



Anglophone Africa Workshop on Protected Areas Bulletin

A Summary Report of the Anglophone Africa Subregional Workshop on Protected Areas

Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)

ONLINE AT [HTTP://WWW.IISD.CA/AFRICA/BIODIV/ASRWA/](http://www.iisd.ca/AFRICA/BIODIV/ASRWA/)
VOLUME 5, No. 2, SUNDAY, 19 AUGUST 2007

SUMMARY OF THE ANGLOPHONE AFRICA SUBREGIONAL WORKSHOP ON PROTECTED AREAS: 13-16 AUGUST 2007

The Anglophone Africa Subregional Workshop on the Review of and Capacity Building for the Implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas (the Workshop), under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), convened from 13-16 August 2007, in Cape Town, South Africa. One in a series initiated in response to the request of the eighth meeting of the CBD Conference of the Parties (COP-8), the Workshop sought to review and strengthen capacity for the implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA), and was attended by 75 participants, including government representatives from 20 countries, representatives of five non-governmental organizations and nine indigenous community representatives.

The Workshop was organized by the CBD, with financial support from the European Commission, Worldwide Fund for Nature, The Nature Conservancy, and in collaboration with the Government of South Africa, the World Commission on Protected Areas of the IUCN-World Conservation Union, Conservation International, BirdLife International, and the UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre.

The aim of the Workshop was to review the progress on implementation of the PoWPA in the countries in Anglophone Africa and to agree on recommendations to the CBD's second meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Protected Areas. Issues analyzed addressed: protected area system master planning technical themes including ecological gap analysis, management effectiveness assessment and capacity action planning, and sustainable financing; as well as national and regional next steps; and recommendations from the Workshop. It took the format of plenary presentations, interactive exercises, and individual and country group discussions, facilitated by resource people from the supporting organizations.

On Monday and Tuesday, participants heard presentations and case studies on ecological gap analysis, management effectiveness assessment and capacity action planning, and sustainable finance. They also convened in country groups to discuss and complete country reports on four key questions in relation to each of these themes: the status of activities; challenges and opportunities; next steps; and support needs.

On Wednesday, participants considered national and regional next steps, finalized country reports and began formulating recommendations for the second OEWG on Protected Areas. In the concluding session on Thursday, participants heard a presentation and recommendations from indigenous peoples, local communities and traditional fisher folk, and finalized the Workshop recommendations. Closing remarks confirmed that participants found the Workshop to have been a valuable and practical exercise, with outcomes including detailed recommendations for international and national action, information on progress on the PoWPA within countries and regions, and a concrete collaborative outcome in the form of a regional clinic in Madagascar.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF RELATED PROCESSES

The CBD, negotiated under the auspices of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), was adopted on 22 May 1992, entered into force in 1993 and currently has 190 parties. The Convention aims to promote the conservation of biodiversity, the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources. The PoWPA, adopted by CBD Decision VII/28,

IN THIS ISSUE

| | |
|---|----|
| A Brief History of Related Processes | 1 |
| African Related Processes | 2 |
| Report of the Workshop | 3 |
| Overview and Experience in Developing National Master Plans or National Strategic Plans | 4 |
| Strengthening of Capacity for: Conducting Ecological Gap Analysis, Sustainable Financing and Management Effectiveness | 4 |
| Overview of Progress on Country-Level Implementation of the PoWPA, Identification of Constraints and Opportunities to Promote Implementation | 8 |
| Inputs to the OEWG on Protected Areas | 10 |
| Closing of the Workshop | 11 |
| Upcoming Meetings | 12 |
| List of Abbreviations | 12 |

The *Anglophone Africa Workshop on Protected Areas Bulletin* is a publication of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) <info@iisd.ca>, publishers of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org>. This issue was written and edited by Derick Gabone, Leonie Gordon and Harry Jonas. The Editor is Soledad Aguilar <soledad@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Programme Manager of the African Regional Coverage Project is Richard Sherman <rsherman@iisd.org>. Funding for coverage of this meeting has been provided by South Africa's Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) through the IISD, DEAT, UN Environment Programme's Regional office for Africa, and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biodiversity's partnership for IISD Reporting Service coverage of African regional meetings. IISD can be contacted at 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4, Canada; tel: +1-204-958-7700; fax: +1-204-958-7710. The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in other publications with appropriate academic citation. Electronic versions of the *Bulletin* are sent to e-mail distribution lists HTML and PDF format) and can be found on the Linkages WWW-server at <http://www.iisd.ca/>. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 212 East 47th St. #21F, New York, NY 10017, USA.

states that establishment and management of protected areas together with conservation, sustainable use and restoration initiatives in the adjacent land and seascape are central to the Convention. The CBD's Article 2 defines a protected area as "a geographically defined area, which is designated or regulated and managed to achieve specific conservation objectives," and Article 8 calls for the establishment of a system of protected areas or areas where special measures need to be taken to conserve biological diversity. Accordingly, national protected area systems have been developed and maintained as key elements of national strategies to conserve biological diversity.

COP-4: At its fourth meeting (May 1998, Buenos Aires, Argentina), the COP decided to consider protected areas as one of the three main themes of COP-7.

COP-5: At its fifth meeting (May 2000, Nairobi, Kenya), the COP adopted, *inter alia*, a work programme on dry and sub-humid lands, including the use and establishment of additional protected areas and strengthening of measures in existing protected areas as some of its target actions for implementation.

COP-6: At its sixth meeting (April 2002, The Hague, the Netherlands), the COP encouraged collaboration with the IUCN-World Conservation Union (IUCN) Fifth World Parks Congress (WPC-V) and established an *Ad Hoc* Technical Expert Group on Protected Areas to review methods and approaches for the planning and management of protected areas, including options for appropriate policies, strategies, and practices consistent with the objectives of the Convention. COP-6 also adopted, *inter alia*, the expanded programmes of work on forest biodiversity, and Article 8(j) (Traditional Knowledge), which include a number of components and activities related to protected areas.

WPC-V: The Fifth World Parks Congress (September 2003, Durban, South Africa), led to the adoption of the Durban Accord, the Durban Action Plan, a message to the CBD and a set of 32 recommendations. The Durban Accord calls for, *inter alia*, a fresh and innovative approach to protected areas and their role in the broader conservation and development agenda, and the Durban Action Plan provides a framework for the actions needed to achieve this. The message to the CBD calls on the COP to adopt a rigorous programme of work on protected areas and establish effective means of monitoring and assessing the implementation of such programme.

COP-7: At its seventh meeting (February 2004, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia), the COP adopted the PoWPA with the overall purpose of: supporting the establishment and maintenance of comprehensive, effectively managed, and ecologically representative national and regional systems of protected areas that collectively contribute to achieving the Convention's objectives (with a 2010 target for terrestrial and a 2012 target for marine protected areas); and contributing to the 2010 target to significantly reduce the current rate of biodiversity loss, and the objectives of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) Plan of Implementation and the Millennium Development Goals. The PoWPA consists of four interlinked elements intended to assist Parties in establishing national programmes of work with targeted goals, actions, specific time frames, inputs and expected measurable outputs. COP-7 also decided, *inter alia*, to assess, at each of its meetings until 2010, progress in the implementation of

the PoWPA and to establish an OEWG on Protected Areas to support and review implementation of the programme of work and report to the COP.

OEWG ON PROTECTED AREAS: The first meeting of the OEWG on Protected Areas (June 2005, Montecatini, Italy) agreed to review implementation of the PoWPA at its second meeting, which did not take place before COP-8 due to lack of timely financial resources. Parties and relevant organizations were asked to submit information to COP-8.

EXPERT WORKSHOP ON PROTECTED AREAS: The expert workshop on protected areas (17-18 March 2006, Curitiba, Brazil) concluded that reporting on review of implementation of the PoWPA should concentrate on outcomes, as well as developing an evaluation matrix for the review of the PoWPA's implementation.

COP-8: At its eighth meeting (March 2006, Curitiba, Brazil), the COP reviewed progress made in the implementation of the PoWPA and recognized lack of implementation by, and capacity-building constraints of, developing countries. The COP decided to: convene a second OEWG on Protected Areas to evaluate progress and elaborate recommendations to COP for improved implementation; requested the Secretariat to organize regional workshops to review the implementation of the PoWPA and build capacity; and encouraged parties, other governments and relevant organizations to support and implement capacity-building activities. In addition, the COP adopted various options for mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the PoWPA and urged parties to give due consideration to conservation of biodiversity in their national development strategies, including poverty reduction strategies, with a view to maximizing the mobilization of funding for the implementation of the programme of work.

SUBREGIONAL WORKSHOPS: Subregional workshops on protected areas have been held for: the Caribbean (Miami, US, 20-22 June 2006); Latin America (Quito, Ecuador, 24-26 June 2006); the Eastern Caribbean (St Lucia, 5-7 December 2006); South and West Asia (Dehradun, India, 2-4 April 2007); and Eastern Europe (Isle of Vilm, Germany, 17-21 June 2007).

AFRICAN RELATED PROCESSES

Africa has a large heritage of biodiversity forming the region's natural wealth on which its social and economic systems are based. Globally, the number of protected areas has been increasing significantly over the last decade, with now more than 100,000 protected sites worldwide covering 11.6% of the Earth's land surface. Many of these protected areas are found in Africa. In addition to South Africa hosting two significant political events addressing sustainable development and the environment including protected areas, namely the WSSD in 2002 and WPC-V in 2003, several Africa-specific processes have been initiated with two key ones highlighted below.

NEPAD ENVIRONMENT ACTION PLAN: The African Ministerial Conference on the Environment, a permanent forum of African environment ministers, guided the development and subsequent adoption of the Environment Action Plan of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) at the second Ordinary Session of the African Union Assembly (July 2003, Maputo, Mozambique). The action plan is organized

into clusters of programmatic and project activities to be implemented over an initial period of 10 years. NEPAD has an associated Action Plan for the Environment Initiative, which recognizes the key role played by protected areas. The African Protected Areas Initiative (APAI) is also associated with NEPAD, and was conceived as an Africa-wide and African-led process aimed at addressing fundamental issues related to protected areas in the region. The APAI programme and activities are aimed at enhancing the conservation of biodiversity and management of protected areas systems.

AFRICAN CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF NATURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES:

The African Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (Algiers Convention) was adopted by the Organization of African Unity in 1968 and has 30 Contracting States. The second ordinary session of the African Union Assembly (July 2003, Maputo, Mozambique) adopted the revised Algiers Convention, which has not yet entered into force. The Convention's main features include requirements to: consider conservation imperatives in development plans; reconcile customary rights with the Convention; establish and maintain conservation areas; give special protection to endangered species; control wildlife traffic; grant special management and protection to water; design strategies for rational management of forests; utilize rationally land resources and grasslands; and institute conservation education at all levels.

REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP

On Monday morning in plenary, Jo Mulongoy, Principal Officer, Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters, CBD Secretariat, on behalf of the CBD Executive Secretary, Ahmed Djoghlaif, welcomed participants and opened the Workshop, underscoring the unique cooperation between the CBD and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and stressing the potential role of such partnerships in assisting in the Convention's implementation. Maria Mbengashe, Chief Policy Advisor, Biodiversity and Marine International Cooperation, South African Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, welcomed participants on behalf of her government, commenting that it was apt that the workshop is being held in Africa against the background of the WSSD and IUCN WPC-V, two events also hosted by South Africa, which included milestone decisions on protected areas in the Johannesburg

Plan of Implementation and the Durban Accord and Action Plan. She also noted challenges faced by African countries in implementing and financing protected area management plans and monitoring progress towards achieving the 2010 biodiversity target.

Jo Mulongoy presented on the background and progress on the PoWPA, focusing on its rationale, the nature of the programme, and its future outlook. He highlighted lessons on how to improve protected areas management and stressed that protected areas are important instruments for meeting the 2010 biodiversity target and provide numerous benefits. He emphasized that the global system of protected areas is not sufficiently large, well planned or well managed to maximize these benefits and underscored the need for financial resources, capacity-building and adequate human and institutional resources.

Trevor Sandwith, Deputy Chair, IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (IUCN-WCPA), provided an overview of the IUCN-WCPA strategy and its alignment with the PoWPA.



Trevor Sandwith, Deputy Chair, IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas

He detailed four priority areas: the global system of protected areas, strengthening biodiversity management, working at broader scales, and involving people. On completing the global system, he emphasized the need to deepen understanding on the factors affecting biodiversity and to develop integrated approaches. On involving people, he highlighted the need to undertake conservation together with

local communities. He concluded by underscoring the need for local action to implement protected area policy.

Sarat Babu Gidda, Programme Officer, In-situ and Ex-situ Conservation, CBD Secretariat, explained that the Workshop provides an opportunity for the CBD Secretariat to interact with Anglophone African countries on national implementation of the PoWPA, and that he considered it to be the beginning of an on-going process.

Maxim Vergeichik, Global Project Coordinator, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), presented on the recently launched Early Action Grant initiated to provide financial support to least developed countries (LDCs) and small island developing states (SIDS) to implement country actions on the PoWPA. Noting that the Early Action Grant has a budget of US\$9 million, targeted at 13 activities, he emphasized that funds are limited to projects implementing CBD activities in LDCs and SIDS. He further noted that funded activities must not overlap with current or expected Global Environment Facility (GEF) project funding. Vergeichik explained that country applications will be reviewed by the International Technical Review Committee. In ensuing discussions, participants noted the preconditions of the Early Action Grant,



L-R: Jo Mulongoy, Principal Officer, Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters, CBD Secretariat, and Maria Mbengashe, Chief Policy Advisor, Biodiversity and Marine International Cooperation, South African Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism

raised concerns about GEF limited financial allocation for medium- sized projects and referred to the GEF resource allocation framework.

Charles Besançon, Head of Protected Areas Programme, UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), provided an outline on the World Database on Protected Areas, explaining that it is used for, *inter alia*: gap analysis; dissemination of protected area information; mapping data; and pipeline planning. Noting current data on protected areas, he lamented that, at current rates, targets for the establishment of marine protected areas will not be met until 2045. Besançon further underlined the need to track progress towards global conservation goals; the role of the World Database on Protected Areas in aiding the understanding of transboundary protected area systems; and that the database is only as good as the information supplied. Describing operations at the national, regional and international level, he highlighted collaboration with the European Environment Agency, which collates information on behalf of the European Union (EU) member states. He concluded by stressing the need for greater regionalization and stronger networks to streamline the database's processes for data collation, including for Africa. Ensuing discussion focused on the potential modalities for regionalizing the database.

Participants elected Maria Mbengashe, South Africa, as Chair of the Workshop. Sarat Babu Gidda, CBD Secretariat, introduced, and participants adopted, the agenda (UNEP/CBD/WS-PA/AA/1/1/) and the organization of work (UNEP/CBD/WS-PA/AA/1/add.1).

Explaining that he would facilitate the interactive sessions which would form the backbone of the workshop, Jason Spensley, Senior Biodiversity Advisor, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), outlined the themes of these sessions as: ecological gap assessment; management effectiveness and capacity action planning; sustainable financial planning and mechanisms; the application process for the UNDP/GEF Early Action Grant; and national and regional enabling strategies. He explained that the discussions would conclude with the adoption of recommendations to be presented to the second OEWG on Protected Areas.

During the three days, participants worked within five country groups, facilitated by resource persons from the supporting NGOs, to complete reports on the PoWPA.

Country Group One comprised representatives from Ethiopia, Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania and Rwanda with a resource person from IUCN. Country Group Two comprised Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique and Seychelles, facilitated by resource people from the Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF) and TNC. Country Group Three comprised representatives from Egypt, Ghana and Liberia, facilitated by resource people from WWF and Conservation International



Sarat Babu Gidda, Programme Officer, In-situ and Ex-situ Conservation, CBD Secretariat

(CI). Country Group Four comprised representatives from South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland, Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe, NGO and local community representatives, and was facilitated by IUCN. Country Group Five comprised country representatives from Botswana, Namibia, and Zimbabwe, with UNEP-WCMC as facilitator.

Participants also worked on the recommendations to the second meeting of the OEWG on Protected Areas to be held in February 2008. At the end of the meeting, participants adopted a report of the Workshop with the outcomes of group deliberations annexed. The following sections summarize the main issues addressed and recommendations presented by participants during the Workshop.

OVERVIEW AND EXPERIENCE IN DEVELOPING NATIONAL MASTER PLANS OR NATIONAL STRATEGIC PLANS

On Monday morning, Jamie Ervin, Senior Protected Area Specialist, TNC, provided an overview of the main elements of a comprehensive protected area system master plan. She discussed the need for an overriding vision, followed by development of strategies on how to improve protected areas' network design, management effectiveness and enabling environment. She characterized the design of a master plan as an opportunity to integrate different agencies in the formulation of a comprehensive programme.



Jamie Ervin, Senior Protected Area Specialist, The Nature Conservancy

Jamie Ervin then facilitated the first technical session. Participants were asked to consider their countries' progress on assessing the following areas: gap assessment, threats, management effectiveness, capacity, equity and benefit sharing, governance, policy environment, sustainable finance, and a comprehensive monitoring plan. Each country was then asked to note their work on a master-planning matrix. Comments following from the exercise included low scores on governance systems and benefit sharing as well as on the challenge of integrating local and national policies with regional initiatives. Ervin noted that the master-planning matrix would be annexed to the Workshop report.

STRENGTHENING OF CAPACITY FOR: CONDUCTING ECOLOGICAL GAP ANALYSIS, SUSTAINABLE FINANCING AND MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS

From Monday to Wednesday, participants were provided with an overview of the main elements of a comprehensive protected area system master plan, participated in an interactive exercise, and discussed tools and training in ecological gap assessment, management effectiveness, and sustainable finance plans. For each of these technical themes, resource people presented a general overview and case studies and engaged in interactive exercises, and participants then convened in country groups to discuss four key questions: the status of activities; challenges and opportunities; next steps; and support needs.

ECOLOGICAL GAP ANALYSIS: Jamie Ervin, TNC, provided an overview of the ecological gap analysis method and outlined: its definition; importance; major steps and general principles; and the utility of gap assessment. She emphasized that gap analysis is a comparison between the status of biodiversity and the status of protection within a country and outlined four major steps of gap analysis: biodiversity status; protection status; results analysis; and filling of gaps. During discussion, participants highlighted the implications of climate change for protected areas, the financial and human resources constraints in gathering information for conducting analyses, the use of expert knowledge in overcoming these constraints and the inclusion of indigenous knowledge in gap analysis. Several participants questioned how gap assessment could be utilized to advance the economic and political case for protected areas.

Laurette Rasoavahiny, Director for Promotion of Protected Areas, Ministry of Environment, Water and Forests, Madagascar, and Anity Ny Aina Ratsifandrihamanana, Conservation Director, WWF Madagascar and West Indian Ocean Programme, provided an overview of an ecological gap analysis carried out in Madagascar. They outlined the process, which included priority setting, identifying goals and acquiring mapping tools, namely the Marxam and Zonation computer programmes. The key outcomes were ecosystem maps identifying the critical areas for protection. The maps, they explained, were subsequently used as a basis for establishing new protected areas, to support decision making for regional forest zoning and mining permits and to provide scenarios for biodiversity offsets. The lessons learned included: the length of the process; the importance of capacity building within the country; that process is sometimes as important as outcomes; that technical infrastructure is needed to house data and tools; and that using various tools allows for comparison. Comments from participants concerned the management of the new protected areas, reconciling social and environmental priorities, costs and the impact on communities.

Gerhart Verdoorn, Executive Director, BirdLife South Africa, speaking on behalf of BirdLife International, stressed that bird conservation is crucial for global biodiversity conservation and highlighted the work of the Important Bird Area (IBA) programme. He noted that the IBA programme focuses on globally threatened birds, restricted-range species, biome-restricted assemblages and significant congregation sites. He emphasized that IBA site selection is based on vulnerability and irreplaceability, and that local site support groups collate site information. He further stressed that the IBA concept can be generalized for other taxonomic groups. In ensuing discussions, Verdoorn responded to requests for clarification about the



Gerhart Verdoorn, Executive Director, BirdLife South Africa



Participants held interactive discussions on ecological gap analysis in four country groups.

value of identifying sites that require protection by explaining that such identification is crucial in making the case for legal recognition of protected areas.

Country Group Discussions: Participants then convened in groups to discuss the four key questions in relation to ecological gap assessment.

In Country Group One, Kari Lahti, Programme Officer, IUCN Programme on Protected Areas, outlined the process, requesting country representatives to complete a template on country actions addressing the four key questions. Country representatives reported on the status of country activities such as wildlife censuses, mapping, and the establishment of relevant working groups and task forces. On obstacles and challenges, participants highlighted, *inter alia*: lack of capacity, lack of funding, lack of awareness, failure to utilize indigenous knowledge and the need to link conservation and poverty as well as other relevant strategies. On support, participants highlighted technical support and training.

Most participants in Country Group Two rated their countries' management plan at one out of three, noting, however, that management plans are in place, and the process of conducting gap analysis, integrating non-protected areas into existing government plans, and harmonizing cross-departmental work on protected areas has begun. Participants stressed a lack of: adequate knowledge on available gap analysis tools; financial resources for conducting the assessment; and institutional capacity. On next steps, participants emphasized the need to develop an inventory of terrestrial, freshwater and nature ecosystems, increase cooperation between different sectors and exchange experience between countries. Regarding support for next steps, participants called for assistance in forming a regional clinic and supporting gap analysis training, suggesting funding could be sought from the EU and the GEF.

On status, participants in Country Group Three identified the lack of gap analyses, insufficient information on biodiversity and the need for strengths, weaknesses opportunities and threats (SWOT) analyses. On challenges, the group underlined a lack of financial resources and of coordination between government departments, leading to a limited stakeholder involvement and information transfer. On support for next steps, they suggested forming working groups, increasing political will and enhancing community stakeholder participation.

On status and challenges, participants in Country Group Four raised issues such as improving leadership and institutions, integrating policies, capacity building and clarifying

responsibilities. On next steps and support, the group raised the need to build a case for biodiversity, develop action plans and create biodiversity data standards.

MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS: Gerald Steindlegger, Forest Policy Officer, WWF, highlighted the need for protected area management effectiveness evaluation (PAME), noting that many protected areas are managed ineffectively or threatened by poaching, mining, logging and other pressures. He outlined critical steps in a PAME and described four PAME methodologies: in-depth evidence-based; system-side peer-based; scorecard expert-based, such as the WWF/World Bank Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool; and categorical assumption-based.



Gerald Steindlegger, Forest Policy Officer, WWF

Explaining that all PAMEs will be collated in the World Database on Protected Areas, he noted their multiple uses, which include identifying and comparing single and system-wide threats, tracking trends, and assisting in fulfilling the PoWPA requirement to develop capacity action plans. On lessons learned, he highlighted the need to: involve the right people and agencies from the outset, prioritize actions, review progress and engage donors. In the ensuing discussion, Jason Spensley, TNC, pointed out that PAME activities are eligible for the UNDP/GEF Early Action Grant funding.

In an interactive session, Gerald Steindlegger asked participants to indicate on a chart whether they had carried out a PAME, and whether key recommendations had been developed and implemented. As a result of this exercise he highlighted that the majority of countries had carried out a PAME and developed key recommendations but only five had implemented these recommendations. Participants were also asked to consider and rate from one to three, major threats, critical management activities and institutional constraints confronting their protected areas management systems. They were then presented three country case studies.

Jamie Ervin, TNC, highlighted protected area management experiences from South Africa, drawing from a case study conducted with system-wide peer-based approaches of protected area management effectiveness in 110 Protected Areas in KwaZulu-Natal. She noted that the study included a review of existing material, collection of data in six regional workshops to establish: threats and pressures, management strengths and weaknesses, and correlations between practices, planning and budgeting. In concluding, she emphasized that PAME assessments are reviewed every five years and annual in-depth assessments are performed on a few reserves with findings integrated into budget processes.

Fidel Ruzigandekwe, Director of Conservation, Rwanda Wildlife Agency, presented the Rwandan National Management Effective Assessment and Capacity Action Plan. He noted that Rwanda has emerged from an environmental conservation

“dark period” but stressed that conservation processes have now commenced, highlighting political leadership commitment, regional cooperation with Uganda and the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the work of the Rwanda Environment Management Authority and Rwanda Office of Tourism and National Parks. During discussions, participants commended Rwanda’s efforts and noted the challenge for protected area management of population pressure and movements of pastoralists.

Kari Lahti, IUCN, presented on a recent comprehensive international management effectiveness evaluation (MEE) of the Finnish Protected Area System Natural Heritage Services of Metsähallitus in 2004. He explained that the MEE team was drawn from international experts who studied the “big picture” relating to the state of the environment, social and economic conditions as well as the performance of the park’s management. The team reported in 2005, making ten main recommendations, including adopting an ecosystem approach, involving communities, site planning and state of the park reporting. He suggested that an MEE should be built upon by integrating its recommendations into the site and system-level processes as well as designing a comprehensive action plan.

Country Group Discussions: Participants then convened in groups to discuss the four key questions relating to management effectiveness.

In Country Group One most country representatives accorded a low score to the status of PAME in their countries. On obstacles, all agreed on the need for stakeholder coordination and a standardized approach. On next steps, one participant proposed awareness raising within and across institutions, while another suggested integrating MEE into national strategies. On support, participants highlighted the need for access to expertise.

Some participants in Country Group Two highlighted a protected area management plan assessment carried out using WWF’s Rapid Assessment of Protected Areas Management methodology. On obstacles, several noted lack of institutional coordination, limited inclusiveness and ownership, and the need to adopt assessment tools for protected areas. On next steps, participants proposed establishing a regional workshop to share tools and exchange expertise and urging their governments to undertake assessments.

Country Group Three reported differing levels of progress towards PAME but all agreed that the main obstacles to advancement are insufficient financing, and lack of capacity and political will. They called for technical and financial support to build institutional capacity.



Country Group Three participants

Country Group Four participants discussed the possibility of collaboration between the three countries and ideas included holding joint information-sharing meetings.

The key message to emerge from the discussions in Country Group Five related to the lack of awareness at the government level of the importance of protected area management effectiveness, in particular in relation to the critical nature of goal and objective setting. Participants also highlighted the need to improve bureaucratic systems which inhibit the flow of management plans to protected area managers.

SUSTAINABLE FINANCING: Sarat Babu Gidda, CBD Secretariat, outlined the critical steps of a sustainable finance plan for national systems of protected areas. He explained that as the total number of protected areas increase so the level of funding allocated for protected areas may become stretched. Accordingly, the development of sustainable funding strategies becomes a priority. Gidda listed three steps for a sustainable finance plan: identifying funding opportunities by undertaking a systems-level financial gap analysis; prioritizing the sources by assessing the feasibility of the new and existing financial mechanisms at the site and system level; and presenting strategies to fill the funding gaps. Turning to the different mechanisms, he explained that they range from market-based to internal funding systems and depending on a number of factors, different types of funding will be more appropriate. He suggested that government leadership is critical to the process which entails an investment of six to eighteen months and between US\$20,000-US\$50,000. In comments, issues related to community involvement and the relevance of good governance were raised.

Jamie Ervin, TNC, gave a brief overview of a number of different types of funding, including: governmental, bi-multilateral donors, trust funds, debt-for-nature swaps, payment for eco-services, tourism concession fees, conservation taxes, corporate sponsorship, biodiversity offsets and prospecting, and carbon offsets. She asked country representatives to discuss amongst themselves which of the funding mechanisms were most appropriate for their countries and mark their thoughts on a matrix. Upon completion of the matrix, participants presented their observations, including Samuel Kasiki, Deputy Director Biodiversity Research and Monitoring, Kenya Wildlife Service, discussing his experience with branding and park fees increases.

Léon Rajaobelina, Regional Vice President, CI, outlined Madagascar's development of a finance strategy for protected areas since 2000. He emphasized that the strategy was informed by four studies undertaken to assess current and projected costs of managing protected areas. In addition, he outlined elements of the strategy's funding mechanism, including: a trust fund target of US\$50 million by the end of 2008; utilization of 8% of the country's agreed

foreign debt cancellation for protected areas; an annual increase of entrance fees and other park revenues by 5%; sourcing biodiversity conservation donors; and imposing a green tax.

Léon Rajaobelina then introduced a case study on a newly established trust fund as part of a long-term financing strategy for biodiversity conservation in Madagascar. He emphasized that potential donors had been consulted at an early stage on all basic aspects of the trust fund and that commitments of approximately US\$20 million were secured before its establishment. Noting that more than US\$11 million have been disbursed, he said that Madagascar has also agreed to earmark US\$10 million of its allocation under the GEF Resource Allocation Framework 2007-2010 for the trust fund. He further explained that the first grant agreement has been signed with the National Park Service. He suggested that, amongst other factors, securing support from the government from inception and establishing early dialogue with potential donors contributed to the project's success. He concluded by outlining next steps, including continued fundraising and establishing a track record in granting and supervisory roles.

Country Group Discussions: Participants then convened in groups to discuss the four key questions in relation to sustainable financing.

The majority of participants in Country Group One reported little progress towards sustainable financing. The key obstacles and challenges identified included limited marketing strategies, lack of investment in protected areas and weak interaction between local, federal, and regional government authorities. Next steps proposed included identifying gaps, creating a business plan, and setting up a task force or steering committee on sustainable financing. On support, participants called for training as well as diplomatic support at the policy level.

Participants in Country Group Two deliberated on their respective countries' financial plans for protected areas and rated these plans on a scale of one to three. Some noted limited diversification in sources of finance and knowledge on reinvesting funds, and resistance to adopting conservation taxes. On next steps, participants emphasized the need to analyze existing funding sources.

The majority of countries in Country Group Three reported that they did not have comprehensive sustainable financial plans and agreed that the fact that national laws do not allow for funds to go directly to the local level is an obstacle to sustainable finance. On opportunities, they suggested linking protected areas to poverty reduction and sustainable development in order to leverage GEF funding. On next steps, they highlighted the need for countries to adjust existing laws and policies to promote an enabling environment for planning and implementation.



Representatives from Country Group One discussed sustainable finance planning and mechanisms.



Léon Rajaobelina, Regional Vice President, Conservation International

On status, the participants in Country Group Four: agreed that there were no strategic financial plans at the national level; identified lack of information at the policy making level and vulnerability of funds to external risks as present obstacles; and proposed that next steps include rationalizing the legal position for nature conservation. On support they called for private sector involvement, technical input and skills development.

On status, all country representatives in Country Group Five reported that no comprehensive sustainable finance plans exist, largely because of lack of skills and support. The group felt that the UNDP/GEF Early Action Grant provides a good way to begin to address the issue and might be used to engage consultants.

OVERVIEW OF PROGRESS ON COUNTRY-LEVEL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POWPA, IDENTIFICATION OF CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES TO PROMOTE IMPLEMENTATION

Jamie Ervin, TNC, recapitulated on the elements of a protected area system master plan addressed during the Workshop, emphasizing that these form part of an integral system. On best practices, she highlighted several key elements including that: the process should be iterative; action planning is critical; and results from the assessment should be incorporated into the master plan. In ensuing discussions, Khaled Allam Harhash, Head of the Planning Unit, Egyptian Nature Conservation Sector, noted the success Egypt had achieved by testing management effectiveness at ground level in protected areas to enable extrapolation on a system-wide basis at the national level.

Jason Spensley, TNC, spoke on national implementation coalitions for the PoWPA, noting that a number of countries in Latin America and Asia in particular, have established such coalitions, known as National Implementation Support Partnerships (NISPs). He highlighted lessons learned from successful NISPs, including the need for in-country leadership and establishment of a buffer against political change, as well as providing funding incentives. On structure, he emphasized that coalition



Jason Spensley, Senior Biodiversity Advisor, The Nature Conservancy

size should be relevant to national context, citing Brazil and Panama which have 28 and four NISP members respectively, and that existing models of collaboration should be built upon. On NISP results, Spensley highlighted: increased funding for PoWPA activities by aligning resources; improved political mandate and political will, such as through the Micronesian Challenge in Palau, and Coral Triangle Challenge Indonesia; and significant conservation results, noting the establishment of 5.9 million hectares of new protected areas in Brazil.

Léon Rajaobelina, CI, highlighted that Madagascar also has a coalition of government agencies, donors and NGOs but that it does not take the form of a NISP. David Duli, Country

Coordinator, WWF Uganda, noted the formation of a pressure group consisting of NGOs and government institutions in his country seeking to address the current wave of threats against protected areas.

Maxim Vergeichik, UNDP, provided a detailed outline of the UNDP/GEF Early Action Grant application process. He urged countries to apply for PoWPA activities related to, *inter alia*: setting national targets and indicators; gap assessment and planning; evaluating experiences on wider landscape integration; identifying and addressing institutional and legal gaps; establishing training programmes and curricula; studying existing, and identifying new, finance options; developing implementation and monitoring schemes; and developing and adopting methods and standards for evaluating protected area management and governance effectiveness. Outlining application processes, Vergeichik underlined the need to inform CBD and GEF focal points about their applications, and noted that the funds can be utilized for the appointment of local or international consultants, management activities, and targeted training. During discussion, participants deliberated on possibilities for joint country application. In response to a question on how countries would be selected in the event of a surfeit of applications, Vergeichik outlined the applicable criteria and explained that approximately 50 to 60 countries will receive funding in this round.

Participants then studied the various categories under which applications could be made to the UNDP/GEF Early Action Grant and two countries reported back to plenary about which of the categories matched their needs. Aimée Mpambara, Environmental Impact Assessment Officer, Rwanda Environment Management Authority, explained that Rwanda could apply for GEF funding under the headings of ecological gap assessment, financial assessment and management effectiveness standards, after first verifying that no overlap exists with other GEF funding.

She further noted the intention to apply for the small grant to pay for the assessments. Thomas Bwana, Senior Environmental Management



Aimée Mpambara, Environmental Impact Assessment Officer, Rwanda Environment Management Authority

Officer, Tanzania Division of Environment, proposed identifying an institution to coordinate efforts on protected areas and urging them to apply for a small grant to carry out a similar exercise in Rwanda. Khaled Allam Harhash, Egyptian Nature Conservation Sector, mentioned the Nature Conservation Training Centre in Sharm el Sheikh, Egypt, and encouraged participants to apply for funding to attend its courses.

Country Group Reports: On Wednesday afternoon, participants heard reports from country groups on national protected area system master planning, including recommendations and country undertakings.

Country Group One Rapporteur Thomas Bwana, Tanzania Division of Environment, reported on his group's discussions on obstacles and challenges. For gap assessment, these included limited institutional capacity in data management and sharing. For management effectiveness, he listed a lack of access to research data and problems in implementing the ecosystem approach. For sustainable financing, he noted limited marketing strategies and diversion of funding away from protected areas, with next steps including awareness-raising for key decision makers and integrating MEE into national planning reporting. On support needs, the group called for expertise, diplomatic support at the policy level, capacity building on funding applications, and support for CBD focal points. The group made several recommendations including: support for the establishment of transboundary protected areas; support for CBD focal points in facilitating information sharing; capacity-building activities in local communities; and the appointment of national protected area focal points. He concluded by noting that the group undertook to organize awareness-raising workshops, submit proposals to the UNDP/GEF Early Action Grant and initiate a working plan on PoWPA.

Country Group Two Rapporteur Dindoyal Rumjeet, Scientific Officer, Mauritius Ministry of Agro Industry and Fisheries, reported on ecological gap assessment and underlining challenges, including a lack of adequate knowledge on available gap analysis tools. Regarding next steps, the group proposed developing a protected areas management inventory system and exchanging expertise among countries, and requested assistance for a regional clinic and funding by the EU and the GEF. On challenges to management effectiveness the group identified institutional coordination, limited inclusiveness and ownership. On next steps, the group proposed: establishing a regional workshop to share tools; engaging with governments to undertake management assessments plans; and creating a regional management effectiveness support team. On sustainable finance, obstacles included limited diversification in sources of finance, lack of knowledge on reinvesting funds and resistance to adopting conservation taxes. The group suggested analyzing existing funding sources, and called for stronger lobbying support from the CBD Secretariat. Rumjeet also presented on the group recommendations, including: technical support on information sharing within the subregion; organization of a donor meeting; and the establishment of a learning network on PoWPA implementation. The group also undertook to hold a subregional workshop on sustainable finance in January 2008 in Madagascar. David Duli, WWF Uganda, highlighted the limited role of engaging national governments in the group undertakings.

Country Group Three Rapporteur Khaled Allam Harhash, Egyptian Nature Conservation Sector, reported on his group's work. On gap assessment, he noted that most countries had not undertaken a full ecological gap analysis,



Country Group Three Rapporteur Khaled Allam Harhash, Head of Planning Unit, Egyptian Nature Conservation Sector

had limited biodiversity maps and needed to focus more closely on the marine environment. Challenges and next steps included designing environmental corridors and forming working groups for information sharing. On management effectiveness, Harhash reported that only one country had carried out a system-level assessment, explaining that it was due to lack of funding and capacity. The next steps the group proposed were carrying out PAME evaluations, improving institutional structures and called for political will and financial support. On financial planning, the group reported that finance was mainly sourced from governments and generally fell short of budgetary requirements. Challenges identified included limited stakeholder involvement and lack of political will to take next steps. The group called for financial support for the next steps proposed and recommended creating additional biodiversity focal points, appointing a cross-sectoral coordinator to manage biodiversity issues across national authorities and strengthening institutional capacity between stakeholders.

Reporting on his group's discussions on ecological gap assessment, Country Group Four Rapporteur Thulo Qhotsokoane, Senior Environment Officer, Lesotho Department of the Environment, explained that neither Lesotho nor Swaziland had conducted ecological gap assessments. Next steps included conducting systematic gap assessments in Lesotho and Swaziland and calling upon the South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) to support its neighbors by sharing data and experience. On management effectiveness, country representatives reported an increased rate of biodiversity reporting for protected areas with new auditing requirements for government funding in South Africa. Opportunities and challenges identified included a lack of coordinated national protected area programmes and difficulties in tracking revenue and expenditure across different levels of government. The group proposed organizing a subregional workshop, convened by SANBI, to share information, provide technical training and build capacity. On sustainable finance, the group reported that government funds are earmarked for protected areas but are not underpinned by sustainable funding plans, and urged development of a case for business investment in protected areas as well as technical support for the development of trust funds. Qhotsokoane reported that the group's recommendations included: acquiring technical assistance, developing community programmes and appointing CBD PoWPA focal points.

Country Group Five Rapporteur Tapera Chimuti, Director of Conservation, Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority, reported on broad themes recurring across ecological gap analysis, management effectiveness and financial planning. On status, he reported that PoWPA activities are underway but remain in their early stages, noting lack



Country Group Five Rapporteur Tapera Chimuti, Director of Conservation, Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority

of coordination between ministries, and that lead agencies' resources are stretched. He listed lack of political will and role confusion among biodiversity agencies as obstacles. Next steps and support included meetings of appropriate decision makers, sensitizing national leaders about the links between biodiversity and human well being and applying for GEF funding. In conclusion, he noted the group's recommendation that countries explore collaboration within the Southern African Development Community framework to encourage collaboration and to support park managers' further training.

INPUTS TO THE OEWG ON PROTECTED AREAS

On Wednesday morning, Jason Spensley, TNC, explained that participants would begin discussions on recommendations to be forwarded to the second OEWG on Protected Areas, as well as to CBD COP-9, CBD member countries and other governments, and to donors and other supporters.

Participants reconvened in the five country groups to finalize country reports on national protected area system master planning and to agree a maximum of three recommendations and undertakings arising from the Workshop discussions. Trevor Sandwith, IUCN-WCPA, then facilitated discussions on the recommendations that had emerged from the country group reports. He clustered the recommendations into five categories: institutional coordination; regional cooperation; capacity-building and technical development; community participation; and financial support.

Regarding institutional coordination, he summarized the recommendations as including the need for leadership in sustaining projects and to promote continuity of stakeholder participation, and coordination between national authorities. In discussions, participants added the need to include all stakeholders in establishing conservation institutions and the impact of lack of capacity in the formation of institutional frameworks.

On regional cooperation, Trevor Sandwith highlighted a recommendation for CBD Parties to establish regional learning networks and the CBD Secretariat to provide technical support in information sharing. Noting the limited capacity of the CBD Secretariat, Gerald Steindlegger, WWF, urged countries to seek NGO and other stakeholder assistance in establishing a regional network on protected areas.

Regarding capacity building and technical development, Trevor Sandwith summarized the recommendations as including: increasing professional skills; technical training in ecological gap analysis; and sustainable financial planning and developing community capacity. Participants added that much capacity already exists in countries and among regions, but the challenge is to effectively share it. One participant commented that

protected area managers should form a network to facilitate this, with another adding that further training for biodiversity professionals, with an emphasis on taxonomists, is vital.

Regarding financing, Trevor Sandwith noted that, in addition to the need for increased funding, groups had called for financial mechanisms for effective protected area management and technical assistance for financial planning through technical assistance. He also emphasized the need to lobby support from national governments and not just from international donors. Observing a long-term decline in funding for protected areas, Nik Sekhian, Regional Technical Advisor, Biodiversity and Regional Waters, GEF, urged participants to learn from countries such as Namibia, Zambia and Madagascar, which have been successful in establishing a case for investment, such as linking protected areas with development. Kari Lahti, IUCN, stressed that in applying for the UNDP/GEF Early Action Grant, countries should prioritize management-effectiveness evaluations above sustainable financing.

On Thursday morning, participants worked to finalize the recommendations to be forwarded to the second OEWG on Protected Areas. Trevor Sandwith, presented the draft recommendations to be forwarded to the second meeting OEWG on Protected Areas and facilitated an interactive session where participants gave further comments. The recommendations were listed under five headings.

- On national cooperation, recommendations included: appointing national CBD PoWPA focal points and supporting their role in championing implementation through: better identification of roles and responsibilities; promoting effective coordination; increasing involvement of civil society; creating skills development programmes; and convening an annual review forum.
- On regional cooperation the recommendations included: supporting existing, or the establishment of new, regional and subregional platforms for cooperation and knowledge exchange; ensuring active IUCN-WCPA professional support; and developing active learning networks.
- On capacity development, recommendations highlighted the need for: technical support for the development of professional capacity; awareness raising at all levels; technical clinics on priority PoWPA activities; and a system of monitoring progress through WCMC.
- On community involvement, recommendations included: effective processes to activate community involvement; recognition of community based organizations as co-implementers; improved governance roles and responsibilities; skills development at a local level; support for schools-based programmes; and actively identifying and taking communities through a national process to integrate community contributions to protected area systems.



Nik Sekhian, Regional Technical Advisor, Biodiversity and Regional Waters, GEF



Trevor Sandwith, Deputy Chair IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, facilitated discussions on the Workshop's recommendations

- On funding, recommendations included supporting the development of a more powerful business case for national funding of protected areas by: promoting links with development agencies; providing guidance and tools supported by capacity development for better financial planning at system and protected area levels; improved cost effectiveness of protected area management; demonstration of measurable progress at meeting goals; and mobilizing private sector expertise. The recommendations also suggest that governments, international organizations and NGOs enhance coordinated financial and technical support through capacity development at national and regional levels among protected area professionals and develop PoWPA learning partnerships.

In the interactive session that followed, participants commented upon and added to the recommendations presented. One participant suggested that on cooperation, new regional structures should be avoided, preferring enhancement of existing structures. On community involvement, the importance of continuous involvement was raised in addition to factoring local community-level knowledge and expertise into decision making. The systematic involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the CBD PoWPA process, including regional PoWPA regional implementation workshops, was also proposed. On finance, a participant added a recommendation to promote mechanisms to stimulate private sector financing through corporate social responsibility and biodiversity offsets.

The final comment focused on how the group could operationalize the recommendations. Trevor Sandwith concluded the session by explaining that the Secretariat would further work on the list of recommendations in order to put them in presentable form for the second meeting of the OEWG on Protected Areas, to be held in Rome, in February 2007.

CLOSING OF THE WORKSHOP

On Thursday morning Jason Spensley, TNC, explained that the country reports and Workshop recommendations would be annexed to the CBD Secretariat's report of the Workshop.

Annetta Bok, Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee, South Africa, presented a statement from the indigenous people, local communities, and traditional fisher folk of Anglophone Africa, welcoming the opportunity presented by the Workshop to participate in the review of progress on the PoWPA. She highlighted the value of partnership and inclusion, as well as of the application of traditional knowledge and practices in accordance with CBD Article 8(j) (traditional knowledge), and noted the disconnect

between national processes and the community. She presented recommendations to governments including: improving communication with indigenous peoples, local communities and fisher folk; and establishing mechanisms to build their capacity. Further recommendations included obtaining prior informed consent from indigenous peoples, local communities and traditional fisher folk for all development projects, and ensuring respect for their livelihoods and traditional lifestyles while implementing the PoWPA. Bok concluded by emphasizing collaboration in partnership with the CBD Secretariat in achieving 2010 and 2012 biodiversity targets and implementation of the PoWPA.

Further to the participant's discussion of recommendations summarized in the previous section, Sarat Babu Gidda, CBD Secretariat, urged participants to pay attention to implementation of PoWPA, source funding from donor countries and agencies, and concluded by thanking sponsors, resource persons and participants. Jo Mulongoy, CBD Secretariat, expressed gratitude for South Africa's hospitality, highlighting that "we learn by doing."

Participants gathered together to make final comments and expressed gratitude to the CBD Secretariat, sponsors and resource people, and other participants for sharing their country experiences. Ronney Renaud, Managing Director, Seychelles Marine Parks Authority, announced a concrete outcome of the meeting as the reaching of an agreement by Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique and Seychelles to host a regional clinic in January 2008 in Madagascar. Aimée Mpambara, Rwanda Environment Management Authority, noted that the Workshop had provided a fruitful platform for reviewing her country's achievements and future actions. Alexander Belokurov, Programme Officer, WWF Protected Areas Initiative, highlighted the importance of fulfilling commitments and undertakings made during country-group discussions.

Sikhumbuzo Dlamini, Director of National Parks, Swaziland National Trust Commission, proposed, and participants adopted, the Workshop report, including the annexed recommendations. The Workshop closed at 11.25am.



Sikhumbuzo Dlamini, Director of National Parks, Swaziland National Trust Commission



Anglophone Africa Subregional Workshop on Protected Areas participants.



L-R: Jason Spensley, The Nature Conservancy, and Sarat Babu Gidda, CBD Secretariat, discussed next steps.



UPCOMING MEETINGS

SECOND LATIN AMERICAN CONGRESS ON NATIONAL PARKS AND OTHER PROTECTED AREAS:

The Second IUCN Latin American Congress on National Parks and Other Protected Areas will be held from 30 September - 6 October 2007, in Bariloche, Argentina. The Congress will address a wide range of issues related to management of protected areas and biodiversity conservation. For more information contact: IUCN Regional Office for South America; tel: +593-2-337-226-1075; fax: +593-2-337-226-3075; e-mail: samerica@sur.iucn.org; internet: <http://www.sur.iucn.org/boletin-parques/congreso.htm>

FIFTH MEETING OF THE CBD OEWG ON ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING:

The fifth meeting of the CBD's OEWG on access and benefit sharing, will take place from 8 - 12 October 2007, in Montreal, Canada. This meeting will continue CBD's work on aspects of an international regime on access and benefit sharing, including access to genetic resources, prior informed consent and traditional knowledge. For more information contact: CBD Secretariat; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: secretariat@cbd.int; internet: <http://www.cbd.int/meetings/default.shtml>

FIFTH MEETING OF THE ARTICLE 8(J) OEWG: The fifth meeting of the CBD's OEWG on Article 8(j) (traditional knowledge) and Related Provisions will take place from 15 - 19 October 2007, in Montreal, Canada. This meeting will consider a progress report on the programme of work for Article 8(j), as well as a plan of action for retention of traditional knowledge, innovation and practices. For more information contact: CBD Secretariat; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: secretariat@cbd.int; internet: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meeting.aspx?mtg=WG8J-05>

FIFTH TRONDHEIM CONFERENCE ON BIODIVERSITY:

The fifth Trondheim Conference will take place from 29 October to 2 November 2007, in Trondheim, Norway. This conference aims to provide input to the CBD and its preparations for COP-9, to be held in Germany in 2008. Focus will be on the critical role of biodiversity and ecosystems in providing goods and services that are necessary for human well being and security, as well as for economic development. For more information contact: Norway's Directorate for Nature Management; e-mail: postmottak@dirnat.no; internet: <http://www.trondheimconference.org/>

SIXTH MEETING OF THE CBD OEWG ON ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING:

The sixth meeting of the CBD OEWG on access and benefit sharing will meet from 21 - 25 January 2008, in Geneva, Switzerland. This meeting will continue work on aspects of an international regime on ABS, including access to genetic resources, prior informed consent and traditional knowledge. For more information contact: CBD Secretariat; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: secretariat@cbd.int; internet: <http://www.cbd.int/meetings/default.shtml>

SECOND MEETING OF THE CBD OEWG ON PROTECTED AREAS:

The second meeting of the CBD OEWG on Protected Areas will take place from 11 - 15 February 2008, in Rome, Italy. This meeting will consider

future action on the Programme of Work on Protected Areas, including country reports on implementation and recommendations from a series of workshops. For more information contact: CBD Secretariat; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: secretariat@cbd.int; internet: <http://www.cbd.int/meetings/default.shtml>

CBD SBSTTA 13: The 13th meeting of the CBD's Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice will take place from 18 - 22 February 2008, in Rome, Italy. This meeting will review progress in the CBD's implementation and address scientific and technical issues in relation to the Convention. For more information contact: CBD Secretariat; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: secretariat@cbd.int; internet: <http://www.cbd.int/meetings/default.shtml>

CBD COP-9: CBD COP-9 will take place from 19 - 30 May 2008, in Bonn, Germany. The COP will consider, *inter alia*, progress in the implementation of the PoWPA and recommendations arising from the second OEWG on Protected Areas. For more information contact: CBD Secretariat; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: secretariat@cbd.int; internet: <http://www.cbd.int/meetings/default.shtml>

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-----------|---|
| APAI | African Protected Areas Initiative |
| CBD | Convention on Biological Diversity |
| CI | Conservation International |
| COP | Conference of the Parties |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| IBA | Important birdlife area |
| IUCN | World Conservation Union |
| LDC | Least developed country |
| MEE | Management effectiveness evaluation |
| NEPAD | New Economic Partnership for Africa's Development |
| NISP | National implementation support partnerships |
| OEWG | <i>Ad hoc</i> open ended working group |
| PAME | Protected areas management effectiveness |
| PoWPA | Programme of Work on Protected Areas |
| SANBI | South African National Biodiversity Institute |
| SIDS | Small island developing states |
| TNC | The Nature Conservancy |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNEP | United Nations Environment Programme |
| UNEP-WCMC | UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre |
| WCPA | World Commission on Protected Areas |
| WPC-V | IUCN Fifth World Parks Congress |
| WSSD | World Summit on Sustainable Development |
| WWF | Worldwide Fund for Nature |