

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

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

**VANCOUVER, CANADA**

**13 – 17 FEBRUARY 2017**

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

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

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

**Contacts:** [kathy.mackinnon@iucn.org](mailto:kathy.mackinnon@iucn.org) and [harry@naturaljustice.org](mailto:harry@naturaljustice.org)

## BACKGROUND

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

*By 2020 at least 17 % of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 % 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 landscape and seascape.***

While substantial progress has been made on expanding national and global protected area systems over the past six years, it has not been matched in terms of better defining what would 'count' as other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs). In response, the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) set up a [Task Force](#) in September 2015 to provide guidance on this issue and a [first international meeting](#) was held in January 2016 in Cambridge, UK. The outcomes of that meeting were presented at the twentieth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the CBD (Montreal, April 2016), at which the work of the WCPA Task Force on OECMs was formally acknowledged.

A [second meeting](#) of the Task Force was convened in Vilm (Germany) in July 2016. At that meeting, participants presented case studies of potential OECMs, which contributed among other things to the development of a protected area-OECM comparison table and screening tool. The results of the first two meetings were drawn on to develop a [consultation document](#) that was circulated to Task Force members in October 2016. The inputs were collated and formed the basis of the first draft of guidance on OECMs. The core elements of the draft guidance were presented at the World Conservation Congress (Hawai'i, September 2016) and at the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP-13) to the CBD (Mexico, December 2016). COP-13 adopted five decisions containing references to OECMs, illustrating the increasing focus that parties to the CBD are placing on OECMs.

Participants of the Vancouver meeting received a copy of the draft guidance and were asked to use it to develop at least one case study of a potential OECM. At the meeting, participants presented their case studies and worked to improve the draft guidance.

## OVERVIEW OF THE MEETING

From 13-17 February, participants met at the Listel Hotel, Vancouver (Canada) to present case studies and enhance the draft guidance on OECMs (see agenda in **Annex I**). Participants at the meeting were drawn from diverse geographical and institutional backgrounds, reflecting the breadth of conservation efforts in the wider land- and seascapes (see **Annex II**).

The following individuals presented Canadian case studies and related initiatives:

- Alexandra Barron (Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society (CPAWS)-BC Ocean Conservation Manager): Rockfish Conservation Areas;
- Bill Wareham (David Suzuki Foundation): Rockfish Conservation Areas;
- Charles Short (BC Forest and Natural Resources Lands Operations): Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures - A Provincial Context;
- Christie Chute (Fisheries and Oceans Canada): Fisheries and Oceans Canada's Operational Guidance for Identifying Marine 'Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures;
- Kim Dunn (World Wildlife Fund): WWF-Canada: 30 Coral Closure - National and International Waters;
- Kim Sander Wright (ICCA Consortium): OECMs: An Opportunity to Advance the Rights of Canada's Indigenous Peoples;
- Linda Nowlan (West Coast Environmental Law): BC Central Coast Example - MaPP Zone and Indigenous Declared Crab Closures;
- Olaf Jensen (Environment and Climate Change Canada): a) IUCN OECMs - Key Habitat Sites for Migratory Birds and Caribou Habitat; and b) Scott Islands Marine National Wildlife Area;
- Satnam Manhas (Ecotrust Canada) - Ecotrust Canada and the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC);
- Dave MacKinnon (Chairperson, Canadian Council on Ecological Areas): Updates on CCEA Science-based Guidance for Reporting Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures; and
- Steve Diggon, Chris McDougall, and Caroline Butler (Coastal First Nations): First Nations Marine Planning in the Northern Shelf Bioregion: Considerations for Identifying and Assessing OECMs.

The following people presented case studies from other countries, updates on the Task Force's work and on related initiatives:

- Clara L. Matallana Tobón (Adjunct Researcher, Territorial Management for Biodiversity Program, Alexander von Humboldt Institute for Research on Biological Resources): Sacred Site of Jaba Taniqashkaka Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta-Colombia: Kogui Indigenous Authorities, Amazon Conservation Teams;
- Erich Hoyt (Co-chair, IUCN Marine Mammal Protected Areas Task Force): Could Certain Initiatives for Whales and Marine Mammals Help to Pilot Other Effective Place-based Conservation Measures?;
- Gary Martin Tabor (Executive Director, Center for Large Landscape Conservation): Connectivity Conservation Specialist Group;
- Harry Jonas (Co-Chair, IUCN-WCPA Task Force on OECMs): Beyond Protected Areas - Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures;
- Hesti Widodo (Coral Triangle Centre): Experiences from Indonesia;

- John Waitthaka (Vice Chair, IUCN-WCPA): Community and Private Conservancies in Kenya;
- Marc Hockings (Emeritus Professor, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, The University of Queensland, WCPA Science): Shoalwater Bay Military Training Area;
- Naomi Kingston (Head of Programme, Protected Areas, UNEP-WCMC): Reporting OECM to Protected Planet;
- Paul Donald (BirdLife International): The Role of OECMs in Achieving Aichi Target 11;
- Rebecca Singleton (Social Research Coordinator, Blue Ventures): Antongil Bay, North-Eastern Madagascar;
- Siyu Qin (Coordinator, Social Science Initiative, Conservation International): Revisit the Map: Conservation Beyond Protected Areas within the Amazon Region; and
- Sonam Wangchuk (Chief, Wildlife and CITES Management Authority, Bhutan): Bhutan: OECMs Perspective.

The core outcomes of the deliberations are presented in this report. The reports of the second day's presentations are set out in a report by CPAWS.<sup>1</sup>

Overall, the meeting provided a useful opportunity to build on the existing inputs from Task Force members, collate case studies from around the world and review potential OECMs against criteria and categories. The draft guidance will be updated in accordance with the meeting's outcomes and circulated for field-testing.



<sup>1</sup> [http://cpawabc.org/upload/IUCN\\_OECM\\_Workshop - CPAWS Summary Report - 14Feb2017-Final .pdf](http://cpawabc.org/upload/IUCN_OECM_Workshop_-_CPAWS_Summary_Report_-_14Feb2017-Final_.pdf)

## PART I: INPUTS TO THE DRAFT GUIDANCE

During the course of the meeting, specific aspects of the draft guidance were discussed in plenary and in small groups. Breakout groups were facilitated by: Marc Hockings, Sabine Jessen, Naomi Kingston, Dan Laffoley, Dave MacKinnon, Clara Lucia Matallana Tobon, Eleanor Stirling, Stephen Woodley and Kim Sander Wright. The following sections provide an overview of the core outcomes of those deliberations.

### 1. OVERARCHING COMMENTS

- The guidance will be applicable beyond 2020, with explicit reference that defining and reporting OECMs will be relevant to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDGs 14 and 15.
- OECMs are part of a broad range of conservation options ranging from protected areas managed with a primary conservation objective to measures designed to promote more sustainable use. The guidelines should underscore the qualifiers in Target 11, particularly the emphasis on effective and equitable management.
- OECMs offer an opportunity to recognise legitimate conservation efforts, under different governance regimes. Guidance that is too strict (substantively or procedurally) will discount areas that may be contributing to the *in situ* conservation of biodiversity. But care must be taken ensure that recognition focuses on effective conservation (Aichi Target 11) rather than sustainable management measures that are more appropriately recorded against other targets. It will be useful to provide ancillary guidance, with case studies, in addition to the main guidelines. The guidelines and ancillary guidance should be available online.
- OECMs will provide effective conservation for a range of attributes including rare, endangered and range-restricted species, habitat types and ecosystems that are poorly-represented in protected area networks as well as other areas recognised as important for their biodiversity values.
- More focused guidance should be provided on recognizing indigenous and community-based OECMs, while recognizing that not all indigenous and community lands and waters would either be protected areas or OECMs. The use of the term 'local communities' in the guidance should be linked to the CBD guidance on the term.
- The guidelines should use internationally agreed CBD definitions of terms, wherever possible, and strive to keep language clear and accessible. The glossary can provide further elaboration of key terms. Boxes could be used to illustrate key aspects of guidance, e.g. typology of OECMs.
- The guidance could encourage better conservation outcomes, including improved management of areas that would not currently qualify as OECMs but could do so with improved protection and management. 'Candidate OECMs' could be a useful category for guidance on improving governance and management to promote effective biodiversity conservation.

- Recognition of an area as an OECM may incentivize the application of robust conservation measures to areas of recognized biodiversity significance such as Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), Ecologically and Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs), and Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs).
- Some OECMs may become recognised as protected areas over time if they meet the IUCN definition of a protected area and those responsible for their governance and management wish them to do so.

## **2. GEOGRAPHICALLY DEFINED SPACE**

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

## **3. NOT RECOGNISED AS A PROTECTED AREA**

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

## **4. GOVERNED**

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

## **5. MANAGED**

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

- ‘Degree of control’ relates to the governing authority’s ‘management capacity.’
- There was discussion about the term ‘degree of control,’ with some participants preferring ‘degree of influence,’ ‘conservation outcomes when challenged’ or ‘adequate management capacity to ensure the site meets its objectives.’ It was agreed that the ability to control threats depends on the governance and management mechanisms in place.
- Analysis at the site level will determine what the local institutions are that ensure that actions and activities lead to conservation and biodiversity outcomes.
- It was underscored that engendering long-term plans that bring together multiple stakeholders is important but can be time and input-intensive processes.
- ‘Legal measures’ are one means of achieving enduring, rather than short-term, conservation outcomes, but in some cases ‘other means’ such as planning processes or other non-regulatory options may also achieve the same enduring

outcomes, especially if they cannot be easily reversed or modified. The critical measure is that the ‘measure’ or ‘means’ should be *effective*.

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

The second group made the following comments:

- Communities may have effective management mechanisms, but realistically may not be able to prevent government authorities from authorising mining/forestry activities within their territory.
- ‘Controllable threats’ refers to activities occurring within or near the area that could impact on its biodiversity outcomes. Many, if not most, area-based measures are likely to have rule-sets that apply primarily or exclusively within their boundaries. Using a threats-based approach can help determine the effectiveness of local control.
- Control implies the capacity (and authority) to conserve ecosystems and species biodiversity as a whole.
- Drawing on the guidance on OECMs produced by the Canadian Council on Ecological Areas, it was suggested that governance authorities should have both the capacity to fight a threat *and* the willingness and determination to do so.
- It is important to avoid situations in which a governance authority is managing threats for the benefit of one species without also focusing on the broader ecosystem.

## 6. LONG-TERM

The group developed the following ideas about the use of ‘long-term’ in the guidance:

- One suggested approach to define long-term as: ‘expected to persist for the long term, which in practical terms means at least 25 years with the expectation it will be ongoing and permanent.’
- Caution, however, was urged in adopting an explicit time rule. A 25 year rule, for instance, might enable inclusion of managed rotation areas within production forest where the intent is clearly exploitation and not conservation. The group recognised that some shorter-term renewable designations can lead to permanent long-term protection e.g. Quebec’s 25-year-renewable designations of conservation areas with private landowners, which have a 95% success rate of becoming permanent after the second 25-year term. The guidance could usefully include reference to the intent behind the time frame. For example, intent to intensively harvest an area in the future (some forms of forestry and fisheries) is different from areas where there is no future intent to intensively exploit the area’s natural resources.
- Conservation endurance is a reflection of governance endurance. Governance considerations might limit the term, i.e. in situations where communities do not have formal rights.
- The threat of climate change and its likely impact on species’ ranges and distribution is an additional reason to recognise OECMs as areas that can effectively expand the conservation estate.

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

## 7. EFFECTIVE AND ENDURING IN SITU CONSERVATION

The group made the following points on ‘effective conservation’:

- Effectiveness in conserving biodiversity is the key element defining OECMs.
- While the term ‘conservation’ can cover a wide range of activities, the guide will use the CBD definition of ‘*in situ* conservation.’
- Target 11 is closest to the fully protected end of the conservation spectrum, but there will be low levels of exploitation in some kinds of OECMs – similar to the situation in some protected areas. OECMs will lie towards the protected areas end of the conservation spectrum even where the *in situ* conservation of biodiversity is not the primary management objective.
- One of the uses in some OECMs will be traditional harvesting, given the strong linkage with Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs). It cannot be assumed without evidence that all such traditional use is effective and sustainable, especially with growing human populations. More guidance on this matter will be useful.
- Effectiveness is best measured by monitoring conservation outcomes. However, OECMs will usually be recognized based on current biodiversity values and the conservation tools in place as long as there is reliable knowledge that such conservation measures are known to be effective. For example, we know that areas closed to fishing, like MPAs, almost always lead to an increase in fish diversity, biomass and size. So a long-term full fisheries closure to protect an ecosystem (i.e. a permanent no take area) might be declared an OECM based on the literature on fisheries closures. Unfortunately, most fishery closure areas, created by fisheries departments are usually shorter-term measures focusing only on restocking one or more species of commercial interest so would not qualify as OECMs.
- Where an area is recognised as an OECM, the area’s values should also be monitored after establishment to ensure conservation outcomes. It would be useful to work with the WCPA Task Force on Protected Areas and Biodiversity Outcomes to discuss monitoring options.

## 8. BIODIVERSITY

‘Biodiversity outcomes’ were discussed in a small group and then further worked on to develop the following formulation.

OECMs will exhibit one or more of the following outcomes by effectively protecting:

- Rare, threatened or endangered species and habitats including the ecosystems that support them.

- Representative natural ecosystems.
- High levels of ecological integrity or ecological intactness, which are characterized by the occurrence of the full range of native species and supporting ecological processes. These areas will be intact or be capable of being restored under the proposed management regime.
- Range-restricted species and ecosystems in natural settings.
- Important species aggregations, including during migration or spawning.
- Ecosystems especially important for species life stages, feeding, resting, moulting and breeding.
- Areas of importance for ecological connectivity or that are important to complete a conservation network within a landscape or seascape.
- Areas that provide critical ecosystem services such as carbon storage in addition to *in-situ* biodiversity conservation.

To qualify as an OECM, the management system should identify and address the conservation of all possible attributes for which the site is nominated. Species do not exist in isolation and should not be managed as such. There should be evidence of consideration of the full range of potential biodiversity attributes in delineating an OECM and determining management arrangements.

During the discussion, there was a suggestion to nuance language to cover situations in which single species also constitute the core habitat, such as sea grass beds in Bermuda. There was also a discussion about whether to include 'significant' as a qualifier to 'biodiversity.' Some supported the idea while others strongly disagreed - arguing that sticking to the CBD definition of 'areas important for biodiversity' is a better approach.

## **9. ECOSYSTEM SERVICES**

It was agreed to retain the current definition.

## **10. CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL VALUES**

In the context of OECMs, the relevant cultural and spiritual values are those that promote biodiversity conservation.

## **11. SCREENING TOOL**

There was agreement that greater specificity was required on the first step in the screening tool relating to whether the measure qualifies under Target 11 and that a decision tree would be useful. Two groups worked on this issue. One group suggested that the issue could be approached by first asking: 'Does the measure best fit under Goal B of the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity (Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use) or Goal C (Improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity).' A version of this approach was developed, below.



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

It was suggested the screening tool could benefit from being further developed along the lines of the approach adopted by the Canadian Council on Ecological Areas – also to help identify ‘candidate sites’.

### 13. MONITORING AND REPORTING

The group suggested the following seven steps in relation to ‘monitoring biodiversity and the link to effective conservation.’

1. Describe biodiversity values on the site:
  - What do we care about?
  - Clear documentation and sources of info to support this?
  - What level of biodiversity significance is needed to be an OECM?
  - Think about representativeness intactness, landscape context, rare, threatened and significant species and habitats, and EI framework?
  - What thresholds?
2. Nominate priority attributes.
3. Document current and potential use:
  - Link to attributes spatially.
  - Review impacts.
4. Use 3 to identify threats and stressors (also in the context of the notes above); identify stakeholders to engage:
5. Inputs.
6. Measures (define as interventions):
  - Are they effective?
  - Are they sufficient to maintain the biodiversity features?
7. Outcomes:
  - Measuring status of priority attributes.
  - Set targets, indicators to measure status and trends over time.
  - Measuring mitigation of threats.

- Monitor process and manage adaptively.

During the discussion, additional comments included:

- The crux of this issue is: know what is important, describe it, understand relationships of use, and threats to control.
- During the process the governance authority must identify all of the attributes that are applicable. It does not have to be more than one, but it does have to be all the relevant criteria. 'Cherry-picking' is not acceptable.
- Such a framework is potentially very resource intensive, which may limit the ability of some stakeholders, including indigenous peoples' and local communities' – among others – to conduct such studies.
- Examples of the evidence could include management plans and reports etc. as well as other approaches including those that are traditional knowledge-related.

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

- Ensure clarity about who can contribute data to the WDPA and under what circumstances, including validation protocols.
- Other questions included: Who gets to report? What if there are disputes? What is the particular (sub-)national government's role? Is there an effectiveness bar in reporting? Who will be doing designation and reporting, monitoring and assessments, measuring management and effectiveness?
- The WDPA currently has very little reporting on effectiveness of sites so this represents an exciting opportunity.

#### **14. MARINE**

The group identified six critical issues:

1. How to make a decision between assigning a measure to Targets 6 and 11 regarding spatial measures.
  - a. Measures may be reported under more than one target.
  - b. One cannot make these decisions without a better understanding of conservation values in the area, the biodiversity and threats. One can then ask if the measures are effective at creating a management process. They could qualify as OECMs if this is the case.
2. Setting minimum conservation standards: what are allowable uses in OECMs?
3. What is meant by 'effective' and is this measured in the context of all biodiversity values in an area?
  - a. Effective needs to be measured in the broader context of values and threats not single species targets alone.
4. Can OECMs be recognised in 'areas beyond national jurisdiction'? What does it mean for management of such sites? Does recourse to UNCLOS and the Convention on the High Seas assist?
5. How is comparability across countries ensured in application of OECM guidelines?

6. How does complex, multi-jurisdictional responsibility impact on degree of control? Is there consideration of other sectoral issues and controls? Do we expect demonstration of appropriate degree of control to address recognised and potential threats in multi-jurisdictional situations? If not, it is suggested that authorities may designate OECMs that have no control over activities that have direct impacts on the area's biodiversity.

In the discussion, participants asked whether the fact that an entire Exclusive Economic Zone is conserved and there is an extremely small chance of seabed mining in part of the area would prevent the whole area being recognised as an OECM. It was suggested that it is critical to reach out to colleagues working with Locally Managed Marine Areas to test the guidance, particularly against Targets 6 and 11.

## **15. INDIGENOUS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES**

A number of participants suggested better underscoring the focus on human rights, free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) and equitable governance. Perhaps this can be done in a box to draw attention to it.

## **16. INDUSTRIAL SITES vs. USES**

In the context of industrial sites, it is important to determine whether the industry is a) exploiting the biodiversity e.g. FSC certified forests, b) putting environmental and protection measures in place to manage threats to biodiversity, or c) biodiversity is a secondary benefit due to protection of the site e.g. an Australia sewage site recognized as a Ramsar site. Conditions under b) and c) would also apply to military areas.

## **17. INCENTIVES AND IMPLICATIONS OF BEING AN OECM**

The group made the following points:

- FPIC being obtained before listing a site as an OECM is not just an indigenous/community concern – the state (including the army) and businesses/private individuals will also be concerned about potential obligations.
- It is important to spell out the potential benefits of recognition of an OECM as well as the implications for management.
- More resources and capacity will be needed to identify, monitor and report OECM.
- Issues to consider that may occur in relation to areas governed by indigenous peoples and local communities include:
  - Perception of increased regulation.
  - Restricting future development opportunities.
  - Unrealistic expectations on payments for ecological services.
  - Perception of losing control of lands or territories.

## 18. SHORT FORM OF 'OECMS'

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

## 19. POST-2020

IUCN WCPA has established a Task Force to look at post-2020 targets for biodiversity and provide inputs to the CBD process via official IUCN channels. The work on OECMs could contribute by proposing: a) separate targets for protected areas and OECMs, and b) a target for areas, which promote connectivity and facilitate species range shifts in response to climate change and other threats

## 20. PILOT SITES

It will be important to test the guidelines on the ground in different governance and management contexts, both terrestrial and marine. A session on pilot sites led to the following countries being identified as possible places in which to run trials of the guidance: Bermuda; Colombia; Madagascar; Kenya; Bhutan; Fiji and/or the Solomon Islands; and Indonesia. Suggestions were also made for trials to focus on: community-governed areas; military areas, prisons and restricted areas; critical habitat designations; FSC certified forests; fishing closures; and restoration areas. These assessments are expected to fine tune criteria on qualifications for OECM status and identify those areas that generally would not qualify. In parallel, a project led by BirdLife International is exploring the linkages between (unprotected) KBAs and OECMs. See **Annex III**.

## ANNEX I: AGENDA

### Day 1: Monday 13 February Introductions and background

- 12:00            *Guests Arrive at Listel Hotel*
- 12:30 –            *Lunch at the hotel in the Impressionist Gallery*  
13:30
- 14:00 –            Introductions, presentations of draft guidance by IUCN and CCEA  
15:30
- 15:30 –            *Break*  
16:00
- 16:00 –            Discussions to determine the key outstanding issues, opportunities, and needs for  
17:00            ‘testing’ guidance in pilot countries

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

- 9:00 – 9:30        Brief introductions and presentation of draft IUCN guidance
- 9:30 – 10:30      Presentations and discussion of case studies from Canadian First Nations, DFO,  
Province of BC and ENGOS
- 10:30 –            *Break*  
11:00
- 11:00 –            Presentations continued  
13:00
- 13:00 –            *Lunch at Forage Restaurant*  
14:00
- 14:00 –            Follow up discussions and highlighting of emerging issues from case studies  
15:30
- 15:30 –            *Break*  
16:00
- 16:00 –            Discussion of issues emerging from case studies  
17:30

### Day 3: Wednesday 15 February In-depth Consideration of Guidance and Key Issues

- 9:00 – 9:45        Recap of previous days discussions and identification of key issues
- 9:45 – 10:30      Breakout working groups to address key issues that have emerged from days 1 and 2
- 10:30 –            *Break*  
11:00

11:30 – Working Groups continued  
13:00

13:00 – *Lunch*  
14:00

14:00 – Additional WGs on specific issues, e.g. marine issues and/or discussions on  
15:30 opportunities and needs for 'testing' guidance in pilot countries

15:30 – *Break*  
16:00

16:00 – Report back and discussion of issues for further debate  
17:30

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

9:00 – 10:00 Follow up discussion based on previous day's discussion

10:00 – *Break*  
10:30

10:30 – Feedback including on monitoring and reporting to WDP  
12:00

12:00 – *Lunch at Listel Hotel*  
13:00

14:00 – Field trip to the top of Grouse Mountain and dinner at the Observatory Restaurant  
20:00

#### **Day 5: Friday 17 February** **Outcomes and Next Steps**

9:00 – 10:00 Summation of key outcomes and opportunities for piloting

10:00 – *Break*  
10:30

10:30 – Next steps – development of Vancouver Roadmap – and task allocation,  
12:00

12:00 – *Lunch at the Listel Hotel (either sit down or bag lunch for those leaving early)*  
13:00

## ANNEX II: PARTICIPANTS

### PARTICIPANTS WHO ATTENDED THE FULL MEETING

**Christie Chute**, Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
**Charles Clover**, Executive Director, Blue Marine Foundation  
**Paul Donald**, BirdLife International  
**Marc Hockings**, Emeritus Professor, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, The University of Queensland, WCPA Science  
**Erich Hoyt**, Co-chair, IUCN Marine Mammal Protected Areas Task Force  
**Sabine Jessen**, National Director, Oceans Program, CPAWS  
**Olaf Jensen**, Protected Areas Program Manager, Environment Canada  
**Harry Jonas**, Director of Programs, Natural Justice / Task Force Co-chair  
**Naomi Kingston**, Head of Programme, Protected Areas, UNEP-WCMC  
**Dan Laffoley**, Principal Advisor, WCPA Marine  
**Dave MacKinnon**, Chairperson, Canadian Council on Ecological Areas  
**Kathy MacKinnon**, Chair, WCPA / Task Force Co-chair  
**Dr. Sarah Manuel**, Senior Marine Conservation Officer, Bermuda Government  
**Clara L. Matallana Tobón**, Adjunct Researcher, Territorial Management for Biodiversity Program, Alexander von Humboldt Institute for Research on Biological Resources, Colombia  
**Siyu Qin**, Coordinator, Social Science Initiative, Conservation International  
**Rebecca Singleton**, Social Research Coordinator, Blue Ventures  
**Eleanor Sterling**, Chief Conservation Scientist, Center for Biodiversity and Conservation, American Museum of Natural History  
**Gary Martin Tabor**, Executive Director, Center for Large Landscape Conservation  
**John Waithaka**, Vice Chair, IUCN-WCPA  
**Sonam Wangchuk**, Chief, Wildlife and CITES Management Authority, Bhutan  
**Hesti Widodo**, Coral Triangle Centre  
**Stephen Woodley**, WCPA Science  
**Kim Wright**, ICCA Consortium, Global Coordinator for Coastal, Marine and Island Environments

### PARTICIPANTS WHO ATTENDED FOR THE SECOND DAY

**Caroline Butler**, Director of Heritage Research, Gitxaala Environmental Monitoring, Gitxaala First Nation  
**Steve Diggon**, Regional Marine Planning Coordinator, Coastal First Nations, Great Bear Initiative  
**Darcy Dobell**, Principal Consultant, the Wabe  
**Kim Dunn**, Manager, National Oceans Governance, WWF-Canada  
**Satnam Manhas**, Forest and Ecosystem Services Program Manager, Ecotrust Canada  
**Chris McDougall**, Haida Oceans Technical Team, Council of the Haida Nation  
**Linda Nowlan**, Staff Council, West Coast Environmental Law  
**Charlie Short**, Executive Director, Strategic Projects for Resource Management Objectives  
**Bill Wareham**, Manager, Science Projects, David Suzuki Foundation

## ANNEX III: POTENTIAL PILOT SITES AND RELATED INITIATIVES

PILOT	ISSUES
<b>Bermuda</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Zoning policy, using existing legislation to implement an OECM</li> <li>-Cultural heritage</li> <li>-Landscape/seascape issues – international work</li> </ul>
<b>Colombia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Locally managed areas</li> <li>-If the guidance works in practice</li> <li>-Urban areas</li> <li>-National applications – looking broadly across Columbia</li> <li>-Application to water resource area conservation</li> <li>-Areas used for compensation/ private land</li> </ul>
<b>Kenya</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Private, group, and community conservancies – managing PA/OECM split – could look at implications</li> <li>-LMMA's</li> <li>-Links between legislation and OECMs</li> <li>-Use of standards for OECMS</li> <li>-Effectiveness/monitoring</li> <li>-Industrial effects – grazing and mining</li> <li>-Long-term sustainability of conservancies – failure of eco-tourism</li> </ul>
<b>Birdlife Questionnaire</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Adding 10 countries</li> <li>-KBA's – study is confined to looking at undesignated KBAs</li> </ul>
<b>Bhutan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-KBA</li> <li>-Traditional land use – on the list on page 20</li> <li>-OECMs along linear features (rivers) – interesting for connectivity and the role OECMs play in enhancing connectivity</li> </ul>
<b>Pacific Islands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-LMMA in Fiji and Solomon Islands</li> <li>-Fishing closures</li> <li>-Implications for an OECM designation</li> </ul>
<b>Military Areas/Prisons/ Restricted Areas</b>	<p>Australia (Marc Hockings). Canada (Stephen Woodley; Dave MacKinnon, Sabine Jessen)</p>
<b>Critical habitat designation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Where/who? Canada - CPAWS (Rhona &amp; Sabine)</li> </ul>
<b>FSC certified forests</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Industrial use</li> <li>-Implications</li> <li>-Relationships to other designations</li> <li>-Canada- SW to investigate, other countries needed</li> <li>-Categorization needed – natural forests</li> </ul>
<b>Fishing Closures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-CCEA guidance Canada</li> <li>-Other countries (Bermuda and Pacific Islands)</li> <li>-Dan to follow up</li> </ul>

<b>Restoration Areas</b>	-Kathy MacKinnon to follow up – particularly relevant to wetlands -Methods -Connectivity
--------------------------	--

<b>Indonesia</b>	-Legislation -LMMA's -Use of screening
------------------	--