



INTERPRETING AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGET 11 IN THE CANADIAN CONTEXT:

**TOWARDS CONSENSUS ON
“OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES”
OCTOBER 2013**

Summary and Results of a CCEA National Workshop
5-7 FEBRUARY 2013, OTTAWA, CANADA

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Overview of the Workshop.....	1
1.2 Workshop Goal.....	1
1.3 Context	1
1.4 Purpose of the Workshop	3
1.5 Format of the Workshop.....	3
2 RESULTS.....	5
2.1 Overall Workshop Recommendation.....	5
2.2 Consensus Statements on the Five Major Issues Concerning “Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures” ..5	
1. Purpose of area-based measure / intention.....	5
2. Long term.....	5
3. Importance of nature conservation objectives.....	5
4. Nature conservation outcomes.....	5
5. Strength of conservation measures.....	5
2.3 A Draft Decision Screening Tool for “Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures”	5
2.4 Recommended Improvements to the Screening Tool.....	6
3 WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS.....	10
3.1 Day 1: Tuesday, 5 February 2013 - Presentations (click on title to link to presentation)	10
3.1.1 Welcome and introduction	10
3.1.2 Welcome from Environment Canada	10
3.1.3 Canadian policy context: 2020 Biodiversity goals, targets and indicators for Canada	10
3.1.4 Origins of Target 11 with specific references to the Convention on Biological Diversity Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) and “other effective area-based conservation measures”	10
3.1.5 IUCN Interpretation of “other effective area-based conservation measures”	10
3.1.6 Meeting Aichi Target 11: What does success look like for protected area systems?	10
3.1.7 Science based interpretation of “Other effective area-based conservations measures in Aichi Target 11, with specific reference to marine areas.”	10
3.1.8 Science based interpretation of other-effective area-based conservation measures in Aichi Target 11 with specific reference to marine areas	10
3.1.9 Considerations, variables and potential examples: Target 11 Private Lands	10
3.1.10 Overview of key issues related to “other effective area based conservation measures” in the context of achieving quantitative coverage of Aichi Target 11	10
3.2 Day 1: Tuesday, 5 February 2013 - Panel Discussion.....	11
3.2.1 Panel Discussion	11
3.3 Day 2: Wednesday, 6 February 2013	11
3.3.1 Panel Discussion: Theory to practice – Issues, criteria and examples of “other effective area-based conservation measures”	11
3.3.2 Plenary Discussion: Concerning the scope of “other effective area-based conservation measures”.....	12
3.3.3 Plenary Discussion: Introducing and refining a tool for assessing “other effective area-based conservation measures”.....	12
3.3.4 Small Group Discussions: Identifying criteria for “other effective area-based conservation measures”	12
3.4 Day 3: Thursday, 7 February 2013.....	13
3.4.1 Plenary Discussion: Identifying key issues related to further development of the Screening Tool for assessing “other effective area-based conservation measures”.....	13
3.4.2 Plenary Discussion: Applying Aichi Target 11 Screening Tool to some potential examples of “other effective area-based conservation measures.”.....	13
3.4.3 Plenary Discussion: Call for consensus on workshop recommendations and key issues	13
4 APPENDIX	14

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview of the Workshop

The Canadian Council on Ecological Areas (CCEA) hosted a national workshop February 5-7, 2013, on interpreting Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in the Canadian context.

Target 11 states:

“By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.”

The workshop focused on the Target 11 phrase “... other effective area-based conservation measures ...” (OEABCMs), which also appears in Canada’s proposed 2020 biodiversity goals and targets (described below). Representatives of Canadian protected area and conservation agencies, CCEA directors, as well as representatives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Secretariat, International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), land stewardship organizations, Aboriginal organizations, universities, and other experts were invited to participate (Table 1). The workshop agenda can be found in the Appendix to this report.

1.2 Workshop Goal

The goal of the workshop was to come to consensus on and develop clear guidance on the interpretation of OEABCMs for the purpose of tracking and reporting progress towards meeting this part of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11.

1.3 Context

In 2010, the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity for the 2011-2020 period, including the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (<http://www.cbd.int/sp/>). The Strategic Plan includes five goals and 20 inter-related targets aimed at halting the global loss of biodiversity. Target 11 is related to Strategic Goal C, which is “*To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity.*”

Parties (including Canada) were also urged to develop domestic biodiversity goals and targets, using the Strategic Plan as a flexible guide. Canada’s federal, provincial, and territorial governments are in the process of developing

aspirational biodiversity goals and targets for Canada, with input from Aboriginal and stakeholder groups. Target 1 of Canada’s proposed 2020 biodiversity goals and targets is directly related to Aichi target 11:

“By 2020, at least 17 percent of terrestrial areas and inland water, and 10 percent of coastal and marine areas, are conserved through networks of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures.”

As a note of clarification, despite the differences in wording between Aichi Target 11 and Canada’s proposed Target 1, a federal representative of the federal/provincial/territorial Biodiversity Working Group responsible for developing Canada’s domestic targets, when questioned, stated that the two targets are intended to encompass exactly the same kinds of areas, so that guidance developed to interpret Aichi Target 11 will be equally applicable to Canada’s proposed Target 1.

A clear and consistent interpretation of the term and the context of “*other effective area-based conservation measures*” will help Canada track and report progress toward its national biodiversity target, as well as its contribution to the global Aichi Target 11.

CCEA has a mission to facilitate and assist Canadians with the establishment and management of a comprehensive network of protected areas representative of Canada’s terrestrial and aquatic ecological natural diversity. CCEA’s objectives include determining the ecological requirements and institutional arrangements needed to secure the integrity of protected area networks; advancing sound stewardship, management, monitoring, and reporting of protected areas; and facilitating the exchange of relevant information among interested partners through regional and national forums. Most of CCEA’s members and collaborators work in protected areas agencies and organizations or otherwise possess considerable expertise in the field, and work with CCEA to develop sound, science-based guidance and recommendations in support of protected areas policy, planning and management.

CCEA is a member of IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature) and maintains the national Conservation Areas Reporting and Tracking System (CARTS). CARTS is used by all federal, provincial, and territorial protected area and park agencies to report on protected areas systems across Canada. CARTS makes use of the IUCN protected area definition and categories as its standardized framework for reporting. Adherence to the IUCN guidelines and standards allows CARTS to

Table 1. Affiliations of Workshop Participants

Federal Government	
Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada	1
Parks Canada Agency	1
Environment Canada	8
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	6
Provincial/Territorial Government	
Alberta	1
Manitoba	2
New Brunswick	1
Northwest Territories	1
Nova Scotia	1
Ontario	1
Québec	1
Saskatchewan	1
Yukon	1
Aboriginal Organizations	
Cree Regional Authority	1
Non-Governmental Organizations	
Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society	2
CCEA (Recorder, Facilitator, Contractor)	3
Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat	1
IUCN Global Programme on Protected Areas	1
Nature Canada	1
Nature Conservancy of Canada	3
Nature Trust of New Brunswick,	1
World Commission on Protected Areas (Past Chair)	1
Academia	
Concordia University	2
Dalhousie University	1
University of Waterloo,	1
Total Number of Participants	44

be used for inter-jurisdictional comparisons and for national and global protected areas reporting. CARTS also makes protected areas data available in Google Earth and database formats, enabling anyone with a computer to visualize, explore, and analyze Canada's systems of protected areas (http://www.ccea.org/en_carts.html).

CCEA is uniquely positioned to facilitate the development of a science-based consensus on the interpretation of Aichi Target 11 in the Canadian context, and guidance for reporting on progress towards the target.

1.4 Purpose of the Workshop

Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 addresses two major aspects of protected areas:

- 1) coverage (which includes representativeness, connectivity, and ecological importance) and;
- 2) management (which includes effective management, sound governance, sustainable finance, and an enabling policy environment).

Target 11 calls for the conservation of at least 17 percent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 percent of coastal and marine areas. The target also includes terms that help to qualify the type and location of areas to be created. Of particular focus for this workshop is the qualifier “*other effective area-based conservation measures*”.

Embedded within both the CBD *Programme of Work on Protected Areas*¹ (PoWPA) and Aichi Target 11 is the notion that protected areas can include not only formally designated, state-owned protected areas, but also private reserves, as well as Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs). The inclusion of “*other effective area-based conservation measures*” acknowledges that some private reserves and ICCAs legitimately meet IUCN's protected area definition and should be recognized as contributing to Target 11, but have not traditionally been reported in national reporting systems (such as CARTS).

Beyond the specific acknowledgement in IUCN guidance and the Programme of Work on Protected Areas that ICCAs and private reserves may qualify as protected areas in certain circumstances, there has been some debate on whether and to what extent other types of area-based measures should be considered to contribute to Aichi Target 11. Specific examples that have been raised for consideration in the Canadian context include some private protected lands and conservation easements not already reported in CARTS, fishery closures, municipal water supply protection areas, and watercourse setbacks.

CCEA is developing CARTS into a tool that can track Canada's contributions toward Aichi Target 11 and Canada's proposed Target 1. As such, a need was recognized for discussion and consensus-building on whether and to what extent the inclusion of “*other effective area-based conservation measures*” requires changes to criteria for reporting to CARTS or the creation of a subset within CARTS for reporting OEABCMs. CCEA is concerned that without a science-based, standardized approach to reporting on Aichi Target 11, area-based measures of limited conservation value could eventually be included in CARTS, giving false or misleading impressions of conservation progress, and undermining CARTS as a credible, independent, science-based reporting tool.

CCEA is also concerned that if the large number of agencies and organizations responsible for protected areas and OEABCMs adopt different approaches to reporting, comparisons among them, as well as roll-ups to the national level, will be flawed. CCEA sees Aichi Target 11 as being primarily intended to build upon previous targets, such as the 1987 Brundtland Commission's 12%, Canada's 1992 *Statement of Commitment to Complete Canada's Networks of Protected Areas*, and the 1995 *Canadian Biodiversity Strategy*.

However, it is important to recognize the valuable contribution of some conservation measures that haven't traditionally been recognized or reported on. Giving recognition to those conservation measures that effectively conserve natural areas and the biodiversity they support leads to real gains in biodiversity conservation.

1.5 Format of the Workshop

Day 1 of the three-day workshop began with an overview of the purpose and operating principles for the workshop. This was followed by presentations providing further background, international context, and guidance for the workshop. Links to the presentations are provided in Section 3.1.

Presentations were followed by a panel discussion in which participants were given an opportunity to question and challenge presenters and explore the topic further, with the overall goal of clarifying how international guidance might be applied in the Canadian context.

Day 2 began with an overview of the workshop process, followed by a panel discussion led by protected area practitioners on issues, criteria for, and examples of OEABCMs. A draft decision tool for assessing the effectiveness of, and potentially screening, OEABCMs was introduced and refined through plenary and small-group discussions.

¹ See for example PoWPA Goal 2.1.2, emphasizing diverse governance types of protected areas, including ICCAs and private reserves.

Day 3 began with a plenary discussion of key issues related to further development of the decision screening tool, followed presentations of trial applications of the tool to real-world examples of areas either currently reported, or likely to be considered for reporting, in CARTS. The workshop ended with the development of consensus-based statements of key necessary traits of OEABCMS, and recommendations for further work on the development of the decision screening tool, with the goal of incorporating guidance regarding OEABCMS into a revised edition of CCEA's *Canadian Guidebook for the Application of IUCN Protected Area Categories*.

2 RESULTS

The workshop resulted in a number of products that will assist in the development of, and provide content for, the 2nd version of CCEA's *Canadian Guidebook for the Application of IUCN Protected Area Categories*. These products include recommendations and consensus statements of the workshop participants, a draft decision tool for screening OEABCMs, and this report

2.1 Overall Workshop Recommendation

The overarching recommendation of the workshop participants was stated as follows:

"We, the CCEA Workshop 2013 participants, acknowledge that consensus agreement was achieved on the five major issues to be considered when screening Aichi Target 11 "other effective area-based conservation measures" (OEABCMs). We recommend that the draft Screening Tool for Target 11 OEABCMs, as well as the advice provided through the practical application of the draft tool to particular examples, be further developed and reviewed, with the ultimate intention of being incorporated into the 2nd version of CCEA's Canadian Guidebook for the Application of IUCN Protected Area Categories."

2.2 Consensus Statements on the Five Major Issues Concerning "Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures"

The following set of agreed consensus statements was developed by the workshop participants to describe the major traits that OEABCMs should have in order to be recognized as contributing to Aichi Target 11. All statements refer to all governance types: governance by government, shared governance, private governance, and governance by indigenous peoples and local communities.

1. Purpose of area-based measure / intention

"Areas included under Target 11 as OEABCMs must have an expressed purpose to conserve nature (biodiversity). We understand that this purpose might be achieved as a co-benefit of other management purposes or activities."

2. Long term

"Areas included under Target 11 as OEABCMs must be managed for the long term to be effective. We accept a working definition of long term to mean there is an expectation that conservation will continue indefinitely."

3. Importance of nature conservation objectives

"In areas included under Target 11 as OEABCMs, in cases of conflict with other objectives, nature conservation objectives shall not be compromised."

4. Nature conservation outcomes

"Areas included under Target 11 as OEABCMs should result in effective and significant nature (biodiversity) conservation outcomes. When there are existing measures/areas that are to be considered as OEABCMs, evidence of conservation outcomes should be used as part of the screening process."

5. Strength of conservation measures

"Areas included under Target 11 as OEABCMs should have a management regime that, through one or more measures that are effective alone or in combination, can reasonably be expected to be strong enough to ensure effective conservation, and if there are gaps, these will be addressed over time."

2.3 A Draft Decision Screening Tool for "Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures"

The workshop developed a Draft Decision Screening Tool to guide Canadian jurisdictions in decisions pertaining to OEABCMs under Target 11 of the *Aichi Biodiversity Targets*, and specifically Strategic Goal C: Improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species, and genetic diversity.

The process of developing the tool involved three major steps:

- 1) Identification of characteristics or elements pertinent to determining conservation effectiveness;
- 2) Identification of discrete criteria that describe each of the characteristics, along a spectrum of most effective (on the left) to least effective (on the right) for the conservation of biodiversity;
- 3) Finally, identification of those criteria that that would help define Target 11 OEABCMs (green, on left of Table 1); those criteria that would define conservation measures not sufficiently effective to be Target 11 OEABCMs (red, on right of Table 1); and those criteria that require further conditions or rationale in order to define conservation measures that would be sufficiently effective to be Target 11 OEABCMs (yellow, in centre of Table 1).

2.4 Recommended Improvements to the Screening Tool

The following improvements were discussed prior to the development of the workshop consensus statements, which resolve a number of these issues (see Section 2.2 of this report):

- Clarify outstanding issues such as the meaning of “long term” as well as the purpose of the measure
- Require resolution on how the intent of the conservation measure should be recognized
- Distinguish between protected areas and OEABCMs within the screening tool
- Ensure that the tool can assess whether the conservation measure is designed to manage relevant threats, both current and foreseeable (also tied in to the “long-term” issue)
- Define what is meant by “governing authority,” which is especially complicated in government context: which level or the government as a whole?
- Provide more detailed guidance on governing authority (“responsible authority”) and legality, including if authority is “partial,” should the conservation areas ever be counted as “effective”?
- Add a row that addresses whether the managing agency has the authority to report under Target 11?
- Acknowledge and provide for areas that have privacy issues related to data
- Language very “government centric:” expand criteria to reflect conservation measures within all governance types, especially private lands and indigenous conservation measures. For example, the current “binding” criteria may not cover non-government types of conservation measures
- Develop the “binding” descriptor/criteria to apply to both surface and subsurface rights
- Ensure that tool addresses when and when not the activities permissible or grandfathered under the conservation measure negate the capacity to manage for biodiversity conservation (see context of language in Category VI regarding activities and extent, such as absorbed, mitigate, etc.)
- Consider putting back into the screening tool the “outtakes” related to conservation outcomes
- Consider removing “by consensus” in jurisdictional row
- Need to provide for the case that assessor may answer “unknown” to any of the descriptors

Table 2. Draft Decision Screening Tool for “Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures”

LEVEL OF AGREEMENT REGARDING POTENTIAL EFFECTIVENESS				
GREEN	Agreement on criteria that would help define “Target 11 other effective area-based conservation measures”			
YELLOW	Disagreement or hesitation on whether criteria defines a measure sufficiently effective to be “Target 11 OEAbCMs”			
RED	Agreement on criteria that define measures not sufficiently effective to be “Target 11 OEAbCMs”			
DEFINITIONS				
CONSERVATION	Conservation, in this context, refers to the in-situ maintenance of ecosystems and natural and semi-natural habitats and of viable populations of species in natural surroundings.			
BIODIVERSITY	Biodiversity, in this context, refers to the variability among living organisms from all sources including, inter alia, terrestrial, marine, and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are a part; this includes the diversity within species, between species, and of ecosystems.			
CONTEXT				
GOAL C: Improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species, and genetic diversity				
PRIMARY MEASURING STICK FOR ASSESSING EFFECTIVENESS: THE LONG-TERM CONSERVATION OF BIODIVERSITY				
LEFT SIDE - GREATER POTENTIAL EFFECTIVENESS			RIGHT SIDE - LESS POTENTIAL EFFECTIVENESS	
GEOGRAPHICAL SPACE	The geographical space is well-defined	The geographical space is not well-defined	The measure is not area-based	
PRIMACY OF OBJECTIVE OF CONSERVATION OF NATURE	The conservation of biodiversity is the primary overriding objective	There are multiple objectives of equal priority in addition to the conservation of biodiversity	There are objectives that have primacy over the conservation of biodiversity, but conservation of biodiversity is still an objective	The conservation of biodiversity is not an objective
SCOPE OF CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES	The objectives are for the conservation of biodiversity as a whole, including ecosystems, species, and genetic diversity	The objectives are for the conservation of multiple elements of biodiversity, such as a species, group of species, habitat, or array of habitats, but not biodiversity as a whole	The objectives are for the conservation of one element of biodiversity, such as a species or habitat, but not biodiversity as a whole	The objectives are not for the conservation of any elements of biodiversity

Table 2 Continued. Draft Decision Screening Tool for “Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures”

PRIMARY MEASURING STICK FOR ASSESSING EFFECTIVENESS: THE LONG-TERM CONSERVATION OF BIODIVERSITY				
LEFT SIDE - GREATER POTENTIAL EFFECTIVENESS			RIGHT SIDE - LESS POTENTIAL EFFECTIVENESS	
GOVERNING AUTHORITY	The governing authority(ies) has established the conservation of biodiversity as the sole mandate	The governing authority(ies) has multiple mandates, but the primary mandate is the conservation of biodiversity	The governing authority(ies) has multiple competing mandates, one of which is the conservation of biodiversity	The governing authority(ies) has no mandate for the conservation of biodiversity
JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY/RECOGNIZED	The governing authority has full jurisdiction to set permissible activities	The governing authority shares jurisdiction to set permissible activities by consensus	The governing authority has partial jurisdiction to set permissible activities	The governing authority has no jurisdiction to set permissible activities
BINDING	The mechanism binds the governing authority and all others	The mechanism binds the governing authority but not all others	The mechanism does not bind the governing authority but binds all others	The mechanism is voluntary
ENFORCEABILITY	The mechanism is highly enforceable	The mechanism is somewhat enforceable	The mechanism is poorly or not enforceable	
LEGAL OR OTHER EFFECTIVE MEANS	The mechanism has the power and breadth to control all activities occurring within the area that could have impacts on biodiversity	The mechanism has the power and breadth to control some activities occurring within the area that could have impacts on biodiversity	The mechanism does not have the power and breadth to control activities occurring within the area that could have impacts on biodiversity	
LONG-TERM	The mechanism is intended to be in effect in perpetuity	The mechanism is intended to be an interim step towards becoming in effect in perpetuity	The mechanism is intended to be in effect for the long term, but not in perpetuity	The mechanism is intended to be in effect for only a specific period of time, or indefinitely, but not in perpetuity
DEDICATED	The mechanism can be reversed only with great difficulty	The mechanism can be reversed with moderate difficulty	The mechanism can be reversed without much difficulty	

Table 2 Continued. Draft Decision Screening Tool for “Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures”

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR POSSIBLE INCLUSION IN SCREENING TOOL OR IN ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE							
GEOGRAPHICAL SPACE/ADEQUACY	The space is sufficiently large and encompassing for its biodiversity objectives to be achieved	The space is not sufficiently large and encompassing that its biodiversity objectives can be achieved					
CONSERVATION TARGETS	The space is located in an area that is of high value for biodiversity conservation	The space is not located in an area that is of high value for biodiversity conservation					
CONSERVATION OUTCOMES	The outcomes are conservation of biodiversity as a whole, including ecosystems, species, and genetic diversity	The outcomes are the conservation of multiple elements of biodiversity, such as a species, group of species, habitat, or array of habitats, but not biodiversity as a whole	The outcomes are the conservation of one element of biodiversity, such as a species or habitat, but not biodiversity as a whole	The outcome is no conservation of any element of biodiversity			
MANAGED TO ACHIEVE	The area is effectively managed to achieve its conservation objectives (for example as evaluated using IUCN management effectiveness guidelines)	The area is somewhat effectively managed to achieve its conservation objectives (for example as evaluated using IUCN management effectiveness guidelines)	The area is not effectively managed to achieve its conservation objectives (for example as evaluated using IUCN management effectiveness guidelines)				
LEGAL OR OTHER EFFECTIVE MEANS	The mechanism is one or more laws or regulations enforceable by federal, provincial, territorial, First Nations, or municipal government, which applies regardless of ownership of the area	The mechanism is ownership by a not-for-profit organization with a primary mandate for the long-term conservation of biodiversity, whose adherence to their by-laws is overseen by a federal, provincial, territorial, First Nations, or municipal government	The mechanism is a legally binding agreement, easement, covenant, or contract enforceable by civil action and held by an organization or agency with a primary mandate for the long-term conservation of biodiversity	The mechanism is an international convention enforceable by sanctions	The mechanism is a land- or water-use plan or zone, whether government, corporate, NGO, First Nations, community, or private citizen, which is legally binding and enforceable	The mechanism is a policy, agreement, resource management plan, land- or water-use plan or zone, whether government, corporate, NGO, First Nations, community, or private citizen, which is not binding or enforceable	Is an international convention which is not enforceable

3 WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS

3.1 Day 1: Tuesday, 5 February 2013 - Presentations (click on title to link to presentation)

3.1.1 Welcome and introduction

(David MacKinnon, Chair, CCEA)

3.1.2 Welcome from Environment Canada

(Virginia Potter, Director General, Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada)

3.1.3 Canadian policy context: 2020 Biodiversity goals, targets and indicators for Canada

(Robert McLean, Executive Director, Wildlife Program Policy, Environment Canada)

3.1.4 Origins of Target 11 with specific references to the Convention on Biological Diversity Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) and “other effective area-based conservation measures”

(Charles Besançon, LifeWeb Initiative Coordinator, Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity)

3.1.5 IUCN Interpretation of “other effective area-based conservation measures”

(Nik Lopoukhine, Former Chair, IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas)

3.1.6 Meeting Aichi Target 11: What does success look like for protected area systems?

(Stephen Woodley, Senior Advisory, Biodiversity and Climate Change, IUCN Global Protected Areas Program)

3.1.7 Science based interpretation of “Other effective area-based conservations measures in Aichi Target 11, with specific reference to marine areas.”

(Jake Rice, Senior National Ecosystem Science Advisor, Ecosystem Science Directorate, Canada Department of Fisheries and Oceans)

3.1.8 Science based interpretation of other-effective area-based conservation measures in Aichi Target 11 with specific reference to marine areas

(Sabine Jessen, National Manager of Oceans and Great Freshwater Lakes Program and BC Marine Conservation Director, Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society)

3.1.9 Considerations, variables and potential examples: Target 11 Private Lands

(John Riley and Colin Anderson, Nature Conservancy of Canada)
- PRESENTATION UNAVAILABLE

3.1.10 Overview of key issues related to “other effective area based conservation measures” in the context of achieving quantitative coverage of Aichi Target 11

(David MacKinnon and Jacques Perron)

3.2 Day 1: Tuesday, 5 February 2013 - Panel Discussion

3.2.1 Panel Discussion

(Charles Besançon, Nik Loupoukhine, Stephen Woodley, Jake Rice, Sabine Jessen, David MacKinnon, John Riley and Karen Beazley (Moderator))

Participants had an opportunity to engage with speakers to question, challenge, and explore how to apply theory to practice. Many issues were raised from a wide range of participants through these exchanges.

Questions raised focused around:

- Where do we draw the line between “conservation measures” and “effective conservation measures”?
- What do we account for under “other area-based conservation measures”?
- What counts under 17 and 10 percent?
- What should not be counted in Target 11?

In general, there was broad support for strong biodiversity measures and the IUCN protected area definition and management category goals. However, there were differences of opinion on how far beyond the definition of protected areas as OEABCMs should be interpreted to extend. Many participants (including some who were present at Nagoya during the negotiation of the target’s language) perceived that OEABCMs were meant to be limited to areas that essentially satisfy the definition of a protected area but which have not traditionally been reported to CARTS (e.g., some privately protected lands and ICCAs). Some others (also including some who were present at Nagoya during negotiation of the target’s language) perceived that OEABCMs were meant to be interpreted more broadly (e.g., a wider range of privately conserved lands and ICCAs, as well as some fisheries closures and many other types of area-based measures). Some suggested that if more measures were to be recognized, differing degrees of effectiveness should also be recognized. Others asserted that protected areas are the primary thrust of Aichi Target 11, and that whatever other areas are included in accounting for OEABCMs, they will be only a small percentage of the total. The focus should be on making a meaningful contribution to the conservation of biodiversity.

There was recognition that the Convention on Biological Diversity’s objective is to deliver biodiversity conservation using the tools that do it best and most effectively, and that area-based measures are under-utilized.

Concerns were raised that criteria-based approaches to “other effective area-based conservation measures” may be seen as judgmental or be politically based, with

no policy guides associated with them, and that a more science-based approach is needed. Concerns were also raised that the term “other effective area-based conservation measures” may be vague in terms of intended effectiveness of biodiversity outcomes, with many kinds of areas of varying degrees of effectiveness potentially needing to be considered. Some participants observed or expected that political pressure to count enough areas to meet the target was being or would be exerted, potentially countering efforts to adhere to a science-based approach. There was recognition that Aichi Target 11 is not the only target for which spatial conservation measures are applicable, and that not all spatial measures should be counted towards Target 11 if they more appropriately fit under another target.

3.3 Day 2: Wednesday, 6 February 2013

3.3.1 Panel Discussion: Theory to practice – Issues, criteria and examples of “other effective area-based conservation measures”

(Heather Lazaruk, Jacques Perron, Yvonne Beaubien, Claudia Haas, Heather Arnold, Mary Rothfels)

Panel members provided valuable feedback on the possible considerations and implementation of OEABCMs. These discussions emphasized the challenges and opportunities, and highlighted the breadth of organizations and sectors that have a role to play.

Panel discussions can be summarized as follows:

- Don’t water down Target 11 just to meet the target; don’t funnel all the criteria through the Target 11 door;
- Other sites may represent options (e.g., UNESCO sites, community pastures [in the process of figuring out how to give more protection], as well as Aboriginal lands);
- Private lands in the NWT are mostly Aboriginal lands, so some ICCAs are reported as IUCN protected areas in CARTS (legally established, but not under Acts);
- Other effective measures to protect land are in place in NWT, but may not fit with globally recognized approaches (e.g., there is a strong link between Aboriginal culture and the land, and a focus on land-use planning, but plans are reviewed every five years, potentially making biodiversity outcomes uncertain over the long term);
- The Aichi Target 11 process can be used to make a change - to move forward to protect biodiversity, including outside of the protected areas box. The focus should not be on counting lots of areas but rather on making areas that are meaningful for the

conservation of biodiversity. There are new tools coming out of Alberta to manage biodiversity that are not traditional protected areas. It's not clear how/if they might count towards Target 11.

- Considering the National Framework for MPA planning, not all marine spatial conservation measures should be counted towards Aichi Target 6. Some may apply to Target 11. A key issue is whether a measure is long-term. Target 6 and Target 11 marine measures should be reported on separately.
- Private landowners may create biodiversity outcomes that contribute to several Aichi targets, sometimes including Target 11. These need to be accounted for adequately. Agreements with conservation agencies and provincial/territorial governments will permit their contribution to be recognized;
- How adequate is the conservation of moving and wide-ranging wildlife populations? Are caribou calving areas which are demarcated on a chart, protected effectively, and reviewed every ten years OEABCMs? They may be effective while in place, but aren't in place for the long-term, so shouldn't be counted as Aichi Target 11 OEABCMs.

3.3.2 Plenary Discussion: Concerning the scope of "other effective area-based conservation measures"

- Workshop participants agreed that it would not be useful at this point in time to call for consensus on the scope of other effective measures (that is, whether they were captured in the IUCN definition of protected areas)
- Recommended that workshop discussions continue on criteria for other effective measures

3.3.3 Plenary Discussion: Introducing and refining a tool for assessing "other effective area-based conservation measures"

- Workshop participants recommended changes to the preliminary version of Screening Tool (Table 2), to ensure a complete list of criteria describing the full spectrum of effectiveness for biodiversity conservation was included (Table 3).

Table 2: Preliminary version 1 of Screening Tool for Assessing "Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures"

http://www.ccea.org/Downloads/WorkshopTool_v1_As_First_Presented_In_Plenary_Feb6_2013.xls

Table 3: Revised version 2 of Screening Tool for Assessing "Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures"

http://www.ccea.org/Downloads/WorkshopTool_v2_For_Review_by_5_Groups_Feb6_2013.xls

3.3.4 Small Group Discussions: Identifying criteria for "other effective area-based conservation measures"

- Participants were divided into five small groups and continued to revise the screening tool and to group criteria into the following categories:
 - Green = agreement of group that criteria helps define a protected area
 - Green hatch = agreement of group that criteria helps define a Target 11 "other effective area-based conservation measure" (OEABCM)
 - Red = agreement of group on criteria that define measures not sufficiently effective to be Target 11 PAs & OEABCMs
 - Yellow = disagreement or hesitation on whether criteria defines a measure sufficiently effective to be Target 11 PAs & OEABCMs
- The results of all five of the small groups were all captured in Table 4.
- A revised version of the screening tool was produced to synthesize the recommended revisions of all of the small groups (Table 5).
- In the end, working groups made almost no distinction between criteria and thresholds of effectiveness necessary to define a protected area and those necessary to make an OEABCM effective.

Table 4: Revised version 3 of Screening Tool for Assessing "Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures"

http://www.ccea.org/Downloads/WorkshopTool_v3_Compiled_Responses_from_5_Review_Groups_Feb7_2013.xls

Table 5: Revised version 4 of Screening Tool for Assessing "Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures"

http://www.ccea.org/Downloads/WorkshopTool_v4_As_reviewed_using_jurisdictional_examples_Feb7_2013.xls

3.4 Day 3: Thursday, 7 February 2013

3.4.1 Plenary Discussion: Identifying key issues related to further development of the Screening Tool for assessing “other effective area-based conservation measures”

The following key issues were identified:

- Expressed management intent vs. outcomes
- What do we mean by “long term”?
- Dominance of the “primacy of nature” objective
- Reversibility of binding commitment – what is actually strong enough (i.e. any decision, even those made by Cabinet, could be overturned in the future)?

3.4.2 Plenary Discussion: Applying Aichi Target 11 Screening Tool to some potential examples of “other effective area-based conservation measures.”

Version 4 of Screening Tool for Assessing “Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures” (Table 5) was used to assess five conservation measures and recommend improvements to the Draft Screening Tool.

3.4.3 Plenary Discussion: Call for consensus on workshop recommendations and key issues

Statements regarding five key issues were posted for consideration:

- Issue 1: Purpose of area-based measure / intention
- Issue 2: Long term
- Issue 3: Importance of nature conservation objectives
- Issue 4: Nature conservation outcomes
- Issue 5: Strength of conservation measures

The workshop agreed in concept with all statements, and then consensus agreement was reached on each statement after wording was reworked. The resulting consensus statements are presented in sections 2.1 and 2.2.

4 APPENDIX



AGENDA

Minto Suite Hotel - Ottawa

February 4-8, 2013

Interpreting Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in the Canadian Context:
Towards Consensus on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4

18:00 - 22:00

ARRIVAL, REGISTRATION & RECEPTION
Salon Earl Grey (Minto Suite Hotel - Ottawa)

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5 (Salon Leger A&B Minto Suite Hotel)

8:00 **ARRIVAL AND REGISTRATION**
Salon Leger A&B (Minto Suite Hotel - Ottawa)

8:30 **WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS**

Welcome from the CCEA
David MacKinnon, Government of Nova Scotia & CCEA Chair

8:45 **Welcome from Environment Canada**
Virginia Potter, Director General, Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada

9:00 **Canada and the Convention of Biological Diversity**
Robert McLean, Executive Director, Wildlife Program Policy, Environment Canada

9:15 **Origins of Target 11 with specific references to the Convention on Biological Diversity Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) and “other effective area-based conservation measures”**
Charles Besançon, LifeWeb Initiative Coordinator, Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters, Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity

10:30 **BREAK (Provided)**

10:45 **IUCN Interpretation of “other effective area-based conservation measures”**
Nik Loupoukhine, Past Chair, IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas

11:30 **Meeting Aichi Target 11: What does success look like for protected area systems?**
Stephen Woodley, Senior Advisor, Biodiversity and Climate Change, IUCN Global Protected Areas Program

12:15 **LUNCH (Provided)**

13:15 **Science-based interpretation of “other effective area-based conservation measures” in Aichi Target 11, with specific reference to marine areas**
Jake Rice, Senior National Ecosystem Science Advisor, Ecosystem Science Directorate, Department of Fisheries and Ocean

14:00 **Science-based interpretation of “other effective area-based conservation measures” in Aichi Target 11, with specific reference to marine areas**
Sabine Jessen, National Manager of Oceans and Great Freshwater Lakes Program and BC Marine Conservation Director, Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society

14:45 **BREAK (Provided)**

15:00 **Considerations, criteria and potential examples: Target 11 Private Lands**
John Riley and Colin Anderson, Nature Conservancy of Canada

15:30 **PANEL DISCUSSION**
Charles Besançon, Nik Loupoukhine, Stephen Woodley, Jake Rice, Sabine Jessen, David MacKinnon, and Karen Beazley (Moderator)

16:30 **Overview of key issues related to “other effective area-based conservation measures” in the context of achieving quantitative coverage of Aichi Target 11**
David MacKinnon, Jacques Perron, Registrar of Protected Areas, MDDEFP-Québec

17:00 **WRAP-UP**

**WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6
(Salon Leger A&B Minto Suite Hotel)**

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>8:30 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION
<i>David MacKinnon, Government of Nova Scotia & CCEA Chair</i></p> <p>8:45 Overview of Workshop Process
<i>Pauline Lynch-Stewart, Lynch-Stewart & Associates</i></p> <p>9:00 Panel Discussion: Theory to practice – Issues, criteria and examples of “other effective area-based conservation measures”
<i>Panellists to be confirmed</i></p> <p>10:00 BREAK (Provided)</p> <p>10:15 Plenary Discussion and Call for Consensus: Workshop Recommendation 1 – Concerning the scope of “other effective area-based conservation measures.”</p> <p>11:15 Plenary Discussion: Introducing and refining a tool for assessing “other effective area-based conservation measures”</p> <p>12:00 LUNCH (Provided)</p> | <p>13:00 Plenary Discussion: Introducing and refining a tool for assessing “other effective area-based conservation measures” (Continued)</p> <p>13:30 Small Group Discussions: Identifying criteria for “other effective area-based conservation measures”</p> <p>14:30 BREAK (Provided)</p> <p>14:45 Group Reports</p> <p>15:15 BREAK</p> <p>15:30 Plenary Discussion: Identifying criteria for “other effective area-based conservation measures” and developing the Aichi Target 11 Coverage Tool”</p> <p>16:30 Call for Consensus: Workshop Recommendation 2 – Concerning the criteria of “other effective area-based conservation measures.”</p> <p>16:45 Closing Remarks
<i>David MacKinnon, Government of Nova Scotia & CCEA Chair</i></p> <p>17:00 WRAP-UP</p> |
|---|--|

**THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7
(Salon Leger A&B Minto Suite Hotel)**

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>8:30 Opening Remarks and Workshop Process
<i>David MacKinnon, Government of Nova Scotia & CCEA and Chair Pauline Lynch-Stewart, Lynch-Stewart & Associates</i></p> <p>8:45 Plenary Discussion: Additional guidance for “other effective area-based conservation measures”</p> <p>9:45 Call for Consensus: Workshop Recommendation 3 – Concerning additional guidance on “other effective area-based conservation measures.”</p> <p>10:00 BREAK (Provided)</p> <p>10:15 Presentation: Proposed screening criteria for Canada’s approach to reporting on “other (marine effective area based conservation measures” in national Biodiversity Target 1 and international Aichi Target 11
<i>Jessica Mitchell, Department of Fisheries and Ocean</i></p> <p>11:00 Plenary Discussion: Applying Aichi Target 11 Coverage Tool to determine some examples of “other effective area-based conservation measures.”</p> <p>12:00 LUNCH (Provided)</p> <p>13:00 Plenary Discussion: Applying Aichi Target 11 Coverage Tool to determine some examples of “other effective area-based conservation measures.” (Continued)</p> <p>14:30 BREAK (Provided)</p> | <p>14:45 Plenary Discussion: Applying Aichi Target 11 Coverage Tool to determine some examples of “other effective area-based conservation measures.” (Continued)</p> <p>15:45 Call for Consensus: Workshop Recommendation 4 – Concerning the examples of “other effective area-based conservation measures.”</p> <p>16:15 Closing Remarks
<i>David MacKinnon, Government of Nova Scotia & CCEA Chair</i></p> <p>17:00 WRAP-UP</p> |
|--|--|

**THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7
BANQUET
(Salon Earl Grey Minto Suite Hotel)**

19:45 CCEA Banquet and CCEA “Gold Leaf” Awards



FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8
(Salon Leger A&B Minto Suite Hotel)

- 8:30 **CCEA OPENING REMARKS**
David MacKinnon, Government of Nova Scotia & CCEA Chair
- 8:45 **CCEA Current and Future Projects**
Various Presenters
- 10:00 **BREAK (Provided)**
- 10:15 **CCEA Jurisdictional Reports and Roundtable**
- 12:00 **WRAP-UP AND ADJOURN**