



# **Additional Consideration for MPAs and OECMs**

**Stephen Woodley, Vice-Chair,  
Science and Biodiversity, WCPA**



# Additional Topics Requested (1)

1. Why area-based protection matters at all, given that people are an integral part of the land/seascape and therefore we should really just be managing all our activities equally well everywhere
2. Whether the idea that oil & gas extraction, bottom trawling etc. are incompatible with MPAs represents a substantive recent shift in direction from the IUCN, or is a longstanding principle
3. Whether the fact that Canada generally practices good oceans & fisheries management means that MPAs are less important and/or that more extractive uses are compatible with Canadian MPAs (i.e., restrictions are designed mainly for jurisdictions where management/enforcement is more of a problem)
4. How the IUCN views Canada's risk-based approach to developing MPA management plans
5. Whether "other effective measures" is viewed as a lower category of protection than an MPA

## Additional Topics Requested (2)

6. Re the 2018 guidance that IUCN produced on minimum standards in MPAs. Why the need for that specific guidance, who was involved in its development (especially from Canada), and a clear articulation of which activities should not be allowed in MPAs, from the IUCN's perspective.
7. Where, in IUCN's view, do indigenous protected areas fit within the PA and OECM structure?

## Why area-based protection matters at all?

- Our oceans are in crises - over-fishing has sequentially destroyed stocks everywhere around the globe; catches are overall declining
- Habitat loss (bottom trawling) and overharvest are the two largest contributors to biodiversity decline in the ocean
- Protected areas are the key management tool to address these issues
- Protected areas **do not mean** that people are not part of the ecosystem – communities have used no-take as management tool for millennia – part of customary management systems, taboo areas etc.
- Protected areas, complemented by managing fishing pressure, are a critical part of the solution.
- There is enormous scientific and public support for area-based conservation
- Read **Callum Roberts - The Unnatural History of the Sea**

Does the idea that oil & gas extraction, bottom trawling etc. are incompatible with MPAs represent a substantive recent shift in direction from the IUCN, or is a longstanding principle

- **A long standing principle** – debated at IUCN WCC in Amman, 2000; Bangkok, 2004; Barcelona, 2008; Hawaii 2016.
- They are called “protected areas” for a reason – because they are protected from exploitation, pollution and damage
- Industry arguments that that can operate safely anywhere are not supported by the facts

## **IUCN Resolution WCC-2016-Rec-102**

### **Protected areas and other areas important for biodiversity in relation to environmentally damaging industrial activities and infrastructure development**

- RECOGNISING that the concept of areas being 'no-go', or off-limits, to environmentally damaging industrial activities, including mining, oil & gas and agriculture, and environmentally damaging infrastructure, such as dams, roads and pipelines, is integral to conservation policy for protected areas and other sites of known importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services
- CALLS ON governments to prohibit environmentally damaging industrial activities and infrastructure development in all IUCN categories of protected areas..

## Why new Guidance? - Applying IUCN's Global Conservation Standards to Marine Protected Areas

- Not actually new - Short synthesis of existing IUCN standards and resolutions as they apply to MPAs, including
  - PA Definition and Categories (Dudley et al)
  - IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas
  - IUCN resolutions from World Conservation Congress's
- Need to inform the marine community because of the rapid increase in MPAs globally, driven by Target 11
- Concern about lack of adherence to agreed upon standards in marine.
- Governments (WDPA) globally report 7.3 % protection but [Marine Conservation Institute's Atlas of Marine Protection](#) reports 3.7%.
- Ultimately, a response concern about the global state of the Oceans
- Wide range of Canadian involvement – in all elements - Green List, OECM, Definition and Categories – Govt, Academic, NGO, Industry; open consultation

## If Canada generally practices good oceans & fisheries management, are MPAs less important and/or that more extractive uses are compatible?

- **No.** MPAs are an integral part of good oceans management. Canada has agreed to that by treaty.
- MPAs have many values - represent experimental benchmarks, protection of spawning stocks, key biodiversity areas etc.
- If Canada had perfect fisheries management, it would still need, and benefit from, MPAs. MPAs can increase harvest.
- The statement that Canada generally practices good fisheries management is not supported by the facts
  - AG report – 12/15 critical stocks had no recovery plans; 52% of stocks did not have established reference points
  - Long history of stock collapses – cod, Atlantic halibut, salmon, sardines, herring etc.
  - Large-scale destruction of benthic communities from trawling



## How does IUCN view Canada's risk-based approach to developing MPA management plans?

- Some uncertainty about what exactly a risk-based approach is?
- Environmental assessment by another name – based on impact prediction
- MPAs are part of a precautionary approach, risk-based applies to managed system
- Ocean ecosystems are complex and our ability to predict cause and effect is limited – i.e. how removal of x tons of fish will affect stock recruitment? or Glass sponge reef example of mid water trawling and benthic-pelagic linkages?
- MPAs can be part of an experimental approach to fisheries management because they provide benchmarks or controls, that allow tests of predictions; recruitment areas; spillover;

# Indigenous Protected Areas

- IUCN strongly supports indigenous protected areas and one governance type that can apply to any of the 6 categories
- IPAs protected areas –must meet the definition of PAs
- Increasingly common in the world – Australia, African conservancies
- Traditional harvest, connection to land/sea is often part of IPAs
- Category 6 used in many areas of the world for IPA
- Traditional harvest occurs in all categories except 1A and 1B

## Are OECMs viewed as a lower category of protection than an MPA?

- **No. Categories only apply to Protected Areas** – PA categories is based on management intent. All PAs have the same definition and must have the conservation of nature as the primary goal
- Categories are not lower or higher in terms of conservation, they represent different management approaches
- Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures arose from the Convention on Biological Diversity (Target 11) as being equally effective in conservation nature, but they are **not** protected areas.
- OECMs do not have categories under current draft guidance and will not.
- If the question is around effectiveness, OECMs should not be “less effective”. They arrive from different management approaches
- IUCN resolution states that Protected Areas should be the primary mechanism to achieve Target 11.

# The OECM Guidelines

- IUCN formally asked by the Convention on Biological Diversity to develop guidance
- WCPA Task Force held 3 expert workshops in Cambridge, England (January 2016), Vilm, Germany (July 2016) and in Vancouver, Canada (February 2017)
- Global consultation
- Potential OECMs tested against the guidelines in several countries
- CBD sponsored Expert Workshop – Montreal, March 2018
- SBSTTA discussion – Montreal, July 2018

# CONTEXT: IMPLEMENTING THE CBD STRATEGIC PLAN for Biodiversity

- The Strategic Plan has 20 Targets.
- All efforts to maintain biodiversity are of value, but not all should be mapped to Target 11.
- **Target 6:** Sustainable harvesting of fish, invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants
- **Target 7:** Sustainable management of agriculture, aquaculture and forestry

# DRAFT DEFINITION OF AN OECDM - CBD SBSTTA from IUCN

***“A geographically defined area other than a Protected Area, which is governed and managed in ways that achieve positive and sustained outcomes for the in situ conservation of biodiversity, with associated ecosystem services and cultural and spiritual values”.***

# CORE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PAs AND OECMs

- Protected areas should have a ***primary conservation objective***.
- The defining criterion of an OECM is that it should ***deliver*** the effective and enduring *in-situ* conservation of biodiversity, ***regardless*** of its objectives.

# THREE TYPES OF APPROACHES THAT LEAD TO OECMs



# 1. PRIMARY CONSERVATION

Areas that may meet all elements of the IUCN definition of a protected area, but which are not officially recognised as such because the governance authority does not want the area to be designated as a protected area by the relevant national government.

For example, in some instances indigenous peoples and local communities may not want areas of high biodiversity value that they govern, including sacred natural sites, to be designated as protected areas or recorded in government protected area databases. If the governance authority agrees, such areas should be reported as OECMs.

## 2. SECONDARY CONSERVATION

‘Secondary conservation’ is achieved through the active conservation of an area where conservation outcomes are a secondary management objective.

For example, enduring watershed protection policies and management may result in effective protection of biodiversity in forested watersheds, even though the areas are primarily managed for objectives other than conservation.

For example, no harvest areas due to military reserve restrictions

# 3. ANCILLARY CONSERVATION

Areas that deliver conservation outcomes as a by-product of management activities even though biodiversity conservation is not a management objective.

For example, Scapa Flow in the Orkney Islands protects shipwrecks and war graves from World War II. This protection has led to the ancillary conservation of important biodiversity.

The distinction between ancillary and secondary conservation may sometimes be difficult to make if some conservation objectives exist but the importance assigned to those objectives is low.

# Examples of what might count - OECMs

## Likely

- Some indigenous/community conserved areas
- Coastal and marine areas protected from interference for reasons other than conservation, e.g. historic wrecks
- Areas in production landscapes that are managed for conservation rather than exploitation (FSC representative forests)
- Watershed protection areas for cities
- Community pastures with native prairie
- Sections of military reserves with conservation goals and management

## Unlikely

- Urban parks and other formal gardens
- Temporary fishing closures that are in place only until an overfished area recovers
- Heavily grazed grassland or grassland replanted with monocultures or non-native species for livestock
- Large, landscape or seascape scale management policies targeting a limited number of biodiversity elements (e.g. fishing or hunting restrictions on individual species)
- Production forests with some biodiversity rules

## Target 11: Global Progress occurring between 2016 and 2018 – *CBD SBSTTA June 2018*

- Global coverage increased from 4.12% to 7.26%; the number of CBD Parties with at least 10% coverage increased from 23 to 34.
- marine ecoregions and pelagic provinces with at least 10% MPA cover increased from 84 to 99 and 3 to 4, respectively.

		Current 2018	Projected 2020
At least 10% of coastal and marine areas conserved	Global ocean: 4.1%	7.26%	10.5%
	National waters: 10.2%	16.77%	24.0%
	ABNJ: 0.25%	1.8%	2%
	23 Parties reaching at least 10%	34 Parties reaching at least 10%	

