation.

Practical criteria/considerations

1. Size

The size of the area should be suitable for the particular aim of designating the area, including maintaining its integrity, and should enable the effective management of that area.

2. Potential for restoration

The area has a high potential to return to a more natural state under appropriate management.

3. Degree of acceptance

The establishment of the MPA has a comparatively high potential level of support from stakeholders and political acceptability.

4. Potential for success of management measures

There is a high probability that management measures and the ability to implement them (such as legislation, relevant authorities, funding, and scientific knowledge) will meet the aims for designation.

5. Potential damage to the area by human activities

It is an area where significant damage by human activity may happen in the short term.

6. Scientific value

The area has a high value for scientific research and monitoring.

3 Mobilizing Financial Resources

Item 3.2. of the provisional agenda

- **Document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/3: Options for mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas**

Introductory remark

Mr. Joshua Bishop resumed the results of a global review of challenges and options for the sustainable financing of protected areas, which was conducted by IUCN in 2005¹. Mr. Sheldon Cohen presented an overview on the document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/3, which was prepared by the CBD Secretariat.

General remark of the Vilm Workshop

The participants at the workshop at Vilm welcomed the suggested recommendations and background note on protected finance from the Executive Secretary. In light of decisions taken at COP7, the participants suggest reorganizing the recommendations in line with decisions of COPVII/20 and 28, in order to provide clearer provenance and justification. The workshop also stressed the need for greater recognition of the links between protected areas and achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, and their integration into Parties' poverty reduction strategies. Participants also noted the need for consistency throughout the document in relation to estimated financial needs and expenditures of protected areas.

The participants felt that the Suggested Recommendations should be expanded to include:

1. Recognition of the opportunity provided by the Millennium Review Summit in September 2005 to highlight the critical role of protected areas in achieving the MDGs;
2. Additional financing mechanisms currently being used or under consideration, such as the International Finance Facility;
3. Strengthened recommendations relating to the governance and transparency of protected area financing, in particular to ensure that existing funding for implementation of the Programme of Work is used as effectively as possible;
4. Market-based tools and partnerships;
5. The need for national and regional processes to develop and support the effective use and assessment of financial resources.
6. A new global database and periodic reporting on protected area finance to help balance availability of funds with regional assessments of funding needs;
7. An on-going donor forum to support implementation of the Programme of Work;
8. An integrated approach to national-level assessments of protected area benefits and values.

¹ Emerton, L., Bishop, J., and Thomas, L. 2005: Sustainable Financing of Protected Areas: A Global Review of Challenges and Options. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.

Document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/3:

Suggestions on the text:

**OPTIONS FOR MOBILIZING FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE PROGRAMME OF WORK BY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND COUNTRIES WITH
ECONOMIES IN TRANSITION**

Note by the Executive Secretary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(abridged; continued)

Increased international assistance, the broadening of economic assessment, the rationalization of taxation, fees and payments for environmental service schemes, and partnership initiatives with private sector are some of the options for generating resources. Building strong institutional arrangements for financing the implementation of the programme of work is essential. The prospects for foreign direct investment remain strong and the external sources of funding will remain essential in the short term. As the financial mechanism of the Convention, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) has a central role to play in providing funding support for the programme of work. Other funding agencies, particularly the bilateral donor agencies, will continue to have an important role to play ~~need to provide significant additional funding.~~

SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS

~~The Ad Hoc Open Ended Working Group on Protected Areas may wish to request the Conference of the Parties –:~~

~~1. — *Urge Parties:*~~

~~(a) — To organize national and as appropriate, regional protected area financing roundtables of donors and recipient Governments, for the purpose of advancing progress on national and regional level sustainable finance strategies and the achievement of target 3.4 in the programme of work on protected areas adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its seventh meeting;~~

~~(b) — To consider prioritizing the need to undertake, on an immediate basis, a national protected area values and benefits initiative, in accordance with activities 3.1.2 and 3.4.6 of the programme of work, to assess, document and communicate the socio-economic values of protected area systems, focusing in particular on the critical contribution to poverty alleviation and achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs);~~

~~(c) — To design financial sustainability plans for protected area systems that incorporate a diversity of national and international funding sources and include:~~

~~(i) — Analysis of current financial income and expenditures, overall financial needs and gaps;~~

~~(ii) — Definition and quantification of protected area goods and services, and potential sources of investment to pay for such goods and services;~~

~~(iii) — Screening and feasibility analysis of potential financial mechanisms;~~

- ~~(iv) Elaboration of a comprehensive financial plan for ensuring long term financial support for the system of protected areas;~~
- ~~(d) Implement comprehensive financial plans for ensuring long term financial support for the system of protected areas, considering the following options:~~
 - ~~(i) National environmental or conservation trust funds that support protected areas systems (Such funds can be used for channelling multilateral and bilateral grants, tourism based revenues, debt for nature swap proceeds, and contributions from non-governmental organizations.);~~
 - ~~(ii) Funding mechanisms around tourism, resource extraction (e.g., environmental compensation payments linked to petrochemical operations), and other high-revenue industries that have direct links to protected areas, without placing undue stress on or increasing threats to protected areas;~~
 - ~~(iii) Funding mechanisms that channel the economic values of ecosystem services (e.g., water use fees);~~
 - ~~(iv) Redirection of perverse subsidies to support protected areas (possibly starting with those sectors having clearest linkages e protected areas);~~
 - ~~(v) Support to institutional strengthening and improved governance of protected areas management authorities and to build capacity of protected area officials to undertake financial planning and management with business approaches;~~
- ~~2. Invite the United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank and the United Nations Environment Programme, along with other relevant organizations, to help facilitate and support the protected area financing roundtables referred to in paragraph 1 (a) above;~~
- ~~3. Invite the Global Environment Facility:~~
 - ~~(a) To approve and operationalize a new expedited funding window for fast-disbursing grant funding to support early action activities of the programme of work (e.g., 2006 and 2008 timelines) at a scale to sufficiently support developing countries, particularly least developed and small island developing States, and countries with economies in transition;~~
 - ~~(b) To provide full-sized and medium-sized GEF grants designed to support national systems of protected areas and the targets and timetables in the programme of work and focus more sharply on protected area systems and sustainability strategies; and~~
 - ~~(c) To increase the envelope of GEF biodiversity funds for protected areas in the GEF 4 business plan, taking into account the goals and targets in the programme of work and GEF's niche in providing system-wide protected areas support;~~
- ~~4. Urge developed countries:~~
 - ~~(a) To support a strong fourth replenishment for the GEF, taking into account the goals and targets in the programme of work and the need for new and additional funding to support this work in developing countries;~~
 - ~~(b) To establish a dedicated funding support to protected areas as part of development assistance directed at achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, and in line with the Millennium Development Goal 7 indicators of protected area coverage and forest cover;~~
 - ~~(c) To provide enhanced support for conservation trust funds and other long-term financing mechanisms that have proven to be particularly successful in supporting recurrent protected area management costs;~~
 - ~~(d) To explore carbon funding linked to reduction in deforestation rates under the Kyoto Protocol process; and~~
 - ~~(e) To support projects aimed at long term financial sustainability of protected area systems;~~

~~5. — Urge international non-governmental organizations, private foundations and private sector:~~

~~(a) — To provide developing countries, countries with economies in transition, financial and technical support to implement the programme of work;~~

~~(b) — To design, support and implement capacity-building programmes for protected areas functionaries in the developing countries to develop and implement sustainable financing mechanisms for protected areas; including through such partnerships as the Conservation Finance Alliance and the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas; and~~

~~(c) — To develop partnership initiatives and institutional arrangements for financing the implementation of the programme of work.~~

~~6. — Request the Executive Secretary:~~

~~(a) — To make existing conservation finance tools available through the clearing house mechanism; and~~

~~(b) — To submit the present recommendation for the information and for further action of participants in the donors' meeting to be held in Montecatini, Italy, following the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas.~~

The Ad hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Protected Areas:

Recalls the terms of reference contained in Decision VII/28, paragraph 29(b), and emphasizes the need to build on the protected area finance provisions contained in Decisions VII/28 and VII/20 of the Conference of the Parties;

Notes the urgent challenge of achieving sustainable finance for protected areas, particularly in the developing world and countries with economies in transition;

Recognizes that securing adequate financing for protected areas increasingly requires demonstrating the links between protected areas and human livelihoods, to frame them in the broader context of natural resources management, achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and contributions to sustainable development.

Notes the need to ensure that protected areas financing is effectively addressed in the outcomes of the upcoming Millennium Review Summit in September 2005, including clear recognition of the critical role of protected areas in achieving all of the MDGs, as supported by the results of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.

Acknowledges that all actions in support of sustainable financing of protected areas need to fully address equity, benefit sharing and participation commitments under Goals 2.1 and 2.2 of the Programme of Work.

Reaffirms the urgent need for funding to support elements in the Programme of Work requiring early action.

Decides to adopt the following recommendations, structured around the relevant provisions in Decisions VII/20 and VII/28, notably paragraphs 9, 10, and 11, and Programme Element 3, and requests the Conference of the Parties to:

1) MOBILIZE AS A MATTER OF URGENCY THROUGH DIFFERENT MECHANISMS ADEQUATE AND TIMELY FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK, WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THOSE ELEMENTS REQUIRING EARLY ACTION

a) Urge Parties:

-
- i) To explore options for new international finance mechanisms to support the Programme of Work, drawing upon the Landau Commission report², other relevant studies, and lessons from experiences with financing for other public goods;
 - ii) To provide enhanced support for conservation trust funds and other long-term financing mechanisms which have proven to be successful in supporting the recurrent costs of protected area management [(former paragraph 4c)];
 - iii) To pursue market-based funding mechanisms that capture the local economic values of ecosystem services provided by protected areas (e.g. water-use fees) [(former paragraph 1diii)];
 - iv) To expand³ project-based funding for carbon sequestration in protected areas and to explore other potential carbon-based funding mechanisms, such as compensation for reductions in national deforestation rates, under the Kyoto Protocol and other climate change mitigation processes [(former paragraph 4d)];
 - v) To develop public / private partnership initiatives and institutional arrangements with non-governmental organizations, private foundations and the private sector, for financing the implementation of the programme of work [(former paragraph 1di)];
 - vi) To pursue funding mechanisms around recreation, resource extraction, and other industries that have direct links to protected areas, without placing undue stress on or increasing threats to protected areas [(former paragraph 1dii)];
 - vii) To pursue the use of ecological compensation payments, mitigation and offsets linked to resource development for generating financing for protected areas, without placing undue stress on or increasing threats to protected areas;
 - viii) To eliminate or redirect perverse subsidies to support protected areas, based on technical analyses of subsidies in current national budgets and the identification of high potential opportunities for such reforms, building on recent work on environmental fiscal reform⁴ by the OECD and Poverty and Environment Partnership and focussing specifically on linkages to protected areas [(former paragraph 1div)];
 - ix) To support other strategies and policies aimed at achieving long-term financial sustainability of protected area systems [4e].
- b) Urge non-governmental organizations, private foundations and the private sector:**
- i) To provide developing countries and countries with economies in transition with financial and technical support to implement the programme of work [(former paragraph 5a)];
 - ii) To design, support and implement capacity-building programmes for protected areas stakeholders in the developing countries to develop and implement sustainable financing mechanisms for protected areas, including through such partnerships as the Conservation Finance Alliance and the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas [(former paragraph 5b)].
- c) Urge developed countries:**
- i) To organize an ongoing donor forum to support implementation of the Programme of Work, building on the first meeting in June 2005, with a focus on how to fulfil commitments made at COP7 to mobilize, as a matter of urgency, adequate and timely resources;

2 The Landau report was commissioned by President Chirac of France to develop proposals to mobilize funding for implementation of the Millennium Development Goals.

3 One participant wished to replace “expand” with “share lessons from experience with”. No consensus was reached on this point.

4 Forthcoming inter-agency report available from OECD.

- ii) To consider co-financing for a new expedited funding window under the GEF for fast-disbursing grant funding to support early action activities, as called for in Decision VII/20 [(former paragraph 3a)].

2) ESTIMATE THE COST TO IMPLEMENT THE NECESSARY ACTIVITIES TO MEET THE TARGETS OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK, REVIEW THE EFFECTIVENESS IN USING EXISTING FINANCIAL RESOURCES, AND IDENTIFY THE UNMET COSTS

a) Urge Parties:

- i) To consider, at COP8, the results of national and regional assessments of protected area costs, the effectiveness in using existing financial resources, identification of unmet costs, and recommend further steps as needed;
 - ii) To organize national and regional processes (e.g. training workshops) and make use of appropriate tools, best practice guidelines and validation processes designed to support assessments of protected area costs, effectiveness in using existing financial resources and identification of unmet costs;
 - iii) To adopt an integrated approach to national-level assessments of protected area benefits and values (Target under Goal 3.1) and protected area financing and costs (Target under Goal 3.4);
 - iv) To support the creation by 2006 and periodic updating of a global database on protected area financing, drawing upon national-level assessments, in order to supplement the information base for global strategy and policy on protected areas.
- b) Invite Developed Countries, along with other relevant organizations, to help facilitate and support the national and regional processes referred to above.**
- c) Invite UNEP-WCMC, in collaboration with the Secretariat to the Convention on Biological Diversity, members of the Conservation Finance Alliance and other relevant organizations, to develop and maintain a global database on protected area financing as part of the World Database on Protected Areas.**

3) INTEGRATE WITHIN THEIR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES PROTECTED AREA OBJECTIVES AND REFLECT THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF PROTECTED AREAS TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

a) Urge Parties:

- i) To undertake, on an immediate basis, a national protected area values and benefits initiative, in order to achieve the targets under Goals 3.1, 3.4 and 3.5 of the Programme of Work, to assess, document and communicate the socio-economic values of protected area systems, focusing in particular on their contribution to poverty alleviation and achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and ensuring full and effective participation of local and indigenous communities [(former paragraph 1b)];
- ii) To report periodically on their specific domestic expenditures and international contributions for protected areas, in line with efforts to track progress toward achievement of the MDGs, the Programme of Work, and the 2010 goal.

b) Urge Developed Countries:

- i) To enhance support to protected areas as part of development assistance directed at achieving the Millennium Development Goals, based on the national level assessments described above;

- ii) To integrate support for protected areas into new international development finance mechanisms, such as an International Finance Facility and other mechanisms being considered in the context of the Millennium Development Goals.

4) UNDERTAKE ADDITIONAL URGENT ACTIONS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT THE PROGRAMME OF WORK

a) Urge Parties:

- i) To design and implement financial sustainability plans for protected area systems that incorporate a diversity of national and international, public and private, funding sources and include:
 - (a) Analysis of current income and expenditures, overall financial needs, gaps and opportunity costs;
 - (b) Definition and quantification of protected area goods and services, and potential sources of demand for such goods and services;
 - (c) Screening and feasibility analysis of potential financial mechanisms;
 - (d) Elaboration of a comprehensive plan for ensuring long-term financial support for the system of protected areas [(former paragraph 1c)];
 - (e) Identification of clear linkages to national poverty reduction strategies and MDGs where relevant.
- ii) To support institutional strengthening and improved governance of protected areas and to strengthen the capacity of protected area stakeholders to undertake transparent financial planning and management [(former paragraph 1dv)];
- iii) To organize national – and as appropriate, regional – protected-area financing roundtables of donors, recipient Governments and other relevant stakeholders, for the purpose of advancing progress on national and regional-level sustainable finance strategies and the achievement of relevant targets under Programme Element 3 in the programme of work [(former paragraph 1a)].

b) Invite the United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank, the United Nations Environment Programme, IUCN-The World Conservation Union, along with other relevant organizations, to help facilitate and support the protected area financing roundtables referred to above [2].

c) Request the Executive Secretary:

- i) To make existing conservation-finance tools available through the clearing-house mechanism [(former paragraph 6a)]; and
- ii) To submit the present recommendation for the information and for further action of participants in the donors' meeting to be held in Montecatini, Italy, following the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas [(former paragraph 6b)].

5) PROVIDE GUIDANCE TO THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

a) Invite the Global Environment Facility:

- i) To approve and operationalize a new expedited funding window for fast-disbursing grant funding to support early action activities of the programme of work (e.g., 2006 and 2008 timelines) at a scale to sufficiently support developing countries, particularly least developed and small island developing States, and countries with economies in transition [(former paragraph 3a)];

- ii) To provide full-sized and medium-sized GEF grants designed to support national systems of protected areas and the targets and timetables in the programme of work and focus more sharply on protected area systems and sustainability strategies [(former paragraph 3b)]; and
 - iii) To increase the envelope of GEF biodiversity funds for protected areas in the GEF-4 business plan, taking into account the goals and targets in the programme of work and GEF's niche in providing system-wide protected-areas support [(former paragraph 3c)].
- b) Urge developed countries to support the fourth replenishment for the GEF which takes into account the goals and targets in the programme of work and the need for new and additional funding to support this work in developing countries [(former paragraph 4a)].

(abridged)

4 Development of Tool Kits

Item 3.3. of the provisional agenda

- **Document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/4: Further development of tool kits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas**

Introductory remark

Mr. Martin Lok introduced the document regarding the further development of tool kits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/4) to the participants of the workshop. He presented a number of suggestions on the improvement of the paper.

General remark of the Vilm Workshop

The participants of the workshop welcome the note from the Executive Secretary, including the indicative list of available tool kits. However, the participants came to the conclusion that further elaboration may make the document more useful to Parties.

As regards section I of the document, this does not clearly address the objectives and the possible elements of the tool kit. In addition, section II does not address current experiences with the implementation of existing protected area agreements and therefore lacks an orientation towards action and real needs of parties. Thus the participants suggest to add an explanation to the introductory paragraphs (2-b/c/d) of section I clearly defining the desired focus of the presented list of tools, a paragraph 6-b addressing experiences with respect to the implementation of protected areas, and a paragraph 6-c concerning the needs of parties, which could guide the analysis of gaps regarding the available tool kits.

The Ecosystem Approach as the framework for action under the CBD should be used as overarching concept for the compilation of tools and serve as a reference for the selection of potential tools.

In section II and III, the document contains four tables:

Table 1: Important steps and types of activities required under these steps in establishment and management of protected areas

Table 2: Indicative list of available tool kits for identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of protected areas

Table 3: Indicative list of available tool kits for establishment of ecological networks, development of ecological corridors and buffer zones, participation of indigenous and local communities, stakeholder involvement, benefit sharing and other areas

Table 4: Possible responses to the gaps in the tool kits

There is a clear need for a more coherent structure to the tables. Table 1 should provide topics and activities with regard to the establishment and management of protected areas that need to be tackled by the list of desired tools. However, the steps presented in table 1 do not reflect all the topics dealt with in later sections of the document. Specific reference to the integration of nature conservation with other sectors and to the protection regime of protected areas should be included, as well as the topics ‘stakeholder involvement and participation’ and ‘network-aspects of protected areas’.

The participants suggest to include a new step in table 1 which acknowledges the importance of stakeholder involvement and participation, including benefit sharing. It is also suggested to add under “designation” specific reference to coherence of ecological networks and under “management” specific reference to (1) integration of conservation into sectoral policies, (2) protection regime, and (3) the integration of protected areas into an ecological network, including buffer zones and corridors.

Table 2 and 3 provide an impressive compilation of existing tool kits. However, some shortcomings can be identified:

- The comments with respect to table 1 (no specific reference to ‘integration and protection’ in the proposed steps) also apply here.
- The tables are only poorly related to the goals and functions, and possible elements of tool kits (paragraphs 2-b/c/d). Also there is no information whether they have been tested, validated, what is the geographical scope, etc. Therefore the list does not provide enough information for a focussed analysis.
- The sub-headings in table 2 and 3 are not following the steps of activities defined in table 1. There should be a self-explanatory relation between the actions/steps from table 1 and the sub-headings used in table 2/3. If the classification of the tools was more coherent the clarity of the document would increase. Possible sub-headings for classification in table 2 and 3 would include:
 - Identification
 - Designation
 - Stakeholder involvement
 - Management (planning, implementation)
 - Monitoring and evaluation
- The distinction between table 2 and 3 is not very clear. It is suggested to combine table 2 and 3 into one table.
- Although there are a lot of good tools included in tables 2 and 3, European tool kits are missing. Suggestions for EU- and Pan-European examples are inserted.
- There are no ‘best practises’ included in table 2 or 3. However ‘best practices’ could provide very practical information to member states and stakeholders. It is proposed to add a column titled ‘best practices’ to the merged table. Possible EU suggestions are included.
- The indicative list presented in tables 2 and 3 seems to have omitted existing tool kits from several regions of the world published in other languages than English. These will need to be added.
- With respect to the gaps and ways and means to address them presented in table 4 the participants of the workshop concluded that they could be better structured and linked to the tables 1-3, along the same lines as has been presented before. Suggestions for additional gaps and means to address relate

to marine sites, protection, financial planning, achieving a favourable conservation status and coherence, which are added in the text and table 4.

Document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/4:

Suggestions on the text:

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF TOOL KITS FOR THE IDENTIFICATION, DESIGNATION, MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL SYSTEMS OF PROTECTED AREAS

Note by the Executive Secretary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(abridged; continued)

SUGGESTED RECOMENDATIONS

The Open-Ended Working Group on Protected Areas may wish to:

1. Take note of the existing tools presented in the document as a first indicative list and stress the importance of tool kits for providing voluntary guidance to parties. Consider that tool kits should be user-friendly, adaptive, understandable, action-oriented and geared to the real needs of parties and that they need to be developed in accordance with the ecosystem approach and should promote the development of protected areas as parts of coherent ecological networks ~~note and invite Parties and other Governments to use them as appropriate in the implementation of the programme of work;~~

2. Take note of the need to further review the available tool kits and the gaps identified sofar in the coverage of tool kits used in identification, designation, management and monitoring and evaluation of protected areas;

3. Endorse the further refinement and regular update of the list of available tool kits presented in table 2 and 3, and the development of new tool kits suggested in table 4. ~~in the present note and invite relevant~~ Relevant organizations are invited to contribute to both of these processes ~~their~~ development;

3-bis Request the Executive Secretary to consider the present document as a dynamic tool and make it available as an "INF"-document, to enable addition of new experiences and tool kits over time;

4. Invite the Executive Secretary to work with the IUCN-World Commission on Protected Areas, in coordinating the further review and development of toolkits, in cooperation with appropriate research institutes and NGO's;

4-a Request the Executive Secretray to invite parties to provide information on available tool kits in other languages than English.

4-b Invite Parties and other Governments to use them available tool kits as appropriate in the implementation of the programme of work;

4-c Urge Parties, other governments and funding organizations to support a “Tools Outreach Programme”, including, in accordance with paragraph 27 of COP Decision VII/28, national- and regional-level training workshops organized around key themes in the programme of work and application of relevant tools, with initial focus on early actions in the Programme of Work. The translation of relevant tools into the UN official languages is necessary to enable their application.

5. Urge Parties, other Governments, and funding organizations to provide adequate financial resources and other support for the development of tool kits;

6. Invite the Executive Secretary to make existing tool kits available through the clearing-house mechanism **using an interactive search system, linked with the specific activities of the Programme of Work, and the examples of ‘good practices’**, and to continually update this information as new tools are developed.

(abridged; continued)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In paragraph 29 (c) of its decision VII/28, the Conference of the Parties suggested that one of the tasks to be undertaken by the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Protected should be “to contribute to the further development of tool kits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas, including ecological networks, ecological corridors, and buffer zones, with special regard to indigenous and local communities and stakeholder involvement and benefit-sharing mechanisms”.

2. The programme of work on protected areas highlights the need to identify, and where necessary develop, a series of tools for protected areas. The identification, designation and management of protected areas comprise a series of complex, multi-layered tasks that involve stakeholders in virtually all sections of society. The designation of new protected areas represents a commitment by countries and by private trusts and individuals to maintain land and water systems in perpetuity to preserve their important biological, social and cultural values.

2-b A tool kit is a set of different instruments to facilitate the systematic implementation of agreed common criteria for protected areas policies. The toolkit should provide inter alia voluntary guidance, and Parties are free to develop their own specific criteria, targets and methods. The instruments can vary from methods for data exchange, scientific assessments, planning, communication, public participation, to evaluation and reporting techniques. Depending on the specific purpose different instruments in the tool kit may be applicable to local, national, regional or global level.

2-c Toolkits should be adaptive, understandable, action-oriented and geared to the real needs of Parties. Specific toolkits should be used for specific tasks and situations. Tailor-made assistance through advice, training and capacity-building in applying tool kits should be made part of the work on toolkits.

2-d Possible elements of this tool kit might be

- i. Definitions or interpretations (e.g. on terms such as ‘representative systems’, ‘comprehensive’, ‘ecological networks and corridors’, ‘effective management’, etc.**
- ii. Best practice and possible approaches on all the main steps, goals, targets and actions included in the Programme of Work. Work should start first on those for which a short deadline is set.**
- iii. A check list which encompasses the key steps and targets included in the Programme of Work.**

3. In addition to key areas identified in paragraph 29 (c) of decision VII/28, the programme of work specifically requested for tool kits under activities 1.1.10 (for system planning), 1.4.7 (for site

planning), 2.2.7 (for stakeholder involvement), 3.1.12 (relating to incentive measures) and 3.5.7 (educational tools and materials). A number of organizations and agencies *inter alia* IUCN, WWF, Conservation International, The Nature Conservancy, Birdlife International, Ramsar Convention, World Heritage Convention etc, have developed a range of tools for protected areas. **Also parties and regional agreements have developed a range of tools (e.g. Natura 2000 network of the European Union, the Pan European Ecological Network, the Meso-American Biological Corridor, etc.). [(There is no acknowledgement of experiences of parties or regions.)]** These existing toolkits may not address all the needs in the programme of work. In order to decide what needs to be further developed, it is necessary to list these existing tool kits and examine whether they address the requirements under the programme of work for identification, designation management, monitoring and evaluation of protected areas.

4. The Executive Secretary has prepared the present note to assist the Working Group in its consideration of the further development of tool kits, which is item 3.3 of the provisional agenda for the first meeting of the Group. Section II of document ~~reviews~~ **lists some** the available tool kits in relation with the programme of work. Gaps in existing tool kits vis-à-vis the programme of work are identified in section III, which also contains proposals for addressing these gaps, including identification of possible partners for the development of new tools. **[(For memory: after the discussions about and amendments to the list there is a need to check whether there are still gaps.)]**

II. AVAILABLE TOOLKITS AND THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PROTECTED AREAS

5. The identification of necessary tools is predicated on an understanding of what designation and management entails. There have been several attempts to identify the range of actions needed to carry out successful protected area management. In table 1 below a summary of key steps is presented.

6. For effective implementation of the programme of work on protected areas tools are required for steps outlined in table 1. These steps are not necessarily sequential, with several different actions occurring in parallel, and in many cases may need to be applied to existing protected area networks. Not all tools will be needed in all protected areas, for example approaches to restoration of ecological values are only needed when protected areas have already undergone degradation.

Table 1: Important steps and types of activities required under these steps in establishment and management of protected areas

<i>Steps</i>	<i>Types of activities</i>
Identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of large scale <u>[(meaning?)]</u> conservation targets (species, habitats, biomes, ecosystems requiring protection as per annex 1 of the Convention) • Identification of landscape/seascape mosaic • Protected area design • Assessment of biological values of <u>potentially</u> protected areas • Assessment of other values of and threats to potential/existing protected areas • Ecosystem assessment

<i>Steps</i>	<i>Types of activities</i>
Designation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of legal establishment of protected areas • Negotiation and agreement with stakeholders about protected areas, buffer zones and participatory approaches • Agreement on management objectives of protected areas (on IUCN category), <u>aiming at achieving a favourable conservation status of species and habitats</u> • <u>Ensure coherence of the ecological network</u>
<u>Stakeholder involvement</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Establishment of a process to involve all relevant stakeholders in the management of protected areas.</u> • <u>Especially commit indigenous and local communities in the protection of nature values within designated sites.</u>
Management	<p><u>Planning:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of management plans and annual work plans • Development of business plans (<u>financial planning</u>) • Implementation of capacity building for staff <p><u>Implementation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management interventions to maintain biodiversity and ecological integrity (e.g. by establishing ecological networks, ecological corridors <u>maintaining the connectivity</u>) • Management interventions to maintain other values including cultural values through involvement of indigenous and local communities • Sustainable management options in Category V and VI protected areas and buffer zones • Restoration initiatives as needed to increase value of protected areas • <u>Integrate protected areas management into a wider landscape/seascape planning</u> • <u>Develop if appropriate and necessary buffer zones and ecological corridors to ensure a favourable conservation status of species and habitats within protected areas.</u> • Outreach to the public • <u>Establishment of a protection regime for nature values in protected areas, including compensatory measures</u> • Management of uses (e.g. recreational, scientific, and other uses) in protected areas • <u>Integration of the protection of nature values with economic activities, like agricultural, forestry, fisheries and tourism.</u>

<i>Steps</i>	<i>Types of activities</i>
Monitoring and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Identify a set of indicators</u> • Monitoring and evaluation of protected areas • Adaptive management of protected areas as necessary

6-b Experiences from around the world should guide the development of tool kits within CBD. Already 11,5% of the world's terrestrial surface has been designated as protected area, and provisions have been made for a strong protection regime halting loss of key habitats and species. Another important key result is the increased dialogue between groups of interests, e.g. conservationists, farmers, foresters, fishermen, hunters, in order to assure that human uses of natural resources are sustainable.

6-c However, notwithstanding significant progress in implementing protected areas, species and habitats continue to decline, also outside protected areas. There is a specific need for action to promote further integration of biodiversity conservation into other sectoral policies, e.g. agriculture, fisheries, tourism and forestry. Also action is needed to embed protected areas management in the wider landscape and seascape planning, and to incorporate nature protection into spatial and economic development planning.

7. A number of organizations and agencies have developed a range of tool for protected areas. These tools *inter alia* include the best practice guidelines of IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, Ramsar Convention's guidelines on designation of wetlands, World Heritage Centre's guidelines on designation of world heritage sites, tools developed by international non-governmental organizations. **Also parties and regional agreements have developed a range of tools.** A total of 118 tools pertaining to protected areas have been identified and listed in tables 2 and 3. For ease of reference these tools are listed as per the key areas mentioned in paragraph 29 (c) as well as taking into account the important steps in establishment and management of protected areas outlined in Table1 above.

8. These tools are briefly described with reference to the relevant activities of the programme of work and sources of information. Detailed descriptions of 50 tool kits are being made available on CD-Rom, for information purposes.

[(Table 2 and 3 provide a comprehensive compilation of references to possible tool kits. However, in order to make the compilation more accessible and user-friendly a substantial review is needed. For example information on the type of tool kit (such as methodological, criteria, dataset, guidelines, research report, etc.) and on the experiences with and validation and geographical scope of tool kits should be added to the tables in the form of additional columns. Also the information on source and reference should be standardized. Thus creating the following headings: name, description + type of tool kit, source of reference, including accessibility by internet or other means, relevance to activities of the Programme of Work, examples for application, geographical scope. Furthermore the structure of the tables could be improved by using the same headings and steps/activities as in table 1, and present them in the order of the activities of the programme of work and ecosystem types. A last suggestion with respect to the structure is to merge table 2 and 3 together, because there seems to be some overlap between the two tables.)]

Table 2 Indicative list of available tool kits for identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of protected areas

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
Identification		
1. Extinction threats: a method of site selection for the prevention of species extinctions where sites rank on 3 criteria; endangerment, irreplaceability and discreteness	Alliance for Zero Extinction Alliance for Zero Extinction (2004). Pinpointing and conserving umbrella species in danger of imminent extinctions, http://www.zeroextinction.org/	Activity 1.1.5
2. Endemic bird areas of the world: a dataset of the world's main areas of endemism for terrestrial birds, which can be used to help locate areas of high biodiversity importance	Stattersfield, A J, M J Crosby, A J Long and D C Wege (1998) <i>Endemic Bird Areas of the World</i> , Birdlife International, Cambridge	Activity 1.1.5
3. Important bird areas: method of site selection where high priority sites are those that contain significant bird populations, populations are viable, and site contributes to the goal of representation of conservation of all targets within protected areas	Evans, M. I., Ed. (1994) <i>Important bird areas: Priority sites for conservation</i> . Birdlife International, Cambridge, U.K	Activity 1.1.5
4. Biodiversity hotspots: prioritization scheme resulting in 25 areas that represent the greatest concentration of biodiversity on earth and are therefore a priority for conservation action.	Conservation International Myers, N, R A Mittermeier, C G Mittermeier, G A B da Fonseca, and J Kent (2000) Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. <i>Nature</i> 403 : 853-858	Activity 1.1.5
5. High biodiversity wilderness areas: global prioritization analysis which identified 24 wilderness areas and 5 high biodiversity wilderness areas	Conservation International Mittermeier, R A et al (2003) <i>Wilderness and biodiversity conservation</i> . Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA, 100: 10309-10313.	Activity 1.1.5
6. Important plant areas: a site selection manual for Europe and a framework for developing similar methodologies for other regions	Anderson, S (2001) <i>Identifying Important Plant Areas</i> , Plantlife, Salisbury, UK	Activity 1.1.5
7. Key biodiversity areas (KBA): amalgamation of several different prioritization exercises into one methodology that aims to identify KBAs around the world	Conservation International and partners Guidelines to KBAs are currently being produced and will be available from IUCN	Activity 1.1.5
8. Red List of Endangered Species: uses a set of criteria to evaluate the extinction risk of thousands of species and subspecies, regularly updated	IUCN Species Survival Commission (2004) <i>2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species</i> , http://www.redlist.org/	Activity 1.1.5

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
9. Wetlands of international importance: methodology with 7 criteria including habitat type, species rarity, umbrella species, critical lifecycle stages, plus criteria for water birds and fish	Ramsar Convention The Criteria for Identifying Wetlands of International Importance, as adopted by the 4 th , 6 th , and 7 th Meetings of the Conference of Parties, http://ramsar.org/sitelist.pdf	Activities 1.1.3 And 1.1.5
10. Global Gap analysis of protected areas: outlining key gaps in protected area networks at global level	Conservation International Rodrigues et al. (2004) Effectiveness of the global protected area network in representing species diversity. <i>Nature</i> 428 (6983): 640-643	Activities 1.1.5 and 1.1.6
11. Index of ecoregions under threat: draft methodology for ranking ecoregions by level of threat	The Nature Conservancy Hoekstra, J M, T M Boucher, T H Ricketts and C Roberts (2005) Confronting a biome crisis: global disparities in habitat loss and protection, <i>Ecology Letters</i> 8 : 23-29	Activity 1.1.5
12. Global 200: 237 terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecoregions representing conservation priorities	WWF www.nationalgeographic.com/wildworld/profiles/g200_terr.html	Activity 1.1.5
13. Centres of plant diversity: identification of the major areas of plant diversity and endemism on the three tropical continents	WWF and IUCN (1994-1997) <i>Centres of plant diversity. A guide and strategy for their conservation.</i> Cambridge, UK	Activity 1.1.5
14. Gap analysis: a methodology for assessment of the protection status of biodiversity in a specified region, which looks for gaps in the representation of species or ecosystems in protected areas.	Kavanagh, K and T Iacobelli (1995) <i>A protected areas gap analysis</i> , WWF Canada, Toronto	Activities 1.1.5 and 1.1.6
<u>Critical sites: evaluation of national and regional protected area networks, and identification of critical sites for forest biodiversity conservation in order to improve the effectiveness of these PA networks</u>	<u>IUCN/CEFDHAC</u>	
15. Range-Wide Priority Setting: Conservation planning for broadly-distributed species	Wildlife Conservation Society Wildlife Conservation Society (2002) Planning to Save a Species <i>Conservation in Practice</i>	Activity 1.1.5
16. Last of the Wild: identification of areas least influenced by humans, normalized by biome and region	Wildlife Conservation Society Sanderson (2002) The Human Footprint and the Last of the Wild <i>BioScience</i> 52 :10	Activity 1.1.5
<u>Selection criteria for identification: Interpretation Manual of EU habitats.</u>	<u>http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/nature/nature_conservation/eu_enlargement/2004/pdf/habitats_im_en.pdf</u>	

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
<u>EU Bio-geographical seminars: Assessment of proposed PA under Habitats Directive, identification of gaps in geographic distribution and representativity</u>	http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/nature/nature_conservation/useful_info/documents_publications/pdf/memo_natura.pdf <u>Doug Evans (2005): Natura 2000 – Completing the EU’s network of sites to conserve flora and fauna. – PlantTalk 39:22-27</u>	
Designation		
17. Environmental legislation: Guidelines on establishing legal status for protected areas, now rather out of date	Lausche, B J (1980) <i>Guidelines for Protected Areas Legislation</i> , IUCN Environmental Law Centre, Bonn	Activities 1.1.6 and 3.1.7
<u>Environmental legislation: EU Birds Directive (1979) and EU Habitats Directive (1992)</u>	http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/nature/home.htm	
<u>Selection criteria for designation : annex III of the Habitats Directive</u>	http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/nature/nature_conservation/eu_nature_legislation/habitats_directive/pdf/hab-an3en.pdf	
Management		
Protected area design		
18. Coral reefs: summary of workshop that developed guidelines for effective design of coral reef marine protected areas	Mascia, M (2001) <i>Designing Effective Coral Reef Marine Protected Areas</i> , IUCN Gland	Paragraphs 20,&29 (a) of decision VII/28 and activity 1.1.3
19. Mountain protected areas: set into context with more general discussion about the roles and functions of these areas	Hamilton, L and L McMillan (editors) (2004) <i>Guidelines for Planning and Managing Mountain Protected areas</i> , IUCN, Gland	Activity 1.1.3
20. Marine protected areas: detailed guidelines covering legal framework, partnerships, site selection, planning, managing, zoning, financial and monitoring and evaluation	Kelleher, G (1999) <i>Guidelines for Marine Protected Areas</i> , IUCN Gland	Paragraphs 20 and 29 (a) of decision VII/28 and activity 1.1.3
21. National system planning for protected areas: best practice guidelines	Davey, A G (1998) <i>National System Planning for Protected Areas</i> , IUCN, Gland	Activity 1.1.6
22. Systematic conservation planning: a nine-stage data-driven process for protected area site selection	New South Wales National Parks Service and CSIRO Margules, C R and R L Pressey (2001) <i>Systematic conservation planning, Nature 405</i> (11): 243-253	Activity 1.1.5
23. Designing a geography of hope: ecoregion planning guide for large-scale conservation planning	<i>Designing a Geography of Hope</i> The Nature Conservancy, Arlington	Activity 1.1.5

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
24. Ecoregional assessment standards: 11 basic standards for ecoregional assessment	The Nature Conservancy (2003); <i>Ecoregional assessment standards</i> , Arlington VA	Activity 1.1.5
25. R2 Reef Resilience Toolkit: provides methodologies to help marine protected area managers to respond to threats of climate change on reef systems	The Nature Conservancy and Partners (2004) <i>R2- Reef resilience: building resilience into coral reef conservation; additional tools for managers: Volume 2.0. CD ROM Toolkit</i> , Arlington VA	Activity 1.1.5
26. Landscape species conservation planning: a wildlife-based strategy using landscape species (those that use large, ecologically diverse areas and have significant impacts on the structure and function of natural ecosystems) to define and identify ecologically meaningful conservation areas	Wildlife Conservation Society Sanderson, E W et al (2002) A conceptual model for conservation planning based on landscape species requirements. <i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i> 58 : 41-56	Activity 1.2.2
27. Marine protected areas: guidebook to MPAs covering arguments for protection, economic transition, size, location, networks, permanence, tourism, tropical and temperate seas,	Roberts, C M and J P Hawkins (2000) <i>Fully Protected Marine Reserves: A Guide</i> , WWF, Gland	Paragraphs 20 & 29 (a) of decision VII/28 and Activity 1.1.3
<i>Assessment of biological resources</i>		
28. Biodiversity assessment: analysis of different approaches to biodiversity assessment that attempt to integrate global and local values	Vermeulen, S and I Koziell (2002) <i>Integrating Global and Local Values: A review of biodiversity assessment</i> , International Institute for Environment and Development, London	Activity 4.4.3
29. High conservation value forests: a suite of methods developed to identify priority areas for forest conservation	Forest Stewardship Council; Jennings, S et al (2004) <i>High conservation value forests tool kit</i> , Proforest, Oxford, UK	Activities 1.1.2 and 1.3.1
30. Ecological integrity: methodology for assessment of ecological integrity	The Nature Conservancy, Anon (undated) <i>Assessing the Ecological Integrity of Conservation Targets in Site Conservation Planning and Measures of Success</i> , The Nature Conservancy, Arlington	Activity 4.1.2
31. Population viability analysis: methodology for assessing viable populations	The Nature Conservancy <i>A Practical Handbook for Population Viability Analysis</i> , The Nature Conservancy, Arlington	Activity 4.1.2
32. Rapid ecological assessment: methodology	<i>Nature in Focus: Rapid Ecological Assessment</i> , The Nature Conservancy and The Island Press, USA	Activity 4.3.1

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
33. A Freshwater classification approach for conservation planning: a spatially hierarchical approach to classifying freshwater systems to act as a coarse filter in planning	The Nature Conservancy Higgins, J V, M T Bryer, M L KHoury, and T H Fitzhugh (2005); A freshwater classification approach for biodiversity conservation planning, <i>Conservation Biology</i> 19 (2): 432-445	Activity 4.3.1
34. Ecological integrity: methodology based around answering 8 key questions related to the health of the ecosystem	Parks Canada	Activity 4.1.2
35. Wetland inventory: Guidelines for carrying out wetland inventories	Ramsar Convention A Framework for Wetland Inventory, Wetlands: water, life, and culture”, 8 th Meeting of the Conference of Parties, http://www.ramsar.org/key_guide_inventory_e.htm	Activity 4.3.1
Assessment of other values of and threats to protected areas		
36. Project analysis: a ten stage process for assessing threats that can undermine conservation projects	Salafsky, N and R Margoulis (2001) <i>Is Our Project Succeeding?</i> Biodiversity Support Program, Washington DC	Activity 1.5.5
37. Wetland risk assessment: framework for assessing risks to freshwater protected areas	Ramsar Convention Wetland Risk Assessment Framework, 7 th Meeting of the Conference of Parties, http://www.ramsar.org/key_guide_risk_e.htm	Activities 1.4.3 and 1.5.5
38. Participatory threats assessment: Creating participatory processes for site based conservation	Wildlife Conservation Society Wildlife Conservation Society, New York	Activities 1.4.1 and 1.4.3
39. Assessment and monitoring of coral bleaching: details on global assessments and monitoring of coral bleaching	Oliver, J, P Marshall, N Setiasih and L Hansen (2004) <i>A global protocol for assessment and monitoring of coral bleaching</i> , World Fish Centre, Penang, Malaysia and WWF Indonesia, Jakarta	Activity 1.5.5
40. Valuing ecosystem benefits: paper and set of methodologies for valuation	Pagiola, S, K von Ritter and J Bishop (2004) <i>Assessing the Economic Value of Ecosystem Conservation</i> , The World Bank with IUCN and TNC, Washington DC	Activities 3.1.2 and 4.4.2
Management of sites: Managing Natura 2000 sites: the provisions of article 6 of the Habitats Directive	http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/nature/nature_conservation/eu_nature_legislation/specific_articles/art6/pdf/art6_en.pdf	
Protection of sites: Assessments of plans and projects significantly affecting nature.	http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/nature/nature_conservation/eu_nature_legislation/specific_articles/art6/pdf/natura_2000_assess_en.pdf	
Protection of sites: Interpretation of article 6.4 (Compensation) (in progress)	EU [(to be published)]	

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
<i>Agreement on management objectives of protected areas</i>		
41. IUCN categories in Europe: guidelines for the application of the IUCN Protected Area Management Categories, in a European context	EUROPARC and IUCN (2000) <i>Guidelines for Protected Area Management Categories</i> , Europarc Federation Grafenau	Paragraph 31 of decision VII/28
42. IUCN protected area categories: system for categorising protected areas, by management objective, useful for designing conservation landscapes and ecoregions	IUCN http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/	Paragraph 31 of decision VII/28
43. Guidelines for protected area management categories: detailed guidelines for when to apply different categories	IUCN, CNPPA and WCMC (1994) <i>Guidelines for Protected Area Management Categories</i> , IUCN, Gland	Activity 1.1.1
44. Protected area management principles: detailed principles used in Finland, could serve as a model for use elsewhere	Metsähallitus Forest and Parks Service Metsähallitus (2001) <i>The Principles of Protected Area Management in Finland</i> , Vantaa, Finland	Paragraph 31 of decision VII/28
45. C-Plan: conservation planning software	New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service. C-Plan, 2001	Activities 1.1.1 and 1.1.2
46. Conservation by design: a five stage, comprehensive planning process for broadscale conservation	Anon, <i>Conservation by Design</i> , The Nature Conservancy, Arlington	Activities 4.1.1 and 3.1.4
47. Marxan: Marine reserve design software	Ball, I and H Possingham (2000) <i>MARXAN: A manual</i> , University of Queensland	Activity 1.1.3
48. Conceptual Modeling: explicitly defines conservation threats and targets	<i>Conceptual Modelling for Conservation Planning and Creating Conceptual Models - a tool for thinking strategically</i> , Wildlife Conservation Society New York	Activities 1.4.1 and 1.4.3
49. Landscape Species Selection: a replicable method for identifying species to set priorities for site-based conservation	Wildlife Conservation Society Coppolillo, P <i>et al.</i> (2004) Selection Criteria for suites of landscape species as a basis for site-based conservation <i>Biological Conservation</i> 115 :419.430	Activity 1.4.2
<i>Development of management plans for protected areas</i>		
50. Governance principles: defines a series of five principles for sound governance of protected areas, linked to UNDP principles and provides guidance on how these might be applied	Graham, J, B Amos and T Plumtre (2003) <i>Governance Principles for Protected Areas in the 21st Century</i> , Institute of Governance, Parks Canada and CIDA, Ottawa	Activity 2.1.2
51. Management plans for protected areas: detailed guidance	IUCN and GTZ Amend <i>et al</i> (2003) <i>Management Plans: Concepts and Proposals</i> , Parques Nacionales y Conservación Ambiental	Activity 1.4.4

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
52. Management plans: guidelines for developing plans for protected areas	IUCN Thomas, L and J Middleton (2003) <i>Guidelines for Management Planning of Protected Areas</i> , Gland	Activity 1.4.4
<i>Development of business plans and financial sustainability</i>		
53. Financing guidelines: detailed guidelines of options for raising revenue for protected area management including developing business plans	IUCN Anon (2002) <i>Financing Protected Areas: Guidelines for Protected Area Managers</i> , IUCN, Gland	Activities 3.2.5 and 3.4.2
54. Economic values of protected areas: Guidelines for Protected Area Managers	IUCN Anon (1998) <i>Economic Values of Protected Areas: Guidelines for Protected Area Managers</i> , IUCN, Gland	Activities 3.2.5 and 3.4.2
55. Conservation Finance Guide: CD and online guide to a range of conservation financing mechanisms aimed particularly at protected areas	The Conservation Finance Initiative (2004) <i>Conservation Finance Guide</i> http://guide.conservationfinance.org/	Activities 3.2.5 and 3.4.2
<i>Management interventions to maintain biodiversity</i>		
56. Marine protected area guidelines: establishment of MPAs including basic management principles, issues of effectiveness, legal status (including particularly relevant conventions) and funds	Mehlgarten, M (2002) <i>Marine Protected Areas: A compact introduction</i> , GTZ, Eschborn, Germany	Paragraph 20, 29 (a) of decision VII/28 and activity 1.3.1
57. Guide to managing coral bleaching: including preparing a response plan, predicting bleaching events, responding to bleaching events	Marshall, P A and H Z Schuttenberg (in press) <i>A Reef Manager's Guide to Coral Bleaching</i> , Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, Australia	Activity 1.3.1
58. Coral reefs: online guide to best practice in coral reef conservation including a series of case studies and 13 criteria	International Coral Reef Initiative http://www.icriforum.org	Paragraph 20, 29 (a) of decision VII/28 and activity 1.3.1
59. Invasive species guidelines: online guide to addressing problems of invasive plant and animal species	IUCN Invasive Species Specialist Group (2000) <i>IUCN Guidelines for the Prevention of Biodiversity Loss caused by Invasive Species</i> , IUCN, Gland	Activities 1.5.4 and 1.5.5
<i>Sustainable management options in category V and VI protected areas</i>		
60. Extractive reserves: Guidelines for the creation, establishment and management of extractive reserves (IUCN category VI) with seven case studies from Latin America	J Ruiz Murrieta and R Pinzon Rueda (1995) <i>Extractive Reserves</i> , IUCN, Gland	Activities 2.1.2 and 3.1.8
61. Category V protected areas: guidelines and case studies	Phillips, A (2002) <i>Management Guidelines for IUCN Category V Protected Areas Protected Landscapes / Seascapes</i> , IUCN, Gland	Activities 2.1.2 and 3.1.8

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
<i>Restoration initiatives to increase the value of protected areas</i>		
62. Restoration guidelines for degraded forests in the tropics: detailed guidelines and case studies	ITTO (2002) <i>ITTO Guidelines for the restoration, management and rehabilitation of degraded and secondary tropical forests</i> , International Tropical Timber Organization, Yokohama	Activities 1.2.5 and 1.5.3
<u>Criteria and indicators for protected areas effectiveness</u>	<u>ECOFACT</u> http://www.ecofac.org/Biblio/Download/MissionSuiviEvaluation/SuiviEvaluation1/FichePresentation.htm	
63. Guidelines for the reintroduction of species:	IUCN Species Survival Commission IUCN/SSC Guidelines For Re-Introductions	Activities 1.2.5 and 1.5.3
64. Wetland restoration: guidelines and flow chart for steps to implement restoration	Ramsar Convention http://www.ramsar.org/key_guide_restoration_e.htm	Activities 1.2.5 and 1.5.3
65. Ecological restoration: 53 guidelines covering conceptual planning, preliminary tasks, installation planning, installation tasks, post-installation tasks and evaluation	Clewell, A et al (2000) <i>Guidelines for Developing and Managing Ecological Restoration Projects</i> Society for Ecological Restoration International	Activities 1.2.5 and 1.5.3
66. Forest Landscape Restoration: manual outlining a range of tools for restoring forests from an ecological and social perspective	Mansourian, S, D Vallauri and N Dudley [editors] (2005); <i>Beyond Planting Trees: Forest Restoration in Landscapes</i> , Springer (Forthcoming August 2005)	Activities 1.2.5 and 1.5.3
<i>Adaptive management of protected areas</i>		
67. Adaptive management: Manual outlining the definition, conditions for, steps towards and principles of adaptive management	Salafsky, N, R Margolous and K Redford (2001) <i>Adaptive Management: A tool for conservation practitioners</i> , Biodiversity Support Program Washington DC	Activity 4.2.4
68. Adaptation to climate change: manual outlining the steps that governments and managers of protected areas and other land and water can take to at least partially mitigate climate change.	Hansen, L J, J L Biringer and J R Hoffman (2003) <i>Buying Time: A Users' Manual for Building Resistance and Resilience to Climate Change in Natural Systems</i> , WWF, Washington DC	Activity 1.4.5
<i>Monitoring and evaluation</i>		
69. Coral reef monitoring: demonstrates how monitoring can play a major role in the effective management of marine protected areas	Wilkinson, C et al (2003) <i>Monitoring Coral Reef Marine Protected Areas</i> , IUCN, TNC and the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network	Activity 4.2.1

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
70. Protected area effectiveness: system for assessing management effectiveness of protected areas developed and tested in Latin America	Cifuentes, M, et al (2000) <i>Measuring Protected Area Effectiveness</i> , WWF and CATIE, Turrialba, Costa Rica	Activity 4.2.1
71. Measuring progress in sustainable forest management: FSC principles and criteria	Forest Stewardship Council http://www.fsc.org/en/	Activity 4.2.1
72. Evaluating marine protected area management effectiveness: detailed guidelines and monitoring protocols	Pomeray, R, et al (2004) <i>How is Your MPA Doing? A Guidebook of Natural and Social Indicators for Evaluating Marine Protected Area Management Effectiveness</i> , IUCN	Activities 4.1.2 and 4.2.1
73. Management effectiveness framework: World Commission on Protected Areas framework for assessing management effectiveness of protected areas	Hockings, M et al (2000) <i>Evaluating Effectiveness: A Framework for Assessing the Management of Protected Areas</i> , IUCN, Gland	Activity 4.2.1
74. Principles and criteria: for sustainable management of flagship protected areas	Anon (2003) <i>Pan Park Verification Manual</i> , Pan Parks, Budapest	Activity t 4.1.1
75. Threats to freshwater sites: questionnaire on threats to wetlands of international importance	Ramsar Convention http://www.ramsar.org	Activity 4.2.1
76. Parks in Peril: methodology for measuring conservation success within protected areas developed and tested in Latin America	Measuring Success: The Parks in Peril Consolidation Scorecard, The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, Virginia	Activity 4.2.1
77. World Heritage monitoring: detailed assessment system, including framework and collection of tool kits, developed for natural World Heritage sites	UNESCO Hockings, M et al (2004) <i>The World Heritage Management Effectiveness Workbook</i> : http://www.enhancingheritage.net/index.htm	Activities 4.1.2 and 4.2.1
78. Marine protected area scorecard: questionnaire to track progress in management effectiveness within marine protected areas	Staub, F and M E Hatzios (2003) <i>Score Card to Assess Progress in Achieving Management Effectiveness Goals for Marine Protected Areas</i> , World Bank, Washington DC	Paragraph 20, 29 (a) of decision VII/28 and activity 4.2.1
79. Rapid assessment system: based mainly around workshops and questionnaires, to provide an overview of effectiveness of protected area systems	Ervin, J (2003) <i>WWF Rapid Assessment and Prioritisation of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM) Methodology</i> , WWF, Gland	Activity 4.2.1
80. Monitoring framework: method for measuring conservation impact at site and landscape level	Wildlife Conservation Society (2005) <i>Measuring our Effectiveness</i> , New York	Activities 4.1.2 and 4.2.1

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
81. Protected area tracking tool: simple questionnaire to track progress in management effectiveness of protected areas	Stolton, S, et al (2003) <i>Reporting Progress at Protected Area Sites</i> , WWF and the World Bank Gland / Washington DC	Activity 4.2.1
82. Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation: a basic set of standards agreed by several NGOs	Conservation Measures Partnership (2004) <i>Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation</i> http://www.conservationmeasures.org/CMP/Library/CMP_Open_Standards_v1.0.pdf	Activity 4.2.1
<u>Assessment and monitoring of Natura 2000-sites (in progress)</u>	<u>http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/nature/nature_conservation/monitor_index_reporting/reporting/habitats/index_en.htm</u>	

Table 3: Indicative list of available tool kits for establishment of ecological networks, development of ecological corridors and buffer zones, participation of indigenous and local communities, stakeholder involvement, benefit sharing and other areas.

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
<i>Establishment of ecological networks</i>		
1. European transboundary protected areas: guide and case studies to transboundary protected areas in Europe, identifying 9 stages in development	Europarc (2000) <i>Basic Standards for Transfrontier Cooperation between European Protected Areas</i> Europarc Federation	Activities 1.3.1,-1.3.4 and 3.1.11
2. Transboundary protected areas: guidelines for establishment	Sandwith, T et al (2001) <i>Transboundary Protected Areas</i> , IUCN, Gland	Activities 1.3.1,-1.3.4 and 3.1.11
3. River basin management: integration of freshwater conservation areas within river basins	Ramsar Convention Ramsar Convention (1999) Guidelines for integrating wetland conservation and wise use into river basin management, http://www.ramsar.org	Activities 1.1.3 1.2.2 and 1.3.1
4. Ecoregional assessment workbook: detailed workbook for ecoregional planning	Dinerstein, E et al (2000) <i>A workbook for conducting biological assessments and developing ecoregional visions</i> , Washington DC	Activity 1.4.2
5. Freshwater ecoregional assessment workbook: detailed workbook for ecoregional planning in freshwater ecosystems	Abell, R M et al (2002) <i>A sourcebook for conducting biological assessments and developing biodiversity visions for ecoregion conservation. Volume 2: Freshwater ecoregions</i> , Washington, DC	Activity t 1.4.2
6. Landscape approach to forest conservation: process for integrating forest protection, management and restoration at a landscape scale	Aldrich, M et al (2004) <i>Integrating forest protection, management and restoration at a landscape scale</i> , WWF, Gland	Activities 1.2.1 and 1.2.2

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
7. Planning in priority conservation areas: seven stage guide to implementing ecoregion conservation in priority conservation landscapes	Louks, C et al (2004) <i>From the Vision to the Ground: A guide to implementing ecoregion conservation in priority areas</i> , WWF, Washington DC	Activities 1.2.1 and 1.2.2
<u>Guidelines for the establishment of the Pan European Ecological Network</u>	<u>[(To be completed)]</u>	
<u>Selective bibliography on European Ecological Networks (on national, regional networks, corridors and biosphere reserves)</u>	<u>Council of Europe. Centre Naturopa. 1998</u> <u>[(to be completed)]</u>	
<u>Ecological networks and greenways, concept, design, implementation</u>	<u>Rob Jungman and Gloria Pungetti, Cambridge University Press</u>	
<u>Les aspects juridiques des corridors biologiques</u>	<u>Marie-Anne Bonnin, Université de Nantes</u>	
<u>Flyway concept (AEWA)</u>		
<i>Development of ecological corridors</i>		
8. Conservation corridors: manual on the usefulness, design and implementation of conservation corridors within broadscale planning, ensuring connectivity between protected areas and natural habitats	Sanderson, J et al (2003) <i>Biodiversity Conservation Corridors</i> , Conservation International, Washington DC	Activities 1.2.3 and 1.2.4
9. Sustainable landscapes: developing landscape approaches to conservation, with a particular emphasis on the use of biological corridors to maintain viability of vulnerable species and to encourage ecosystem approaches	Conservation International (2000) <i>Designing Sustainable Landscapes</i> , Centre for Applied Biodiversity Science, Washington DC	Activities 1.2.3 and 1.2.4
<i>Development of buffer zones</i>		
10. Certification of good forest management: principles and criteria for good forest management suitable for use in Category V and VI protected areas and also buffer zones, corridors etc	Anon (undated) <i>Principles and Criteria of Forest Stewardship</i> , Forest Stewardship Council, Bonn	Activities 1.2.3 and 1.2.4
11. Buffer zones management: Defines a series of five principles for sound governance of protected areas, linked to UNDP principles and provides guidance on how these might be applied	Ebregt, A and P de Greve (2000) <i>Buffer Zones and their Management</i> , International Agricultural Centre, Wageningen	Activity 1.2.3
12. Rainforest buffer zones: guidelines for management around protected areas	Sayer, J (1991) <i>Rainforest Buffer Zones: Guidelines for protected area managers</i> , IUCN Gland	Activity 1.2.3

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
<i>Participation of indigenous and local communities</i>		
13. Indigenous and traditional peoples: guidelines for approaches towards indigenous and traditional peoples with lands within or near protected areas	Beltran, J (editor) (2000) <i>Indigenous and Traditional Peoples and Protected Areas</i> , IUCN Gland,	Activities 1.1.7 2.1.1 to -2.2.5
14. Indigenous and local communities: guidelines for co-managed protected areas and community conservation areas	Borrini-Feyerabend, G and A Kothari (compilers 2004); <i>Indigenous and Local Communities and Protected Areas</i> , IUCN, Gland	Activities 1.1.7 2.1.1 to -2.2.5
15. Participation in wetlands: guidelines for establishing and strengthening local communities and indigenous people's participation in the management of wetlands	Ramsar Convention Guidelines for establishing and strengthening local communities and indigenous people's participation in the management of wetlands http://www.ramsar.org	Activities 1.1.7 2.1.1 to -2.2.5
16. Indigenous people and ecoregion conservation: guidelines covering reconnaissance, biodiversity and socio-economic assessment, strategies, planning and feedback	Oviedo, G et al (2000) <i>Indigenous and Traditional Peoples of the World and Ecoregion Conservation</i> , WWF International, Gland	Activities 1.1.7 2.1.1 to -2.2.5
<i>Stakeholder involvement</i>		
17. Participatory three-dimensional modelling: enhancing the capacities of marginalised, isolated, and natural resource-dependent communities to deal with spatial data and communicate on a peer to peer basis	Rambaldi, G and Callosa-Tarr, J (2002) <i>Participatory 3-Dimensional Modelling: Guiding Principles and Applications</i> , ASEAN Regional Centre for Biodiversity Conservation Philippines	Activity 1.4.1
18. Forest scenarios: introduces scenarios as a tool to plan creatively about the future, describing several types of future scenario-based methods	Wollenberg, E et al (2000) <i>Anticipating Change: Scenarios as a Tool for Adaptive Forest Management</i> , Center for International Forestry Research Bogor	Activity 1.4.1
19. Community toolbox: approaches for participatory assessment, monitoring and evaluation in community forestry, participatory assessment, participatory baselines, participatory monitoring, participatory evaluation, information analysis, presentation of results	Davis Case, D'Arcy (1990) <i>The community's toolbox: The idea, methods and tools for participatory assessment, monitoring and evaluation in community forestry</i> , FAO, Rome	Activity 1.4.1
20. Collaborative management of protected areas: a three stage process: preparing for partnership, developing an agreement and implementing and reviewing the agreement	Borrini-Feyerabend, G (1996) <i>Collaborative Management of Protected Areas: Tailoring the Approach to the Context</i> , IUCN Gland	Activity 1.4.1

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
21. Conflict management: principles and many short case studies addressing issues of conflict resolution in protected areas	Lewis, C (1996) <i>Managing Conflicts in Protected Areas</i> , IUCN, Gland	Activity 1.4.1
22. Participatory approaches in natural resource management: covering participation planning, individual and group methods, public events, instructions for facilitators etc	Loikkanen, T et al (1993) <i>Participatory Approach to Natural Resource Management</i> , Metsähallitus Forest and Park Service Vantaa, Finland	Activity 1.4.1
23. Participatory coastal zone decision-making: manual on approaches to participatory decision-making with respect to marine resources and conservation issues	Brown, K et al (2001) <i>Trade-off Analysis for Participatory Coastal Zone Decision Making</i> , University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK	Paragraphs 20, 29 (a) of decision VII/28 and Activity 1.4.1
24. Participatory planning in coastal areas: a detailed methodology for participatory planning in coastal marine areas	Windevoxhel, N (2001) <i>Guide to Participatory Planning in Coastal and Marine Protected Areas</i> , PROARCA Guatemala City	Paragraphs 20, 29 (a) of decision VII/28 and Activity 1.4.1
<u>Communicating with stakeholders and the general public: best practices examples for Natura 2000</u>	<u>El Teide Declaration</u> <u>http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/nature/nature_conservation/natura_2000_network/communicating_natura_2000/el_teide_declar/index_en.htm</u> <u>Natura Network Initiative</u> <u>http://www.eurosite-nature.org/article.php3?id_article=115</u>	
<i>Benefit sharing</i>		
25. Sustainable non-timber forest products: a guide for projects or communities and 6 steps to sustainability: species selection; forest inventory; yield studies; regeneration surveys; harvest assessments; and harvest; useful where NTFP collection is allowed in protected areas	Peters, C M (1994) <i>Sustainable harvest of non-timber plant resources in tropical moist forests: an ecological primer</i> , Biodiversity Support Program Washington DC	Activity 1.4.3
26. Multidisciplinary landscape assessment: gathering natural resource information that reflects the needs of local communities, based on work with communities in Indonesia and including case studies and methodologies	Sheil, D et al (2002) <i>Exploring biological diversity, environment and local people's perspectives in forest landscapes</i> , Center for International Forestry Research Bogor	Activity 2.1.6

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
27. European charter for sustainable tourism: commits signatories to implementing a local strategy for 'sustainable tourism' defined and compliance is independently verified, to help ensure the benefits remain with local communities	Europarc Federation, (2002) <i>The European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas</i> , Europarc Grafenau	Activity 3.1.9
28. Protected areas stewardship certification standards: for game lodges and ecotourism	Game Rangers Association of Africa In preparation	Target 3.1.9
29. Methodologies for assessing non-timber forest products: assessment techniques useful for monitoring whether use is sustainable or not	Wong, J, K Thornber and N Baker (2001); Resource assessment of non-wood forest products: Experience and biometric principles, FAO Rome	Activity 2.1.6
30. Public use measurement: detailed guidelines for reporting on public use of protected areas including programme development, statistics and technical guidance on continual counting systems, visitor studies and data management	K Hornback, E and P F J Eagles (1999) <i>Guidelines for Public Use Measurement and Reporting at Parks and Protected Areas</i> , IUCN, and Parks Canada Gland	Activity 3.1.9
31. Sustainable tourism: guidelines with case-studies on developing sustainable tourism within protected areas	Eagles, P F J, et al (2002) <i>Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas</i> , IUCN, Gland	Activity 3.1.9
32. Environmental education in schools: large manual on development of an environmental education programme	Braus, J A and D Woods (1993) <i>Environmental Education in the Schools: Creating a Program that Works</i> , Peace Corps Washington DC,	Activity 3.5.5
33. Ecotourism development: guide to planning and implementing ecotourism activities	Drumm, A and A Moore (2002); <i>Ecotourism Development: A Manual for Conservation Planners and Managers</i> , The Nature Conservancy, Arlington VA	Activity 3.1.9
<u>"Jewels in the crown"- Good practices on Natura 2000 and leisure</u>	<u>[(NL reference)]</u>	
<i>Access to information</i>		
34. PALNet: protected area website dedicated to capacity building and providing rapid access to information	IUCN http://www.parksnet.org/palnet_english/presentation.htm	Paragraph 29 (c) of decision VII/28 and Activity 1.1.10
35. Earth Conservation Toolbox: website designed to summarise information on tools for implementing the ecosystem approach	www.earthtoolbox.net	Paragraph 29 (c) of decision VII/28 and Activity 1.1.10

<i>Description of tool kit</i>	<i>Source and reference</i>	<i>Relevance to activities of the programme of work</i>
36. World Database on Protected Areas: global database maintained by UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre and partners	http://sea.unep-wcmc.org/wdbpa/	Paragraph 29 (c) of decision VII/28 and Activity 1.1.10

III. GAPS AND WAYS AND MEANS TO ADDRESS THEM

A. *Major gaps in the coverage of tool kits for national and regional systems of protected areas*

[(Because of the flaws of previous sections also section III suffers a lack of focus. In order to increase focus the headings should be simplified and less in number (see also the comments for section I and II). Especially the headings for networks, corridors and buffer zones should be combined, as well as the headings for participation, stakeholder involvement and benefit sharing.]

The following gaps could be added to the analysis (see for more details comments in table 4):

- Identification: less attention for marine sites, especially the management and integration with fishery policies
- Management: Integration and protection
- Management: financial planning, including fundraising and financial management
- Monitoring and assessment: contribution of protected areas to achieving a favourable conservation status of species and habitats in need for protection, as well as the assessment of connectivity and coherence of networks
- Tool kits from research organizations]

9. Section II above indicates there are many tools that can be used for the implementation of the programme of work. The important requirement is to ensure that these are available to Governments and other organizations. Most of these tools are already in public domain and freely available on websites. There is however, a need for additional tools in some areas of the programme of work as shown below:

Identification

(a) There are a number of tools for the planning and assessment stages in establishment of protected area system. However, there are ~~still no single or concise~~ only a few sources source of information for Governments to carry out a **gap analysis** at national level to plan future protected area networks, which is one of the targets under the programme of work to be accomplished by 2006

(b) There is among existing tools a clear **bias towards strictly protected areas** rather than landscape/seascape protected areas, extractive reserves, sacred sites and other protected areas with a strong human presence. There is for instance only very limited guidance aimed specifically at different IUCN categories of protected area other than category I, II and category V;

(c) There is a similar mismatch between the attention paid to **different biomes**, with for instance many tools applicable to forests, far less for freshwater areas and very few for deserts, arid lands, grasslands, savannahs and Mediterranean regions. Also the attention for marine protected areas seem to be less developed, especially where it concerns actions which need to be taken, the integration with sectoral policies, like fisheries, marine transportation, etc., and the connectivity of marine sites;

Designation

(d) IUCN guidelines on establishing legal status of protected areas are out of date. There are clear gaps in addressing the **legal issues relating to protected area designation**, including how to demarcate protected areas;

(e) There is considerable confusion still exists with respect to the **application of the IUCN protected area management categories**, the process of **zoning** in protected areas and choosing a suite of appropriate management policies in protected areas and further guidance is required;

Management

(f) Tools for assisting protected area managers in the **restoration of damaged ecosystems**, either in protected areas established in a partially degraded area or in response to damage that occurs after protection are not available;

(g) Most approaches assume that protected areas are fixed and permanent, and there is virtually nothing to help managers and management agencies to address the likely changes due to **global warming and natural disasters**;

(h) There are also important gaps in general guidance for **capacity-building** for protected area staff;

(h-bis) A key element for successful implementation of protected areas policies is integration and adequate protection against negative influences. There are clear gaps in how to effectively integrate nature protection into economic activities and how to identify and manage sustainable use of natural resources in protected areas.

(h-b) Financial sustainability of protected areas is crucial. Development of tool kits to enable development of effective financial planning and management of protected areas should receive more attention.

Monitoring and evaluation

(i) Although assessment of protected area management effectiveness has been studied considerably, but there is still little guidance available for assessment of either **ecological or social outcomes** of protected areas, especially for data poor countries.

(j) The work on assessment of management effectiveness of protected areas needs to be further developed, particularly in terms of guidance about **achieving a favourable conservation status for species and habitats in need for protection, as well as guidance about** management standards and **protocols** for assessment;

Establishment of ecological network, corridors and buffer zones

(k) More generally, the ecosystem approach is poorly represented in terms of tools that can help to **integrate protected areas** into the wider landscape/seascape **and to assess the connectivity between protected areas and the ecological coherence of the network**. Although some planning tools and transboundary protected area guidelines are available, most of the approaches still ignore the challenges and also the opportunities of working beyond boundaries of parks;

Development of ecological corridors

(l) The concept of corridors is well recognized, **and there are good examples of national and regional possible tool kits. However, at a global level** but clear guidance is ~~not~~ **less** available to help planning and implementation of ecological corridors;

Development of buffer Zones

(m) Most tools and approaches assume that protected areas are entirely natural, yet many contain managed land or rely on cultural landscapes for buffer zones and biological corridors. Tools for addressing **cultural landscapes** are insufficiently developed;

Stakeholder involvement, participation of Indigenous and local communities and benefit sharing

(n) Although there has been considerable progress in addressing issues relating to **indigenous and local communities** in recent years, there are still gaps in terms of advice relating to co-managed protected areas or community-conserved areas;

Stakeholder involvement

(o) Establishment of private reserves is an important new approach to governance and different stakeholder groups are increasingly engaged in establishing private reserves. Most advice on stakeholder involvement is directed at Governments with respect to their own lands and waters and very little is available about participation of stakeholders in establishing **private reserves**;

Benefit sharing

(p) Tools for better methodologies for assessing the **wider values** of protected areas (environmental goods and services, recreational values, homeland for vulnerable human cultures, protection of sacred sites) are needed. Showcasing these wider values of protected areas attract support for establishment of protected areas and help to spread benefits of protected areas into wider community;

(q) Similarly, tools for **evaluating non-biodiversity values** of protected areas are poorly covered (for instance management to protect water supplies or carbon sequestration). Showcasing these non-biodiversity values of protected areas attract support for establishment of protected areas and help to spread benefits of protected areas into wider community;

Others

(r) There is little advice for managers about the implications of **international conventions**, including the Convention on Biological Diversity, for their work; and

(s) Tools are only guidelines, that inevitably need to be adapted to local conditions, so one major gap is a forum for **refining tools** and ensuring that experience is shared between protected-area agencies, non-governmental organizations and others around the world;

(s-bis) What is missing from the list of possible tool kits are the available tool kits of the scientific institutions.

B. Suggested proposals for addressing the gaps

10. Filling the gaps in the tool kits identified in section III above requires a concerted effort by protected area agencies, non-governmental organizations, intergovernmental bodies and academics. Table 4 outlines a list of actions, along with possible contributors.

[(The Executive Secretary should request scientific institutions to provide information on possible tool kits available in their community.)]

Table 4: Possible responses to the gaps in the tool kits

Gap	Response	Possible partner(s)
<i>Identification</i>		
Gaps in methodologies and biomes	Guidance on: ✓ Gap analysis methodologies ✓ Gap analysis for under-represented areas ecosystems (arid lands, grasslands, savannahs, Mediterranean systems temperate forests?, marine sites) [(need to add tropical?)]	The Nature Conservancy and NGO consortium, <u>UNEP-WCMC</u>

Gap	Response	Possible partner(s)
Lack of tools for IUCN categories that dealt with sustainable use	Guidance on IUCN Categories including particularly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Category III ✓ Category IV ✓ Category VI 	WCPA task forces on landscape protection and non-material values Association for Religion and Conservation
Designation		
Advice on legal issues including establishing protected areas	✓ Manual on setting the legal framework for protected area networks and individual protected areas	IUCN Environmental Law Centre and IUCN Environmental Law Commission
	✓ Guidelines for demarcating protected areas	
Lack of tools for application of IUCN management categories	✓ Revised advice about use of IUCN categories	An existing WCPA task force is charged with this work
Management		
Advice for management of protected areas in specialised biomes	Development of guidance for:	WCPA, agencies and NGOs:
	✓ Freshwater systems ¹	Ramsar
	✓ Arid lands and deserts	
	✓ Mangroves	
	✓ Polar environments	
	✓ Prairies, grasslands, and Savannahs ✓ Mediterranean systems	
Tools to address changes due to global warming	Guidance for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Management in the face of climate change ✓ Protected area selection in a time of changing climate 	WCPA, agencies, NGOs IPCC
Guidance and tools for restoration	Restoration guidance is needed with particular emphasis on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Fish populations ✓ Coral reef communities ✓ Mangroves ✓ Arid landscapes/dry forests ✓ Logged over forests ✓ Invasive species control 	Species Survival Commission. Society for Ecological Restoration International NGOs
<u>Guidance on protection regimes</u>	<u>Guidance for:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Management of sustainable use</u> ✓ <u>Assessment of possible negative impacts</u> ✓ <u>Integration of conservation into sectoral policies</u> 	<u>FAO, IMO, IAIA [?], IUCN</u>
Monitoring and evaluation		
Monitoring ecological and social outcomes of management	Methods to track progress in maintaining ecological and social outcomes	Multiple partners
Minimum standards of management	Development of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Minimal standards for protected areas ✓ Protocols for assessment 	WCPA theme on management effectiveness with governments (e.g. New South Wales, Parks Canada, Metsähallitus)

1 There is a great deal of useful material from the Ramsar Convention, but no single guide at present.

Gap	Response	Possible partner(s)
<i>Establishment of ecological networks, corridors and buffer zones</i>		
Integration of protected areas into the wider landscape and seascape	Detailed guidance on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Design of networks ✓ Integration of protected areas within wider landscapes and seascapes ✓ <u>Assessment of connectivity and coherence of the network</u> 	WCPA, Commission on Ecosystem Management, some protected area agencies (e.g. Canada, Metsähallitus), <u>UNEP, Council of Europe and UNESCO-MAB</u>
<i>Development of ecological corridors</i>		
Tools to plan and implement corridors between protected areas	Guidelines for the planning and implementation of ecological corridors including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Minimum useful scale ✓ Avoiding invasive species ✓ Establishment methods ✓ Management options 	WCPA IUCN Programmes NGOs
<i>Development of buffer zones</i>		
Management in cultural landscapes (this is also applicable within Category V and VI protected areas)	Guidance on the integration of management and protection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Organic and traditional farming ✓ Forest management / community management ✓ Small-scale fisheries <p>Much of the information is available but needs repackaging for protected area managers</p>	Partners such as the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements, Marine Stewardship Council, Forest Stewardship Council etc
<i>Stakeholder involvement, participation of Indigenous and local communities and benefit sharing</i>		
Addressing needs in co-managed protected areas and community conservation areas	Developing tools for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Legislative and policy development in co-managed protected areas and community conservation areas ✓ Tools for management and tracking progress 	CEESP, TILCEPA, indigenous communities and organisations
<i>Stakeholder involvement</i>		
Identifying ways in which stakeholders can participate in protected area planning, assessment and management	Many tools are already available but need to be made more available to the protected areas community. In addition, further development is needed on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Training on rapid assessment at a landscape scale for designing and planning protected areas 	CEESP, TILCEPA, FAO, development agencies and NGOs
<i>Benefit-sharing</i>		
Capacity building for protected area managers and rangers	Training materials for rangers and assessment of capacity requirements	International Ranger Federation
Material for outreach and teaching	Providing a way of comparing experience with tools, possible improvements, additions etc.	The Earth Conservation Toolbox, an online database, will include user comments

Gap	Response	Possible partner(s)
Understanding and quantifying non-biodiversity values of protected areas	Development of methodologies for making preliminary and detailed assessments of, e.g., water services, coastal protection, fisheries enhancement, carbon sequestration	World Bank for water guidelines, IUCN / WWF for carbon sequestration
Managing for non-biodiversity values of protected areas	Specific guidance for the management of important cultural and, in particular, sacred sites within protected areas	WCPA task force on sacred and cultural values

5 Review of Implementation

Item 4. of the provisional agenda

- **Document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/5: Consideration of the process for the review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas**

Introductory remark

Mr. Stefan Leiner introduced document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/5 considering the process for the review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas. He also presented some suggestions for the improvement of the recommendations and raised questions concerning timing of the review, information sources for the review, and some aspects of the review process itself.

General Remarks from the Vilm Workshop on the Implementation Review

1. In §19 of decision VII/18, COP urges Parties to achieve fully the goals and targets of the programme of work while recognising that activities should be implemented according to national priorities and circumstances.
2. In §28 of decision VII/28, COP decided to assess at each COP not only the implementation of the programme of work, but also the need for more effective measures and additional financial and technical support
3. A balance should be struck between the need to acquire sufficient information which allows an effective evaluation on the one hand, and the need to reduce the reporting and assessment burden to an essential minimum on the other hand.
4. The evaluation should fulfil a dual objective: On the one hand to assess if the overall objective of the programme of work has been reached in 2010/2012 and if parties have achieved the goals and targets of the programme of work (see §§18 and 19 of decision VII/28). The other objective is to identify lessons learned, best practices and key obstacles in order to improve implementation and further develop the tool kits. COP should not evaluate more than necessary to achieve these two objectives.
5. In short: the evaluation should provide an answer to the question: “Have the parties achieved the goals and targets of the programme of work? If not, why not?”
6. In order to support this evaluation, WG-PA should develop an evaluation matrix which includes for each target of the programme of work the criteria for assessing implementation, the information needed to assess implementation, possible sources of information and a description of progress and main obstacles. An example on how this matrix might look like is annexed to this report. It is suggested that WG-PA1 considers, further develops where appropriate and adopts the matrix.
7. Not all goals and targets should be evaluated at all COPs. A schedule for a stepwise assessment process should also be adopted at WG-PA1. A proposal for such a schedule is included in Annex 2.
8. Regional monitoring and reporting processes (as far as they exist) should as far as possible be made compatible with the global reporting on implementation of the programme of work to reduce reporting burden.

9. National and regional reporting should be complemented by a global assessment on protected area networks, using in particular the indicators related to protected areas of the global framework for assessing implementation of the strategic plan and the 2010 target developed or under development (see decision VII/30 and SBSTTA rec 10/...).
10. Some elements of the implementation can only be assessed at the global or regional level. In particular, information on the implementation of the programme of work as regards marine protected areas in areas beyond national jurisdiction will have to be provided by regional and international organisations. WG-PA1 should adopt a system by which progress made in implementing the programme of work as regards marine protected areas in areas beyond national jurisdiction can be evaluated.

Document UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/1/5:

Suggestions on the text:

CONSIDERATION OF THE PROCESS FOR THE REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PROTECTED AREAS

Note by the Executive Secretary

SUMMARY

(abridged; continued)

SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS

The Ad Hoc Working Group may wish to:

1. ~~Take note of~~ **Adopt** the process **for the review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas** proposed by the ~~Executive Secretary~~ contained in the annexes to the present document, **including:**
 - **a table describing steps and actors for the acquisition of information and the review**
 - **a schedule describing which elements of the programme of work will be reviewed at COP8, 9 and 10**
 - **an evaluation matrix describing for each target of the programme of work the criteria for assessing implementation, the information needed to assess implementation, possible sources of information and a description of progress and main obstacles;**
2. *Request* the Executive Secretary to carry out the activities described in the annex to this note and report thereon to the Working Group at its second meeting; and
3. *Decide* to review the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas at its second meeting **focussing on the issues included in the schedule for COP8;**
4. **Invite Parties and other organisations included in the Appendix of decision VII/28 to submit by 31 July information relevant to the issues included in the schedule for the evaluation at COP 8.**

45. *Invite* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to contribute information needed for the review of implementation **according to the table in annex 1.**

6. Urges Parties to undertake a stakeholder peer review of the draft thematic report for COP9.

(abridged; continued)

I. INTRODUCTION

(abridged; continued)

II. RELEVANT PARAGRAPHS OF DECISION VII/28 SEEKING INFORMATION ON PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK AND THE FOLLOW-UP ACTION TAKEN

5. In §19 of decision VII/18, COP urges Parties to achieve fully the goals and targets of the programme of work while recognising that activities should be implemented according to national priorities and circumstances.

~~56.~~ In paragraph 28 of decision VII/28, the Conference of the Parties decided to assess at each meeting of the Parties until 2010, progress in the implementation of the programme of work, and to determine the need for more effective measures and additional financial and technical support to reach 2010 target.

~~7.~~ In paragraph 30 of the decision the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and invited other Governments and relevant organizations to report to the Executive Secretary on implementation of decision and the programme of work prior to each meeting of the Conference of the Parties until 2010.

~~68.~~ To facilitate the provision of information requested by the Conference of the Parties in paragraph 30 of the decision, the Executive Secretary developed a set of questions relating to those activities and targets contained in the programme of work, that Parties were requested to undertake or achieve before 2008. These questions were included in the revised format for the third national report, which was distributed to Parties in July 2004.

~~79.~~ To obtain the information from scientific organizations, civil society and others as requested in decision VII/28, paragraph 29 (d), for consideration by the Working Group, the Executive Secretary sent letters in November 2004 to relevant scientific organizations, academia, and civil society, particularly those organizations identified in the programme of work as partners or collaborators for its implementation, requesting them to provide relevant information to the Secretariat. As at 15 March 2005, submissions had been received from the World Bank, the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the International Whaling Commission, the International Association for Impact Assessment and the Man and Biosphere Programme of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

III. PROCESS FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PROTECTED AREAS

The programme of work on protected areas contains four programme elements and each programme element is structured into goals, targets and activities of the Parties. The programme of work contains 16 goals, which are outcome-oriented statements of ultimate purpose. Each goal is accompanied by a target, which in almost all cases sets a specific date by which the goal is to be accomplished, and in many cases, provides indicators to measure progress towards the goal. Fourteen of these targets contain specific time bound deadlines of 2010 or 2012 for achieving the targets. Each paired goal and target is followed by a list of suggested activities of the Parties. Many of these activities include intermediate target dates of 2006 or 2008, in recognition of the fact that reaching many of the goals and targets of the programme of work will require a phased, step- by- step approach. **Box 1 and 2 below summarise the goals and targets as well as the activities for which a specific deadline is set in the programme of work.**

[(Insert Box 2.1. and 2.2. of WCPA/CBD Action Guide to the Protected Areas Commitments adopted at the 7th Conference of the Parties (2004) of the Convention on Biological Diversity.)]

~~9~~**10.** The review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas will involve consideration of the progress on, and opportunities and constraints for, each of the goals, **and** targets ~~and activities~~ under the programme of work. Implementation of these activities **of the programme of work** entails financial, human and other capacity requirements. There is therefore a need to gather information on implementation of activities from Parties, other Governments and partners and other collaborators, taking into account the availability of resources and other requirements.

11. A balance should be struck between the need to acquire sufficient information which allows an effective evaluation on the one hand, and the need to reduce the reporting and assessment burden to an essential minimum on the other hand. The evaluation should fulfil a dual objective: On the one hand to assess if the overall objective of the programme of work has been reached in 2010/2012 and if parties have achieved the goals and targets of the programme of work (see § 18 and 19 of decision VII/28). The other objective is to identify lessons learned, best practices and key obstacles in order to improve implementation and further develop the tool kits. COP should not evaluate more than necessary to achieve these two objectives.

~~10~~**12.** The information required for the review will be gathered primarily from the third national reports and from submissions by relevant organizations, partners and collaborators in response to the request of the Executive Secretary, mentioned in paragraph ~~9~~ above. Additional information can be obtained from (i) reports on protected areas projects funded by the Global Environment Facility; (ii) reports of workshops such as the regional technical workshops requested by the Conference of the Parties in paragraph 27 of decision VII/28; and (iii) reports received from international and other relevant organizations, **(iv) additional information submitted by the parties and other partner organisations on the issues for review at COP8.**

13. The Secretariat will establish a synthesis of the information gathered in particular as regards achieving the targets and implementing the activities referred to in the schedule for COP8.

~~11~~**14.** In order to assess the status of implementation, **the synthesis will be pre-reviewed at a regionally balanced workshop consisting of a small number of experts from parties and partner organisations. Should a workshop not be established for time or financial reasons, the pre-review should be undertaken by the Secretariat with the support of an E-forum. The review of implementation on issues scheduled for COP8 will be undertaken by the Open-Ended Working Group on Protected Areas at its second meeting. The review should** ~~information received will be synthesized to~~ highlight what has been implemented, what remains to be implemented, obstacles to implementation, and **recommend to COP8** ways and means for overcoming obstacles

~~12~~**15.** The process for the review of the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas is presented in ~~the~~ annex **1** to this note with some details on the **steps, mechanisms, approaches and actors,**

the tools for the collection of information and the evaluation and review process assessing progress including and a timeframe.

16. Annex 2 includes a schedule describing which elements of the programme of work will be reviewed at COP8, 9 and 10

17. Annex 3 includes an evaluation matrix describing for each target of the programme of work the criteria for assessing implementation, the information needed to assess implementation, possible sources of information and a description of progress and main obstacles

~~13~~**18.** In view of the subsequent reviews that should take place prior to each meeting of the Conference of the Parties until 2010 (decision VII/28, para. 28), the review process discussed in this note could be re-evaluated based on the experience gained and availability of information.

19. WG-PA2 should adopt the questionnaire for the thematic report to be submitted before COP9 on the basis of the evaluation matrix and on the issues included in the schedule for COP9

20. Regional monitoring and reporting processes (as far as they exist) should as far as possible be made compatible with the global reporting on implementation of the programme of work to reduce reporting burden.

21. National and regional reporting should be complemented by a global assessment on protected area networks, using in particular the indicators related to protected areas of the global framework for assessing implementation of the strategic plan and the 2010 target developed or under development (see decision VII/30 and SBSTTA rec 10/...).

22. Some elements of the implementation can only be assessed at the global or regional level. In particular, information on the implementation of the programme of work as regards MPAs in areas beyond national jurisdiction will have to be provided by regional and international organisations. WG-PA1 should adopt a system by which progress made in implementing the programme of work as regards MPAs in areas beyond national jurisdiction can be evaluated.

(abridged)

PROCESS, GUIDELINES AND MECHANISMS FOR MONITORING PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PROTECTED AREAS

Action	Mechanisms/Tools	Guidance on the use mechanisms / tools and time frame
<p>Information acquisition</p>	<p>1.1. The third national reports that are due mid-May, 2005</p> <p>1.1.1. Previous national reports containing sections on protected areas, thematic reports on protected areas, national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs); and other relevant documents considered during the preparation of NBSAPs</p>	<p>1.1. Compilation of third national report will take place after the first meeting of the Working Group, to be held in June 2005 and should be finalized by early September 2005</p> <p>[In the event not enough responses have been received in June 2005 the Executive Secretary will send a reminder and request for information with 15 August 2005 deadline for action.]</p> <p>1.1.1. Sections in NBSAPs and other relevant documents used during the preparation of NBSAPs will be compiled and should be finalized by early September 2005. The Information regarding Article 8, in the first and second national reports submitted between June 1997 and January 1998, and in May 2001 respectively will be compiled, although they include activities carried out before the adoption of the programme of work. The overview of the analysis of this information regarding Article 8 is provided in document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/10. In pursuance of decision VI/25, Parties submitted thematic reports on protected areas A synthesis of information contained in these thematic reports is provided in document UNEP/CBD/COP/7/INF/8. Information contained in the thematic reports will be compiled and should be finalized by early September 2005.</p>
	<p><u>1.1.2 Additional notification to parties seeking information on some key elements identified for review at COP8 in the schedule</u></p>	<p><u>1.1.2. A notification to parties with a few short questions should be sent out in June 2005 to allow additional specific information on PAs (e.g. in case the third national report is not finalised). WG-PA1 to adopt the short additional questionnaire for both parties and 'partner' organisations</u></p>

Review of Implementation

Action	Mechanisms/Tools	Guidance on the use mechanisms / tools and time frame
	<p>1.2. Information submitted by relevant academia, scientific organizations, civil society and others, particularly those organizations identified as collaborators in the programme of work on protected areas</p>	<p>1.2. The Executive Secretary requested in November 2004 these organizations to submit reports. So far only five organizations responded. The Working Group at its first meeting may wish to request the organizations and others to submit the information by 31 July 2005, <u>in particular on those issues for review at COP8 (see schedule and assessment matrix).</u></p> <p>Compilation of information should be finalized by early September 2005</p>
	<p>1.3. Reports on relevant GEF-funded projects</p>	<p>1.3. Progress reports on GEF funded protected area projects will contribute to assessment of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas.</p>
	<p>1.4. Reports of any regional technical workshops organized in pursuance of para 27 of decision VII/28 or relevant to the programme of work</p>	<p>1.4. So far there is no information on the organization of any regional workshops. The Working Group at its first meeting may wish to request the Organizations, and invite Parties and other Governments to organize such regional workshops and submit reports to the Executive Secretary.</p>
	<p>1.5. Questionnaire for a thematic report on the implementation of the programme of work</p>	<p>1.5. In decision VII/28, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and invited other Governments and relevant organizations to report to the Executive Secretary on implementation of the decision and the programme of work on protected areas at each of its meetings till 2010.</p> <p>Reporting to COP-8 (2006) and COP-10 (2010) are being taken care by the third and fourth national reports respectively. However, for COP-9 (2008) a thematic report is planned.</p> <p>Accordingly the Executive Secretary will prepare a draft questionnaire for a thematic report for consideration by the Working Group at its second meeting, <u>in particular referring to issues identified for review at COP9 in the schedule.</u></p> <p><u>Parties should undertake a stakeholder peer review of the draft thematic report for COP9.</u></p>

Action	Mechanisms/Tools	Guidance on the use mechanisms / tools and time frame
<p>Synthesis of information</p>	<p>2.1. Preparation of a synthesis of information mentioned under 1.1 and 1.2 above, using analytical tools developed by the Secretariat.</p>	<p>2.1. This synthesis will commence in July 2005 and will be completed in September 2005.</p> <p>The analytical tool should be submitted for consideration to WG-PA1 to ensure key issues for review at COP8 are included in the synthesis report.</p>
<p>Assessment of the level of implementation</p>	<p>3.1. Consideration of the synthesis report and development of a pre-review of the implementation on issues for COP8 Review the synthesis report taking into account, what has been implemented, what remains to be implemented, obstacles to implementation by a workshop (depending on availability of time and funds) or, in absence of time/funding by the Executive Secretary and an E-forum.</p> <p>3.2. Depending on availability of time and funds E-forum and/or workshop to consolidate the conclusions/findings</p> <p>3.2. Eventual regional technical workshops should also contribute to the review process.</p>	<p>3.1. This review of synthesis report implementation of the key issues for COP8 should be completed by October 2005</p> <p>3.2. The Working group at its first meeting, depending on availability of time prior to its second meeting, may wish to recommend for establishing an E-forum and/or for a workshop to consolidate the conclusions undertake the pre-review. The workshop should consist of a small number of experts from parties and partner organisations and be regionally balanced. It should meet ideally in September.</p> <p>3.2. WG-PA1 to adopt the schedule (see annex 2) and the evaluation matrix (see annex 3)</p> <p>3.3. WG-PA1 to adopt a system by which progress made in implementing the PoW as regards MPAs in areas beyond national jurisdiction can be evaluated.</p> <p>The Working Group will review the conclusions/findings of the synthesis at its second meeting and make recommendations to COP</p>
<p>Review and revisions of review process</p>	<p>4.1. Assessment and revisions of review process, including development of methodologies for further review</p>	<p>4.1. The Working Group at its second meeting may wish to recommend processes and mechanisms for further review taking into account <i>inter alia</i> the schedule and evaluation matrix as well as the thematic report for COP-9 and the 4th national report for COP-10 and other sources of information.</p>

Review of Implementation

Action	Mechanisms/Tools	Guidance on the use mechanisms / tools and time frame
<p>Assessment of the effectiveness of the programme of work and its contribution to the 2010 target</p>	<p>5.1 Gap analysis Review of the implementation of issues for COP8 by WG-PA 2, taking into account results from assessments under items 3.1. and 3.2.</p>	<p>5.1 The Based on the synthesis and the pre-review and using the evaluation matrix, the Working Group at its second meeting may wish to should recommend to COP8 how to improve the implementation of the programme of work assess the effectiveness of the programme of work and its contribution to the 2010 target and related millennium development goals, focussing on the main issues for considerations at COP8.</p>

Annex II

SCHEDULE FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PROTECTED AREAS AT COP8, 9 AND 10

<u>COP8</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Gap analysis (legal, institutional, scientific, financial, ...) identification of protected areas network, development of national (regional) targets and definitions for comprehensiveness, representativity, management effectiveness (Goal 1.1, activities 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.4 and 1.1.5, 3.1.1, 3.2.1)</u> - <u>Financial sustainability (Goal 3.4), in particular national needs assessment (activity 3.4.1) and financial support (3.4.3)</u>
<u>COP9</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>progress towards the overall objective (goal 1.1), in particular designation and contributions towards 2010 target and MDGs</u> - <u>participation, benefit sharing, indigenous peoples (goals 2.1, 2.2)</u> - <u>threats identification and mitigation (goal 1.5)</u> - <u>revision of policies to provide enabling environment (goal 3.1)</u> - <u>provision of financial, technical and other resources (goal 3.4) and sustainable financing plans (activity 3.4.2)</u> - <u>communication, education, public awareness (goal 3.5)</u>
<u>COP10</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>progress towards the overall objective (overall objective, goal 1.1), in particular full and effective management</u> - <u>monitoring frameworks (goal 4.3)</u>

EVALUATION MATRIX (to be developed)

<u>Goal, Target</u>	<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Assessment criteria and key evaluation questions</u>	<u>Description of progress and main obstacles</u>	<u>Information Sources</u>
<u>Number</u>	<u>Description</u>			
<u>1.1</u>	<u>Establishment and maintenance by 2010...</u>	<u>2010</u> <u>2012</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>National (regional) definition of each of the terms comprehensive, ecologically representative and effectively managed developed.</u> • <u>National (regional) gap analysis undertaken by 2006 (activity 1.1.5)</u> • <u>National (regional) Plan (Map) for a comprehensive and effectively managed Protected Area Network established (identification) by 2006.</u> • <u>National (regional) progress report on designation (inc. Map) by 2008</u> • <u>Mechanisms for assessing management effectiveness established by 2010</u> 	<u>National reports,</u> <u>UNEP-WCMC, IUCN</u> <u>WCPA, regional</u> <u>organisations, ...</u>
<u>1.2</u>	<u>Integration into the wider landscape and other sectors, connectivity</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Measures taken on, and progress made towards integration into the wider landscape, connectivity and integration with other sectors</u>	<u>National Reports</u>
<u>1.3</u>	<u>Establish and strengthen regional networks and transboundary protected areas</u>	<u>2010/12</u>	<u>Measures taken for the establishment of regional networks and transboundary PAs, Number or % of protected areas which are integrated into a regional network. Number and location of transboundary protected areas.</u>	<u>National reports,</u> <u>regional organisations</u>
<u>1.4</u>	<u>Effective management of all protected areas.</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>See goal 1.1</u>	<u>National reports</u>

Review of Implementation

<u>Goal, Target</u>	<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Assessment criteria and key evaluation questions</u>	<u>Description of progress and main obstacles</u>	<u>Information Sources</u>
<u>Number</u>				
<u>1.5</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Effective mechanisms to identify and prevent key threats in place (prerequisite to achieve effective management – see goal 1.1)</u>		<u>National reports</u>
<u>2.1</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Mechanisms for equitable sharing of both costs and benefits arising from the establishment of PAs</u>		<u>National reports, reports from NGOs and IPOs</u>
<u>2.2</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Enabling environment (legislation, policies, capacities, resources, governance types, tools) developed ensuring participation and PIC of indigenous people. Plans and initiatives developed for participation in decision making in the identification, designation and management phases of the PA network – level of participation achieved.</u>		<u>National reports, reports from NGOs and IPOs and other relevant stakeholders</u>
<u>3.1</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Review and revise policies to provide an enabling environment for PAs</u>		<u>National reports</u>
<u>3.2</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Comprehensive capacity building programmes implemented</u>		<u>National reports</u>
<u>3.3</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Appropriate technologies and innovative approaches for the effective management of PAs developed, validated and transferred.</u>		<u>National reports</u>
<u>3.4</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Amount of financial needs identified (2005). Sustainable financing plans established. Amount of funding provided by public and private donors to PAs. Level of integration of PA financing strategies into PRSPs and NSDSs. Compilation of studies on value of ecosystem services provided by specific PAs published.</u>		<u>National reports, ES, international organisations, GEF, WB,....</u>

<u>Goal, Target</u>	<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Assessment criteria and key evaluation questions</u>	<u>Description of progress and main obstacles</u>	<u>Information Sources</u>
<u>3.5</u> <u>CEPA</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Measures taken to increase public awareness, understanding and appreciation of the importance of protected areas. Strategies and programmes elaborated.</u>		<u>National reports</u>
<u>4.1</u> <u>Minimum Standards and best practices</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>National (regional) standards, criteria, and best practices for the selecting, establishing, managing and governance of PAs developed and communicated to the Secretariat.</u>		<u>National reports, IUCN, ...</u>
<u>4.2</u> <u>Effectiveness of PA management</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Methods, standards, criteria and indicators for evaluating management effectiveness of PAs adopted (2006). Frameworks for monitoring, evaluation and reporting PA management effectiveness at site, national and regional system level implemented. % of each country protected areas evaluated.</u>		<u>National reports, NGO,...</u>
<u>4.3</u> <u>Assessment and monitoring PA status and trends</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Systems for enabling effective monitoring of protected area coverage, status and trends at national, regional and global scales established. Data on PA coverage, status and trends communicated to UNEP-WCMC In List. Harmonised reporting system (WHC, Ramsar, CBD, UNEP-WCMC,...) on PAs established.</u>		<u>National reports, UNEP-WCMC, NGOs...</u>
<u>4.4</u> <u>Scientific knowledge</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>Scientific results (in particular on Interdisciplinary research on ecological, social and economic aspects of PAs) disseminated and shared (e.g. to the CHM)</u>		<u>Academia, scientific organisations, national reports, ...</u>

Glossary of Acronyms

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CEESP	IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy
CEFDHAC	Conférence sur les Ecosystèmes de Forêts Denses et Humides d'Afrique Centrale
CEPA	Communication, Education and Public Awareness Initiative (CBD)
CHM	Clearing House Mechanism
COP	Conference of the Parties
EU	European Union
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
IAIA	International Association for Impact Assessment
IMO	International Maritime Organisation
IMPA	International Marine Protected Area
IOC	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission
IUCN	The World Conservation Union
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MPA	Marine Protected Area
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NSDS	National Sustainable Development Strategy
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OSPAR	Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic
PA	Protected Area
PHARE	Pre-accession instrument of the EC to assist applicant countries of Central Europe in their preparations for joining the European Union
PoW	Programme of Work
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SBSTTA	Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice
TILCEPA	Theme on Indigenous and Local Communities, Equity, and Protected Areas
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Program
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WCMC	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WCPA	IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas
WG-PA	CBD's Ad Hoc Working Group on Protected Areas
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

**„Expert meeting in preparation of the first meeting of the
Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas“**

May 17 to 22, 2005

at the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation
International Academy for Nature Conservation,
Isle of Vilm, Germany

List of participants

Nr.	Name	Institution	Address /Tel./Fax/e-mail
1.	Adamescu, Mihai Cristian Mr	University of Bucharest Dept. of Systems Ecology and Sustainability	Spl. Independentei 91-95, Sect. 5 RO-050095 Bucharest ROMANIA Tel.: +40-21-411-2310 Fax: +40-21-411-2310 e-mail: adacri@bio.bio.unibuc.ro
2.	Alers, Marcel Mr	UNDP-GEF	304 E 45th Str., 9th floor, Office 934 USA-10017 New York USA Tel. : +1-212-906-6199 Fax: +1-212-906-6998 e-mail: marcel.alers@undp.org
3.	Aminu-Kano, Muhtari Mr	BirdLife International	Wellbrook Court, Girton Road UK-Cambridge CB3 0NA UNITED KINGDOM Tel.: +44-1223-277318 Fax: +44-1223-277200 e-mail: muhtari.aminu-kano@birdlife.org
4.	Benemann, Axel Mr	Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit Division N I 6	PF 12 06 29 D-53048 Bonn GERMANY Tel.: +49 0228/305-2615 Fax: +49 0228/305-2684 e-mail: Axel.Benemann@bmu.bund.de
5.	Berghöfer, Augustin Mr	Humboldt-University Agricultural Faculty Research Group GoBi	Luisenstr. 53 D-10099 Berlin GERMANY Tel.: +49-30-2093-6524 Fax: +49-30-2093-6565 e-mail: augustin.berghoefer@agrار.hu-berlin.de
6.	Bibik, Elena Ms	Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation Dept. of the State Environmental Policy	4/6 B. Gruzinskaya RU-Moscow 123995 RUSSIA Tel.: 254-48-00 Fax: 254-43-10 e-mail: Aamirkhanov@mnr.gov.ru

List of Participants

Nr.	Name	Institution	Address /Tel./Fax/e-mail
7.	Bishop, Joshua Mr	IUCN Senior Adviser - Economics and the Environment	Rue Mauverney 28 CH-1196 Gland SWITZERLAND Tel.: +41-22-999-0266 Fax: +41-22-999-0020 e-mail: joshua.bishop@iucn.org
8.	Clorley, John Mr	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	1/06c, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square UK BS1 6EB Bristol UNITED KINGDOM Tel.: +44-117-372-8700 Fax: +44-117-372-8508 e-mail: john.clorley@defra.gsi.gov.uk
9.	Cohen, Sheldon Mr	The Nature Conservancy	4245 N. Fairfax Drive Arlington, VA 22203 USA USA Tel.: +1-703-841-2644 Fax: +1-703-276-3241 e-mail : scohen@tnc.org
10.	Demeter, Andras Mr	European Community	Avenue de Beaulieu 9 BE 1160 Brussels BELGIUM Tel.: +32-2-296-3245 Fax: +32-2-299-0895 e-mail: andras.demeter@cec.eu.int
11.	Epple, Cordula Ms	German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation Biodiversity Unit	Insel Vilm D-18581 Putbus GERMANY Tel.: +49 38301/86-155 Fax: +49 38301/86-150 e-mail: cordula.epple@bfv-vilm.de
12.	Flousek, Jiri Mr	Krkonoše National Park and Biosphere Reserve	CZ-54311 Vrchlabí CZECH REPUBLIC Tel.: +420-499-456-212 Fax: +420-499-422-095 e-mail: jflousek@knap.cz
13.	Gutsal, Olga Ms	Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine	Uritskovo street, building 35 UA-03035 Kyiv UKRAINE Tel.: +380-40-206-31-47 Fax: +380-44-206-33-08 e-mail: biodiv@menr.gov.ua, goutsal@ukr.net
14.	Hatchwell, Matthew Mr	Wildlife Conservation Society c/o Zoological Society of London	Regents Park UK-London NW1 4RY UNITED KINGDOM Tel.: +44-7976-605770 Fax: +44-1795-830051 e-mail : mhatchwell@wcs.org
15.	Hogan, Rolf Mr	WWF international	Rue de Malagny 6A CH-1196 Gland SWITZERLAND Tel.: +41-22-3640661 Fax : +41-78-8972290 e-mail : rolfhogan@yahoo.com
16.	Jaffeux, Henri Mr	Ministère de l'écologie et du développement durable	20, avenue de Segur F-75302 Paris FRANCE Tel.: +33-1-42191914 Fax: +33-1-42191998 e-mail: henri.jaffeux@ecologie.gouv.fr

Nr.	Name	Institution	Address /Tel./Fax/e-mail
17.	Jensen, Eva Juul Ms	Ministry of the Environment Danish Forest and Nature Agency	Haraldsgade 53 DK-2100 Copenhagen DENMARK Tel.: +45-3947354 Fax: +45-39472198 e-mail: ejj@sns.dk
18.	Kaiser, Martin Mr	Greenpeace	Große Elbstr. 39 D-22767 Hamburg GERMANY Tel.: +49-40-30618-321 Fax: +49-40-30631-121 e-mail: martin.kaiser@greenpeace.de
19.	Kirchner, Andree Mr		Joseph-Haydn-Str. 5 D-28209 Bremen GERMANY Tel.: +49-421-2224004 Fax: +49-421-2224005 e-mail: info@andreekirchner.de
20.	Korn, Horst Mr	German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation Biodiversity Unit	Insel Vilm D-18581 Putbus GERMANY Tel.: +49 38301/86130 Fax: +49 38301/86150 e-mail: horst.korn@bfn-vilm.de
21.	Lago, Alejandro Mr	Universidad Rey Juan Carlos	c/ Tulipan s/n ES-28933 Mostoles SPAIN Tel.: +34-91-4887113 Fax: +34-91-4887068 e-mail: unesco@escet.urjc.es
22.	Leiner, Stefan Mr	European Commission DG Environment	BE-1049 Brussels BELGIUM Tel.: +32-2-2995068 Fax: +32-2-29669558 e-mail: stefan.leiner@cec.eu.int
23.	Loft, Lasse Mr	Europa Universität Viadrina	D-Frankfurt/Oder GERMANY Tel.: +49-30-13898582 e-mail: lasseloft@web.de
24.	Lok, Martin Mr	Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality	PO Box 20401 EK NL-Den Haag THE NETHERLANDS Tel.: +31-70-3785215 Fax: +31-70-3786144 e-mail: m.c.lok@minlnv.nl
25.	Luchetti, Damiano Mr	Ministry of Environment	Via Capitan Bavastro 174 I-00154 Roma ITALY Tel.: +39-06-57228377 Fax: +39-06-57228277 e-mail: luchetti.damiano@minambiente.it
26.	Lund, Carsten Mr	Danish Forest and Nature Agency	Haraldsgade 53 DK-2100 Copenhagen DENMARK Tel.: +45-39-472355 Fax: +45-39-472198 e-mail: clu@sns.dk

List of Participants

Nr.	Name	Institution	Address /Tel./Fax/e-mail
27.	Mack, Rolf Mr	GTZ (German Society for Technical Cooperation)	PF 51 80 D-65726 Eschborn GERMANY Tel.: +49-6196-79-1317 Fax: +49-6196-79-6103 e-mail: rolf.mack@gtz.de
28.	Maggiore, Anna Maria Ms	Ministry for the Environment	Via Capitan Bavastro, 174 I-00154 Roma ITALY Tel.: +3906-57228639 Fax: +3906-57828277 e-mail: maggiore.annamaria@minambiente.it
29.	Martens, Els Ms	Regionaal knooppunt biodiversiteit Vlaanderen Afdeling Natuur, AMINAL	Koning Albert II-laan 20, bus 8 BE-1000 Brussels BELGIUM Tel.: +32-2-5537686 Fax: +32-2 553 76 85 e-mail: els.martens@lin.vlaanderen.be
30.	Movchan, Yaroslav Mr	Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine	Uritskovo street, building 35 UA-03035 Kyiv UKRAINE Tel.: +380-44-206-31-47 Fax: +380-44-206-31-47/53 e-mail: movchan@menr.gov.ua
31.	Nilsson, Per Mr	Göteborg University Dept. of Marine Ecology Tjärnö marine biological laboratory	S-45296 Strömstad SWEDEN Tel.: +46-526-68624 Fax: +46-526-68607 e-mail: per.nilsson@tmbl.gu.se
32.	Paulsen, Gunn Ms	Directorate for Nature Management (DN)	Tungasletta 2 NO-7485 Trondheim NORWAY Tel.: +47-73-580500 Fax: +47-73-580501 e-mail: gunn.Paulsen@dirnat.no
33.	Pusch, Christian Mr	German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation INA Insel Vilm	Insel Vilm D-18581 Putbus GERMANY Tel.: +49-38301-86126 Fax: +49-38301-86150 e-mail: christian.pusch@bfn-vilm.de
34.	Richartz, Saskia Ms	Greenpeace (European Unit)	199 rue Belliard BE-1040 Brussels BELGIUM Tel.: +32-2-274-1902 Fax: +32-2-274-1910 e-mail: saskia.richartz@greenpeace.org
35.	Salmon, Trevor Mr	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	1/07c, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square UK-BS1 6EB Bristol UNITED KINGDOM Tel.: +44-117-372-8567 Fax: +44-117-372-8508 e-mail: trevor.salmon@defra.gsi.gov.uk
36.	Seifert, Peter Mr	Geschäftsbereich MGS Projektträger Jülich (PTJ) des BMBF, BMWA und BMU Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH	Seestr. 15 D-18119 Rostock-Warnemünde GERMANY Tel.: +49-381-5197297 Fax: +49-381-1509 e-mail: p.seifert@fz-juelich.de

Nr.	Name	Institution	Address /Tel./Fax/e-mail
37.	Schliep, Rainer Mr		Offenbacher Str. 17a D-14197 Berlin GERMANY Tel.: +49 30 89733164 e-mail: rainer.schliep@alumni.tu-berlin.de
38.	Stadler, Jutta Ms	German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation Biodiversity Unit	Insel Vilm D-18581 Putbus GERMANY Tel.: +49-38301-86134 Fax: +49-38301-86-150 e-mail: jutta.stadler@bfn-vilm.de
39.	Storck, Wolfgang Mr	Federal Ministry for Consumer Protection, Food and Agriculture	Rochusstr. 1 D-53123 Bonn GERMANY Tel.: +49-228-529-3803 Fax: +49-228-529-4410 e-mail: wolfgang.storck@bmvvel.bund.de
40.	van Dijk, Robert Mr	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands	Bezuidenhoutseweg 67, P.O. Box 20061 NL-2500 EB The Hague THE NETHERLANDS Tel.: +31-703485153 Fax: +31-703485128 e-mail: rh-van.dijk@minbuza.nl
41.	Young, Tomme Ms	IUCN Environmental Law Centre	Godesberger Allee 108-112 D-53175 Bonn GERMANY Tel.: +49-228-2692231 Fax: +49-228-2692250 e-mail: TYoung@iucn.org
42.	Zarzycki, Tomasz Mr	University of Gdansk Institute of Oceanography	Al. Marszałka Piłsudskiego 46 PL 81-378 Gdynia POLAND Tel.: +48-586601613 Fax: +48-586601678 e-mail: tomazs@ocean.univ.gda.pl

Expert meeting in preparation of the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas

Objectives

The goal of the expert meeting is to exchange information on topics on the agenda of the upcoming first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas (June 2005 in Montecatini/Italy) among national experts from European countries. The informal discussion will be based on the documents prepared for the Working Group meeting by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Programme

Tuesday, 17.05.2005

Arrival of the participants at the Isle of Vilm

18.30-20.30 *Dinner*

21.00 HORST KORN
Welcome of the participants
Opening of the meeting, Introduction

Wednesday, 18.05.2005

08.00-08.45 *Breakfast*

09.00-10.00 CHRISTIAN PUSCH
Marine Protected Areas in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction – scientific aspects
Discussion

10.00-11.00 TOMME YOUNG
Marine Protected Areas in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction – legal aspects
Discussion

11.00-11.30 *Coffee / Tea break*

11.30-12.30 JOSHUA BISHOP
Sustainable Financing of Protected Areas: A global review of challenges and options
Discussion

- 12.30-14.00 *Lunch*
- 14.00-15.30 SHELDON COHEN
Overview of Financial Resources Paper by CBD Secretariat
 Discussion
- 15.30-16.00 *Coffee / Tea break*
- 16.00-17.30 MARTIN LOK
Protected Areas – development of toolkits
 Discussion
- 17.30-18.30 STEFAN LEINER
Review of Implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas
 Discussion
- 18.30-20.30 *Dinner*
- 20.30-... **Drafting groups: Contributions to the workshop report (part 1)**

Thursday, 19.05.2005

- 08.00-08.45 *Breakfast*
- 09.00-11.00 **Drafting groups: Contributions to the workshop report (part 2)**
- 11.00-11.30 *Coffee / Tea break*
- 11.30-12.30 **Drafting groups: Contributions to the workshop report (part 3)**
- 12.30-14.00 *Lunch*
- 14.00-15.30 Guided tour in the nature reserve of the Isle of Vilm
- 15.30-16.00 *Coffee / Tea break*
- 16.00-18.30 **Drafting groups: Contributions to the workshop report (part 4)**
- 18.30-20.00 *Dinner*
- 20.00 Concert: Caterina Lichtenberg (mandolin) and Mirko Schrader (guitar)

Friday, 20.05.2005

- 08.00-09.00 *Breakfast*
- 09.00-11.00 **Plenary: Finalisation of the workshop report (part 1)**
- 11.00-11.30 *Coffee / Tea break*
- 11.30-12.30 **Plenary: Finalisation of the workshop report (part 2)**
- 12.30-14.00 *Lunch*
- 14.00-15.30 **Plenary: Finalisation of the workshop report (part 3)**
- 15.30-16.00 *Coffee / Tea break*
- 16.00-18.30 **Plenary: Finalisation of the workshop report (part 4)**
- 18.30-20.30 *Reception at the invitation of the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation*
- 20.30-... Plenary

Saturday, 21.05.2005

- 08.00-09.00 *Breakfast*
- 09.20 Departure of the participants

Annex I
**PROPOSED ORGANIZATION OF WORK FOR THE FIRST MEETING OF THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON
 PROTECTED AREAS**

	<i>Plenary</i>	<i>Sub-Working Group I</i>	<i>Sub-Working Group II</i>
<p>Monday, 13 June 2005 10 a.m. – 1 p.m.</p>	<p>Agenda items: 1. Opening of the meeting 2. Organizational matters 2.1 Election of officers 2.2 Adoption of the agenda 2.3 Organization of work Keynote addresses</p>		
<p>Monday, 13 June 2005 3 p.m.–6 p.m.</p>		<p>3.1. Options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction</p>	<p>3.2. Options for mobilizing adequate and timely financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas by developing countries and countries with economies in transition</p>
<p>Tuesday, 14 June 2005 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.</p>		<p>3.1. Options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (<i>continued</i>)</p>	<p>3.2. Options for mobilizing adequate and timely financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas by developing countries and countries with economies in transition (<i>continued</i>)</p>
<p>Tuesday, 14 June 2005 3 p.m.–6 p.m.</p>		<p>3.1. Options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. (<i>continued</i>)</p>	<p>3.2. Options for mobilizing adequate and timely financial resources for the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas by developing countries and countries with economies in transition (<i>continued</i>)</p>

Provisional agenda of WG-PA-1

	Plenary	Sub-Working Group I	Sub-Working Group II
Wednesday, 15 June 2005 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.		3.3. Further development of tool kits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas.	4. Review of implementation of the programme of work
Wednesday, 15 June 2005 3 p.m.–6 p.m.		3.3. Further development of tool kits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional systems of protected areas. (<i>continued</i>)	4. Review of implementation of the programme of work. (<i>continued</i>)
Thursday, 16 June 2005 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.		Pending issues.	Pending issues.
Thursday, 16 June 2005 3 p.m.–6 p.m.		Adoption of the report of the Sub-Working Group I	Adoption of the report of the Sub-Working Group II
Friday, 17 June 2005 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.	5. Preparation for the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas: 5.1 Draft provisional agenda 5.2 Date and venue 6 Other matters		
Friday, 17 June 2005 3 p.m.–6 p.m.	7. Adoption of the report 8. Closure of the meeting.		
