SUMMARY OF THE CBD EXPERT WORKSHOP ON PROTECTED AREAS: 17-18 MARCH 2006

The Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), with funding from the European Union, convened an expert workshop on protected areas on 17-18 March 2006, in Curitiba, Brazil, prior to the eighth meeting of the CBD Conference of the Parties (COP-8). Over 25 experts from CBD parties and intergovernmental, non-governmental, indigenous and local community organizations participated in the workshop, and 20 observers attended.

The expert workshop was established by the *Ad Hoc* Open-Ended Working Group on Protected Areas at its first meeting (13-17 June 2005, Montecatini, Italy) to preview the possible elements of the work programme on protected areas before the next meeting of the Working Group. Due to lack of financial resources and logistical difficulties, the second meeting of the Working Group on Protected Areas, originally scheduled for December 2005, in Montreal, Canada, could not be held prior to COP-8. Accordingly, the expert workshop aimed to facilitate an informed review by COP-8 of:

· the implementation of activities/elements of the work programme on protected areas; and
· a draft revised evaluation matrix, which includes for each goal of the work programme the criteria and information needed to assess implementation, possible sources of information and the description of progress and main obstacles.

During the two-day workshop, participants suggested further modifications to the evaluation matrix, and made comments on the review of implementation, particularly on difficulties in reporting on progress in implementation. The report of the expert workshop will be submitted to COP-8 as an information document (UNEP/CBD/COP/8/INF/28).

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CBD AND PROTECTED AREAS

The CBD, negotiated under the auspices of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), was adopted on 22 May 1992, and entered into force on 29 December 1993. There are currently 188 parties to the Convention, which 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. Establishment

and management of protected areas (PAs), together with conservation, sustainable use and restoration initiatives in the adjacent land and seascape, are central to CBD Article 8 (*In situ* Conservation).

COP-2 AND -3: At its second (November 1995, Jakarta, Indonesia) and third meetings (November 1996, Buenos Aires, Argentina), the COP considered CBD Article 8, and emphasized regional and international cooperation, and the importance of disseminating relevant experience.

COP-4: At its fourth meeting (May 1998, Bratislava, Slovakia), the COP decided to consider PAs as one of the three main themes for COP-7. It encouraged the CBD Executive Secretary to develop relationships with other processes with a view to fostering good management practices in several areas related to PAs, including ecosystem and bioregional approaches to PA management and sustainable use of biodiversity, mechanisms to enhance stakeholder involvement, and transboundary PAs. It also established an *Ad Hoc* Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on marine and coastal PAs. PAs formed a central element of the thematic work programmes on marine and coastal biodiversity, and inland water ecosystems.

COP-6: At its sixth meeting (April 2002, The Hague, the Netherlands), the COP adopted an expanded programme of work on forest biodiversity, containing a number of activities related to PAs, and calling for work on the role and effectiveness of PAs. It also adopted the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, which specifies that by 2010: at least 10% of each of the world's ecological regions should be effectively conserved, implying increasing representation of different ecological regions in PAs, and increasing effectiveness of PAs; and protection of

IN THIS ISSUE

50% of the most important areas for plant diversity should be ensured through effective conservation measures, including PAs. COP-6 further established an AHTEG on PAs to prepare for consideration of the issue by COP-7.

SBSTTA-8: The eighth meeting of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-8) (March 2003, Montreal, Canada) produced a recommendation on marine and coastal PAs, on the basis of the work of the AHTEG on marine and coastal PAs.

MYPOW: The Open-ended Intersessional Meeting on the Multi-Year Programme of Work of the CBD COP up to 2010 (MYPOW) (March 2003, Montreal, Canada) requested that the AHTEG on PAs, SBSTTA-9 and COP-7 consider the outcome of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (September 2002, Johannesburg, South Africa), which called for supporting initiatives for hotspot areas and other areas essential for biodiversity, and for promoting the development of national and regional ecological networks and corridors (Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, paragraph 44(g)).

FIFTH IUCN WORLD PARKS CONGRESS: The fifth IUCN World Parks Congress (September 2003, Durban, South Africa) called on the CBD COP to adopt a rigorous programme of work on PAs, including specific targets and timetables, and establish effective means to monitor and assess its implementation. A liaison group meeting was convened by the CBD Executive Secretary with a view to identifying Congress elements that should be brought to SBSTTA's attention.

SBSTTA-9: On the basis of the work of the AHTEG on PAs, SBSTTA-9 (November 2003, Montreal, Canada) considered PAs as one of the themes for in-depth consideration and proposed a revised programme of work.

COP-7: At its seventh meeting (February 2004, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia), the COP adopted the programme of work on PAs. The work programme consists of four interlinked elements on: direct actions for planning, selecting, establishing, strengthening and managing PA systems and sites; governance, participation, equity and benefit-sharing; enabling activities; and standards, assessment and monitoring. COP-7 further decided to establish an *Ad Hoc* Open-ended Working Group on PAs and assess progress in the implementation of the work programme at each COP meeting until 2010.

FIRST WORKING GROUP ON PAs: At its first meeting, the *Ad Hoc* Open-ended Working Group on PAs (June 2005, Montecatini, Italy) adopted recommendations on: options for cooperation for establishing marine protected areas (MPAs) beyond national jurisdiction; further development of toolkits for the identification, designation, management, monitoring and evaluation of national and regional PA systems; options for mobilizing adequate and timely financial resources for the implementation of the work programme by developing countries and countries with economies in transition; and a process for the review of implementation of the work programme.

UNGA WORKING GROUP ON MARINE BIODIVERSITY: The *Ad Hoc* Open-ended Informal Working Group of the UN General Assembly to study issues relating to marine biodiversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction (13-17 February 2006, New York) addressed the legal framework for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction and high seas MPAs, among other things. The Working Group expressed the view that area-based

management tools, such as MPAs, are widely accepted and further elaboration of criteria for the identification, establishment and management of MPAs is required.

WORKSHOP REPORT

On Friday, 17 March 2006, CBD Executive Secretary Ahmed Djoghlaf welcomed participants to the expert workshop. He stressed the close interactions between the three objectives of the Convention, highlighting that biodiversity conservation is the precondition for sustainable use and benefit-sharing and protected areas are an essential tool for achieving the 2010 target to significantly reduce the current rate of biodiversity loss. Djoghlaf conveyed the Secretariat's regret for not being able to convene the second meeting of the Working Group on PAs before COP-8. He noted that the expert workshop is not a substitute for the Working Group meeting, but can assist in the continuation of the Group's work.

Adriana Tescari, Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Relations, welcomed participants to the meeting on behalf of Brazil, and thanked the Secretariat for inviting her to chair the workshop. She referred to Brazil's commitment to implement the work programme on PAs not only to protect but also to use biodiversity sustainably. The European Community (EC) highlighted the importance of the work programme on PAs and its impacts on the ground, and urged participants to use this workshop to assess progress in implementation of the work programme before COP-8.

Participants adopted the agenda and the organization of work (UNEP/CBD/EWS.PA/1/1 and Add.1). The Secretariat explained the purpose of the workshop and its expected outputs, namely guidance to COP-8 on: the status of implementation of the work programme; ways and means to promote and facilitate implementation; and types and sources of information and resources needed to continue implementation. He noted that few governments, non-governmental organizations, and local and indigenous communities had provided the requested information on implementation of the work programme on PAs.

PREVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORK PROGRAMME

Participants commented on the information on national implementation of the work programme on PAs (UNEP/CBD/COP/8/29 and UNEP/CBD/COP/8/INF/1), as a preview to facilitate the review of implementation by COP-8. Australia encouraged experts to keep in mind that available information on implementation is limited. The EC suggested focusing on review of implementation and sharing of country experiences at the second meeting of the Working Group on PAs, and recommended that this workshop consider how to ensure that parties provide more information on implementation. Chair Tescari recalled that the CBD Working Group on the Review of Implementation had discussed existing reporting burdens. Participants discussed reporting experiences and reasons for the limited submission of reports, calling attention to the breadth of the subject matter covered by the CBD and lack of human and technological capacity for reporting.

Objectives of reporting: The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds prioritized reporting as a tool to facilitate the COP in assessing progress in implementation and identifying necessary support. The EC noted that reporting should also inform national decision-making and allocation of funds, and allow for sharing

of countries' experiences. The Secretariat called attention to using reports for identifying capacity-building needs. The World Conservation Union-World Commission on Protected Areas (IUCN-WCPA) advocated focusing attention on how reports contribute to biodiversity conservation and, supported by Finland, called for the organization of regional workshops to share lessons learned and build capacity. Romania emphasized the role of broad stakeholder involvement in national reporting to increase awareness and support for the implementation of the work programme. Finland remarked that reporting should be an incentive for implementation and that reports be targeted to practitioners.

Improving reporting: The Nature Conservancy (TNC) called attention to a scorecard tool that has been used in South America to measure implementation. Canada said that reporting should address strategic questions, rather than being descriptive. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) suggested focusing on strategic indicators, and recommended streamlining reporting and engaging national statistical commissions in reporting on PAs. Australia suggested that the workshop identify the necessary steps leading to the development of strategic reporting and indicators, in the context of the CBD work programme on PAs. She also highlighted the need to harmonize different reporting schemes in different ministries and to make information accessible.

India underscored issues of understanding and ownership of reporting at the national level, highlighting the risk of duplication of work by different institutions. The Secretariat noted that the development of indicators to assess progress should take into account that the work programme on PAs is implemented according to national priorities, capacities and needs. The EC highlighted the need to rethink the whole reporting system under the CBD, focusing on outputs rather than processes. Australia and Canada proposed prioritizing the challenges and needs in reports on implementation.

Brazil and Romania shared their experiences on decentralized database systems allowing stakeholders to update information directly. India stressed the importance of cooperation with research institutions in gathering and analyzing information, while Estonia highlighted the role of cooperation with neighboring countries as an effective mechanism to overcome obstacles to reporting. Colombia urged the Secretariat to continue providing financial support towards future meetings of the Working Group on PAs to strengthen cooperation among parties. Overall, participants agreed that regional systems could facilitate identification and provision of solutions to common problems.

Final Outcome: In the preview of implementation of activities/elements of the work programme (UNEP/CBD/COP/8/INF/28, Annex I), participants noted that the information in the report on implementation of the work programme on PAs is not sufficient to assist the COP in a comprehensive review of the work programme. Participants also agreed on the urgent need to improve reporting systems through the assessment of priorities, and recommended that the COP reflect on such systems, making reporting output-oriented rather than activity-oriented.

Participants suggested further actions and means to be considered to streamline reporting, such as:
- improving the method of information gathering;
- identifying fundamental implementation challenges;
- highlighting success stories;
- focusing on relevant questions when reporting;
- integrating reporting of PAs into other thematic areas of the CBD;
- making use of regional discussions and workshops;
- benefiting from the assistance that may be provided by international and regional organizations and NGOs;
- developing national clearing-house mechanisms;
- improving communication between national focal points and national institutions in charge of PAs; and
- making use of available databases, such as the World Database on Protected Areas.

REVIEW OF THE EVALUATION MATRIX
Participants discussed the draft revised matrix for the review of implementation of the work programme on PAs (UNEP/CBD/EWS.PA/1/2) on Friday and Saturday. On Friday, Chair Tescari invited general views on the matrix, and participants proposed modifications to its format and its "key evaluation questions" for each goal of the work programme. On Saturday, participants continued their review of key evaluation questions and, in the afternoon, discussed and adopted a further revised matrix as an annex to the information document for submission to COP-8.

General comments: Uganda requested clarification of how the matrix can be adapted for national level implementation. Canada proposed focusing on capacity-building needs at the national level and on strategies and priorities to move implementation forward at the international level. With TNC, Australia asked whether reporting is to be based on a listing of activities or on the impact of such activities. Conservation International called for concrete indicators for achievement of targets and goals.

The Secretariat highlighted the importance of indicators, such as the coverage of PAs, their representativeness and the efficiency of their management, to show progress in achieving the 2010 target. He also suggested looking both at the actual progress in achieving the 2010 target and at the reasons for success or lack thereof. Romania highlighted the importance of gathering information on legislation and institutional arrangements as easily measurable indicators. Uganda and El Salvador noted problems in understanding questions and compiling the information available to fit the report's format, and proposed simplifying reporting systems. Finland suggested that the Secretariat assist in the identification of obstacles to reporting by providing an analysis of national experiences from national reports.

Canada proposed an introductory paragraph explaining: the purposes of the matrix, namely to provide a strategic assessment of progress, to facilitate the identification of obstacles and to inform on capacity needs; and the intended targeted audience, namely parties identifying priorities in support of their national biodiversity strategy action plans, the COP, and the Secretariat in synthesizing information submitted by parties.

Format of the evaluation matrix: The Russian Federation suggested focusing the "key evaluation questions" contained in the matrix on the status of biodiversity and on how the work programme has contributed to the improvement of this status. Romania recommended clarifying the procedure by which countries are to reply to these questions, and suggested highlighting the most important questions to be answered by all countries. The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) said that the ultimate question is how far countries have progressed

in achieving the targets and goals, and that the detailed "key evaluation questions" listed in the matrix could be used instead as key evaluation "considerations." The IUCN-WCPA suggested a more quantitative and regional approach. Australia raised concerns on insufficient capacity of some countries to report on all the "key evaluation questions."

The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, supported by the IUCN-WCPA, suggested retaining in the matrix only the indicative questions, and adding an annex to it on additional guidance. Australia recommended identifying and simplifying key questions, noting that most contextual information is reported by other mechanisms, such as national reports. Chair Tescari noted that the aim of the matrix is to guide the Secretariat's work and not construct a report. The Secretariat suggested that the questions should highlight: key successes towards achievement of the goals and targets; key challenges or obstacles; and future plans to address these goals and targets.

Participants agreed to:
- place key questions to be answered by all countries in bold, to differentiate them from other national considerations;
- separate descriptions of progress from obstacles, challenges and needs; and
- include information on data sources within responses to key evaluation questions.

Goal 1.1: Establish and strengthen national and regional PA systems integrated into a global network: The EC proposed that questions on the number of and surface covered by new PAs and on the number of ecological systems represented in PA networks should be prioritized. The Russian Federation proposed inserting a timeline for reporting on the establishment of PAs, with Romania proposing to use the interval between COPs.

Participants considered the need for countries to develop a "master plan" for their PA systems, and eventually decided to refer to "plans or actions," to refer both to planning systems and to single steps taken or planned. Participants also discussed whether the questions should refer to percentages or absolute figures for spatial coverage of new PAs, to their contribution to biodiversity conservation rather than to spatial coverage, or to coverage of biomes or ecosystem types. The EC proposed reporting on the progress made, in quantitative and qualitative terms, on comprehensiveness, ecological representation and effective management of PA networks, as defined by each country. IUCN-WCPA suggested including a question on plans for the creation of future PAs. Australia noted that the only necessary information is the increase in area under protection and its adequacy to conserve biodiversity.

Goal 1.2: Integrate PAs in broader land and seascapes and sectors: The Russian Federation and Australia prioritized questions on how the needs of PAs are taken into account in the wider land and seascape to address the need for connectivity, and on measures taken to develop an enabling environment for the integration of PAs. Participants discussed whether to refer to ecological networks, as they may not be applicable to all parties, and decided to refer to "connectivity, including ecological networks" and delete text on "corridors and buffer zones."

Goal 1.3: Establish and strengthen regional networks, transboundary PAs, and collaboration between neighboring PAs across national borders: Participants discussed whether to retain references to high seas MPAs, pending consideration of this issue by COP-8, and eventually agreed to refer to "marine" PAs rather than "high seas" PAs.

IUCN-WCPA opposed referring only to neighboring countries for consultations on potential transboundary PAs. Participants also decided to delete reference to the Convention on Migratory Species in the question on the potential for regional cooperation through the establishment of migratory corridors. Australia requested further guidance on the nature of regional collaboration and the number of countries to be involved in it. Romania, supported by Canada, Australia and IUCN-WCPA, prioritized the question of collaboration across national boundaries in relation to PAs.

Goal 1.4: Substantially improve site-based PA planning and management: TNC and the Russian Federation recommended using percentages rather than absolute figures for the number of PAs with management plans, while Romania suggested percentages for both the number and the surface area of PAs. The Russian Federation suggested combining text on percentages of PAs having management plans and those developed using participatory approaches. The EC suggested having just one question on the percentage of PAs with effectively implemented management plans. India requested retention of the question on management plan preparation through consultative processes. Canada and Australia noted that many PA management plans currently in place address operational issues rather than biodiversity objectives. India and Australia suggested that a question on consultation through site-based workshops should refer to "science-based and participatory" management plans. Romania and India preferred to refer to up-to-date science-based management plans that "are under effective implementation" rather than "have been effectively implemented."

Goal 1.5: Prevent and mitigate the negative impacts of key threats to PAs: The EC suggested expanding the question on measures to prevent and address threats to also include measures to identify and mitigate them. TNC suggested adding a new indicative question on measures taken regarding rehabilitation and restoration of the ecological integrity of PAs.

Australia highlighted the difficulty in identifying "key threats," in light of different levels of threats and responses required, and proposed differentiating among prevention and mitigation of potential threats and addressing existing threats. Cuba suggested requesting information on how the status of PAs is affected after identification of key threats.

Goal 2.1: Promote equity and benefit-sharing: India, supported by Brazil, requested adding reference to economic and socio-cultural "benefits" in addition to "costs" of PAs to local and indigenous peoples. Australia, supported by Colombia, opposed singling out particular stakeholders, and the EC suggested "particularly local and indigenous peoples." Participants agreed to prioritize the question on legislative or policy frameworks addressing the equitable sharing of both costs and benefits arising from the establishment of PAs. An indigenous representative proposed a new question regarding measures to avoid and mitigate the negative impacts arising from the establishment and maintenance of PAs on indigenous and local communities. India also proposed a question on mechanisms to identify and recognize indigenous and local communities' participation in PAs and how their participation has been integrated into the national PA system.

Goal 2.2: Enhance and secure involvement of indigenous and local communities and relevant stakeholders: Australia distinguished between indigenous participation in the process of establishing new PAs and in the management of existing PAs. Colombia proposed referring to both management and co-management of PAs by indigenous communities. The EC proposed focusing the question on the mechanisms to ensure the full and effective participation of indigenous communities in the establishment and management of PAs, and Romania suggested another question on the mechanisms to ensure the participation of other relevant stakeholders. An indigenous representative suggested a question on specific measures taken to support indigenous and local communities' participation in the management of PAs.

Goal 3.1: Provide an enabling policy, institutional and socioeconomic environment for PAs: Colombia and the Russian Federation proposed a question on examples of incentives and policies that have been established for PAs. IUCN-WCPA preferred a question on mechanisms using social and economic valuation and incentives to provide a supportive enabling environment for more effective establishment and management of PAs. Australia favored a question on whether an enabling environment had been provided. Participants agreed to questions on whether incentives and policies have been put in place and on examples of these.

Goal 3.2: Build capacity for the planning, establishment and management of PAs: Brazil suggested an additional question regarding multidisciplinary approaches to PA management. Australia expressed concern regarding the availability and quantification of information on capacity-building programmes, arguing that it could lead to inconsistencies in the collection of data. The EC, Uganda and the Russian Federation noted that capacity building is not easily quantifiable. The Russian Federation prioritized qualitative information, such as the type of capacity-building programmes, rather than quantitative data, such as the number of programmes implemented. El Salvador proposed questions on the identification of tools, strategies and technologies established.

Goal 3.3: Develop, apply and transfer appropriate technologies for PAs: Participants agreed to delete a question on how many PAs have benefited from technological innovations. Rather than listing all technologies for PAs, participants decided to focus the question on whether and which innovative technologies and approaches in PA management have been identified, developed and implemented at national and regional levels. Brazil requested adding a question on technology transfer within and among countries, and Australia suggested focusing on collaborations for sharing technology and experience.

Goal 3.4: Ensure financial sustainability of PAs and national and regional systems of PAs: Colombia proposed questions on financial strategies considering financial and ecological benefits, and the proportion of different funding sources. Brazil preferred a question on mechanisms to use financial resources efficiently, and Australia emphasized the need for a question on strategies for long-term funding for PAs. The Russian Federation prioritized questions on the identification of funding needs and on the providers and quantities of received funding. The EC prioritized questions on the: assessment of financial needs, both in quantitative and qualitative terms; mechanisms to meet these needs; and donors' support to developing countries, countries with economies in transition and

small island developing States. Colombia stressed the need to differentiate between private and public funding, with Romania underscoring the importance of quantifying contributions from national budgets.

Goal 3.5: Strengthen communication, education and public awareness: Finland proposed an additional question on whether the basic biodiversity values of PAs have been clearly identified, understood and communicated, with Australia and Brazil noting the difficulty of collecting data to assess biodiversity values. Participants eventually agreed on a question on review mechanisms to evaluate if communication programmes are effective in communicating the basic biodiversity values of PAs.

Goal 4.1: Develop and adopt minimum standards and best practices for national and regional PA systems: Participants agreed to combine questions on listing standards, criteria and best practices that have been applied to site selection, site management, governance, and long-term monitoring of outcomes. Brazil noted that effectiveness of these standards and practices was more important than listing them, and Australia proposed asking whether standards, criteria and best practices have been applied. Participants debated whether to refer to existing or new, and national or global, standards, and agreed to include them all.

Goal 4.2: Evaluate and improve the effectiveness of protected area management: Romania suggested focusing on percentage of surface area of the PA system rather than on the number of PAs that have been evaluated. Brazil, Finland, Uganda and Conservation International suggested considering both the effectiveness of PAs and their management. Finland and India noted that the IUCN-WCPA framework can be considered for evaluations at the system level, and other managerial evaluation tools could be utilized at park levels. Colombia and El Salvador prioritized assessments of a country's capacity to adopt any systematic way to evaluate effectiveness, including how the results of PA management assessments are incorporated into national strategic plans. Participants agreed to prioritize questions on: countries' systematic evaluation of PA management effectiveness, the percentage of national PA system surface evaluated, and how the results of these evaluations are incorporated into management plans and strategies.

Goal 4.3: Assess and monitor PA status and trends: Australia proposed, and participants agreed on, questions addressing the extent of systems in place to monitor PA status and trends and to report on status and trends in PA systems. TNC proposed reference to the World Database on PAs, managed by UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre in partnership with IUCN-WCPA and the World Database on Protected Areas Consortium. After initial disagreement by Brazil, participants agreed to include a question for consideration on mechanisms to provide regular information to the World Database.

Goal 4.4: Ensure that scientific knowledge contributes to the establishment and effectiveness of PAs and PA systems: TNC proposed a question on the contribution of scientific data to the establishment and monitoring of PAs, and WCS proposed one on the incorporation of scientific information into management decisions. The Russian Federation preferred questions on: existing scientific programmes, existing tools to access scientific information, and the scientific base for establishing and monitoring PAs. The EC proposed a question on the mechanisms to ensure the contribution of scientific knowledge to PAs. Participants agreed on questions on existing

mechanisms to ensure the contribution of scientific knowledge to the establishment and effectiveness of PAs and PA systems, and on mechanisms for scientific information dissemination.

Kiribati called for considering the contribution of traditional knowledge. Liberia proposed a question on the contribution of scientific data and traditional knowledge to PA management effectiveness. Participants eventually agreed to a proposal by the Russian Federation for a question on mechanisms to involve indigenous communities in collaborative research programmes.

Final Outcome: The draft revised matrix for the review of implementation of the work programme on PAs (UNEP/CBD/COP/8/INF/28, Annex II) provides for a strategic assessment of progress made, challenges/obstacles, and capacity-building needs of countries in their implementation of the work programme. The matrix is intended to assist parties to answer key questions identified for each goal of the work programme, and to use the included "national considerations" for guidance to assess the evaluation. The key evaluation questions, as modified during the workshop, address:

- for Goal 1.1 (global network of PAs), quantitatively assessing the ecological representation, comprehensiveness, and effective management of existing national PA systems, coverage of under-represented ecosystems and biomes in PAs established since COP-7, and plans for the establishment of additional PAs by 2010 (terrestrial) and 2012 (marine);
- for Goal 1.2 (integration of PAs), establishing measures to develop an enabling environment (legislation, policies, tools) for integrating PAs into broader land and seascapes and sectoral interests;
- for Goal 1.3 (regional networks, transboundary PAs and collaboration), implementing collaboration in relation to PAs across national boundaries;
- for Goal 1.4 (improvement of PA planning and management), assessing the percentage of PAs with up-to-date science-based management plans that are under development and/or have been effectively implemented;
- for Goal 1.5 (negative impacts of key threats to PAs), putting in place measures to identify, prevent and/or mitigate the negative impacts of threats;
- for Goal 2.1 (equity and benefit-sharing), putting in place legislative or policy frameworks for the equitable sharing of costs and benefits arising from the establishment and management of PAs;
- for Goal 2.2 (indigenous community involvement), implementing mechanisms to ensure participation of indigenous and local communities and relevant stakeholders in the management of existing, and establishment and management of new, PAs;
- for Goal 3.1 (enabling environment for PAs), putting in place the appropriate policy, institutional and socioeconomic frameworks to value goods and services, and enable more effective establishment and management of PAs; and developing types of social and economic valuation methods and incentives and incorporating them into these policies and frameworks;
- for Goal 3.2 (capacity building), carrying out comprehensive capacity needs assessment for PA management and capacity-building programmes, and assessing the success of completed ones;
- for Goal 3.3 (technology transfer), identifying, developing and implementing new innovative technologies for PA

establishment and management at the national and regional level;
- for Goal 3.4 (financial sustainability of PAs), identifying financial needs, and putting in place strategies to meet these needs;
- for Goal 3.5 (communication), establishing a review mechanism for public education programmes to measure effectiveness in communicating the basic biodiversity values of PAs;
- for Goal 4.1 (best practices), applying and documenting standards, criteria and best practices for site selection, management, governance, and long-term monitoring of outcomes;
- for Goal 4.2 (effectiveness of PAs), assessing the extent of application of management effectiveness evaluations and incorporating evaluation results into management plans and strategies;
- for Goal 4.3 (PA status and trends), assessing the extent of systems in place to report on and monitor status and trends of biodiversity in PAs and mechanisms to report on status and trends of biodiversity in the PA system; and
- for Goal 4.4 (scientific knowledge), existing mechanisms to ensure that scientific knowledge contributes to the establishment and effectiveness of PAs, and encouraging collective research between scientists and indigenous and local communities.

CLOSING SESSION

On Saturday afternoon, participants adopted the report of the workshop (UNEP/CBD/COP/8/INF/28) with minor amendments. CBD Executive Secretary Djoghlaf congratulated the experts on the outcome of the workshop and highlighted the importance of enhancing the exchange of experience and communication of best practices on PAs for the achievement of the objectives of the Convention. Chair Tescari thanked participants and drew the workshop to a close at 6:00 pm.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

CBD COP-8: The eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity begins Monday, 20 March, and will continue until 31 March 2006, in Curitiba, Brazil. COP-8 will consider a range of issues, including: island biodiversity; biodiversity of dry and sub-humid lands; the Global Taxonomy Initiative; access and benefit-sharing; Article 8(j) and related provisions (traditional knowledge); and communication, education and public awareness. Participants will also address findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment; scientific and technical cooperation and the clearing-house mechanism; cooperation with other conventions and engagement of stakeholders; guidance to the financial mechanism; and a range of other substantive issues, including: forest, inland water, marine and coastal, and agriculture biodiversity; protected areas; incentive measures; and biodiversity and climate change. For more information, contact: CBD Secretariat; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: secretariat@biodiv.org; internet: http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.aspx?mtg=COP-08.

The *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* daily reports from COP-8 are available at: http://www.iisd.ca/biodiv/cop8/