# Achieving Fair and Effective Protected Areas

## How to enable and measure improved performance in protected areas:
## A Global Workshop

IUCN Headquarters, Gland, Switzerland; and
Gran Paradiso National Park, Cogne, Aosta, Italy,
**24th to 28th June, 2019**

## Workshop Report:

The global workshop had the following objective: to provide guidance on how to help measure and enhance the performance of protected and conserved area sites and systems through the available standards, evaluation methodologies, and assessment toolkits. It brought together a diverse group of over 80 protected area stakeholders representing 35 nationalities and a mix of academics, practitioners, donors and policy makers.

The event was generously supported by the EU-ACP funded BIOPAMA Programme, convened by IUCN with technical support from the Joint Research Centre (JRC) of the European Commission. Participants developed guidance and recommended actions to support fairer and more effective protected and conserved areas. The event was held in the Gran Paradiso National Park, in the facilities of the Fondation Grand Paradis. The location was selected to maximize participation, inspire discussion within a natural setting, while minimizing costs and carbon footprint.

This summary report is complemented by the presentations made and all the other workshop resources (available on the BIOPAMA website) and the summary statement agreed by participants entitled, 'The View from Gran Paradiso' (annexed to this report).

## Day 1: Framing and keynotes

The first evening of the workshop including opening addresses from the Directors of the Gran Paradiso National Park and the Fondation Grand Paradis, Antonio Mingozzi and Luisa Vuillermoz. A suite of keynote presentations started the process of deliberating progress, challenges, opportunities and direction across five streams of interest, with the ultimate aim of bringing these streams together in a clear way forward that will ensure that protected and conserved areas can play their full role. Trevor Sandwith of IUCN spoke to global progress on fair and effective protected and conserved areas and our ambition beyond 2020. He underlined the importance of quality over quantity. Tanya Merceron, coordinator of BIOPAMA in Western and Central Africa, provided an overview of the contribution of BIOPAMA to regional and global biodiversity and protected area targets. Finally, Paolo Roggeri of the JRC spoke to the power of data to support decision making on protected and conserved areas. Short discussions included focus on the post-2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets, specifically in detaching qualitative and quantitative aspects and in making the new targets measurable.

# Day 2: Getting up-to-speed on fair and effective protected areas

Following participant introductions, participants worked in subgroups to shape expectations of this unique gathering of protected area stakeholders. Expectations largely aligned with the stated objective and specific objectives:

- Increased understanding of protected area management effectiveness (PAME), what is happening globally, linkages across tools and systems and how they are mutually supportive, best practice, and how protected areas report
- Particular emphasis on how to integrate all management effectiveness tools to be more user friendly, potentially under one umbrella and enhance complementarity. Participants talked about togetherness, a common understanding approach to protected areas management
- Understand the critical link in theory of change between knowledge and decision making; ensure pathway is known and not just assumed
- Understanding of how to apply funding to get results, how the BIOPAMA Action Grants are going to work
- How we integrate + communicate the global picture

## Session 1: What do we mean by fair and effective protected and conserved areas?
James Hardcastle framed his presentation on the shift from a crisis narrative in conservation to reframing our work as solutions-based paradigm. This is at the heart of the IUCN Green List, as the new global standard connecting good governance and effective planning and management to enhance conservation outcomes. Participants worked in subgroups to identify illustrative examples from their experience. For governance, Colombia noted that the Green List process was instrumental in improvements through assessment. In exploring effective management, Senegal shared its process of community-driven identification of sites, where the State then takes the role of capacity building and accompaniment of process. When discussing sound design and planning, groups surfaced several examples: Ajloun Forest Reserve in Jordan underlined how they went through a process of identifying values, threats and their spatial distribution, leading to the development of a zoning plan with predictions of land-use change and integration into the wider landscape.

## Session 2: Management effectiveness, from principles to practice
Marc Hockings underlined that understanding drivers and purpose of evaluation is important. While principles and practice generally apply to all PAME systems, the context may vary. His presentation outlined key principles and best practices in PAME assessments. Discussions that followed included highlighting the importance of PAME assessments to agencies despite the cost and time implications, and even how managers understand the importance of such assessments. Comments alluded to the fact that assessments need to be supported by evidence and we need to more efficient in light of budget and staffing costs in protected areas.

## Introduction to protected area management effectiveness tools: IMET
Paolo Roggeri provided a comprehensive presentation to introduce IMET and illustrate it through case studies. It was underlined that IMET used existing tools (Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool METT, Enhancing Our Heritage tool EoH, etc.), customisable and could be strongly linked with the BIOPAMA Regional Observatories for Protected Ares

and Biodiversity. As an integrated tool, it embraces a culture of evaluation in which decision-makers use a results-based management and governance for enhanced conservation planning and monitoring processes. As IMET is new to many participants, there were a number of questions seeking clarification, followed by questions of the broader 'fit' of IMET into the landscape of existing tools and assessments. Further IMET sessions were dedicated to increasing awareness and understanding of the potential of the tool.

**Session 3: Governance rights and equity – putting 'fair' into effective**
The final session had Phil Franks presenting on governance and equity assessment in the contact of protected and conserved areas. The presentation and analysis presented resonated deeply with participants. Grouping of questions emerged.

- Enthusiasm was tangible that the subject is being addressed by IIED and IUCN, but with some methodological questions. Is there clarity on definitions of equality and inclusion? Are we adequately taking into account bad governance and corruption while planning conservation actions?
- Differing challenges at site and system levels: work at site level often uncovers issues that need to be dealt with at systems level- whereas system-level assessment is often the first opportunity to gather those stakeholders in the same room.
- Concern that institutions might lack the right expertise in protected area management, which then leads to incorrect use of tools. While consultants are often a stop-gap measure, this leads to outcomes not being owned by institutions.

In wrapping up Day 2, participants flagged a number of key takeaway issues, including the importance of accountability; the critical need for a Governance tool; a focus on conservation outcomes and people; seeking inclusiveness of local communities; building capacity of PAME and governance tools to link to the IUCN Green List; and, the enthusiasm in the room and the commitment and powerful resources of the same to achieve meaningful results.

---

## Day 3: Drilling down in five workstreams of interest / Field Visits

The day was equally split between the possibility to visit the Gran Paradiso National Park and see hands-on the challenges, successes and splendour of this Green Listed protected area.

The morning was the first opportunity for participants to work in intense breakout groups. Over the course of the mornings of Day 3 and Day 4, participants worked with facilitators in understanding the key issues and then co-shaping challenges, opportunities and then recommendations. This ensured that the streams intersected in achieving the objectives of how to help measure and enhance the performance of protected and conserved area sites and systems through the available standards, evaluation methodologies, and assessment toolkits. The workstreams included:

1. Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Assessment (PAME)
2. Governance and Equity Assessment (PAGEA)
3. Monitoring and assessing biodiversity
4. The Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool (IMET)
5. The IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas

## Day 4: Connecting thinking, discussions, recommendations

**Keynote by the European Commission, DG DEVCO, Philippe Mayaux**
The speaker introduced the EC interest in BIOPAMA and the substantive funding allocated to the programme, underlining the critical need for quantitative tools that can show strong evidence to decision makers on defining priorities for funding. He underlined the desire to see assessments conducted at site level being scaled-up to regional and global scales. In observing that subjective self-assessment is not adequate, he suggested that quantitative measures are required such that sites can be compared and repeated over time. He observed the need to create bridges between tools, data-sharing agreements for the BIOPAMA Regional Observatories, and regional work plans with clear deliverables.

He suggested that there is an appetite for scaling-up support to protected areas, and that this is framed in an expectation to see more work at the landscape level. He thinks that protected areas should be seen as working for society, across sectors and including fisheries and agriculture. There should be a clear contribution to economic development.

Mr. Mayaux outlined key strategic directions:
- We collectively need to arrive at the IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020 and CBD COP15 with a clear ambition and vision towards 2030
- The Intra-ACP funding window will no longer exist by the time BIOPAMA II achieves its objectives for this phase
- There are likely to be much larger funding sources aimed at a regional level
- There is a need to use BIOPAMA II to ensure that regional institutions are fully on board
- We can start to envisage a much larger programme than the current ACP focus, and include other regions
- Need to start raising awareness in the EU delegations in non-ACP regions

**The BIOPAMA Reference Information Systems (RIS)**: Three presentations were made to introduce the BIOPAMA RRIS followed by case studies to equip participants with concrete use cases. The sessions included:
- BIOPAMA Data Management- IMET Data workflow: from DB to WEB
- IMET Assessment and improvement of the management – Protected areas framework analysis
- L'Observatoire des Forêts d'Afrique Centrale

These presentations were followed by in-depth Questions & Answers, as participants used the opportunity to deepen their understanding of the capacity, methodology and potential of IMET in the landscape of existing tools and standards.

**Day 5: Connecting, Concluding, Committing**

The final morning of the workshop was an opportunity to bring together the results of the week and to collectively agree to a way forward.

There was a presentation introducing the BIOPAMA Action Component, the programme's grant-making facility.

Facilitators of the five workstreams were given the opportunity to present to plenary the results of the five sessions they had managed. These presentations can be viewed individually; the key results from those workstreams have been integrated into the 'View from Grand Paradiso' validated by participants.

The closing of the workshop was seen as an opportunity to ensure agreement and validation to the results being taken forward. As the participants took stock of the insights and understanding achieved collectively in Gran Paradiso, they embraced and committed to a collective statement, labelled 'The View from Gran Paradiso':

## The View from Gran Paradiso

Conclusions and recommendations from an international workshop on Achieving Fairly and Effectively Managed Protected and Conserved Areas held from 24-28 June 2019 at the Gran Paradiso National Park, an IUCN Green Listed protected area.

More than 80 participants from 35 countries met in the Gran Paradiso National Park, in Cogne, Italy, from 24-28 June 2019, under the auspices of the BIOPAMA Programme, supported by the European Development Fund through the Africa, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States.  The European Commission's DG-DEVCO, IUCN, and the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission, convened the meeting as an opportunity to share and exchange lessons for the implementation of the BIOPAMA programme – a programme that aims to strengthen protected and conserved areas in 79 countries and ensure that they contribute towards sustainable development.  The was graciously hosted by the Fondation Grand Paradis, and the Gran Paradiso National Park.

Participants were conscious that the world is at a crossroads as we approach 2020, the year we will renew the CBD's Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. Nature has never been more threatened, while systems of effective protected and conserved areas provide hope and inspiration for the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services and as a foundation for truly sustainable economies and livelihoods. A suite of keynote presentations started the process of deliberating progress, challenges, opportunities and direction across five streams of interest, with the ultimate aim of bringing these streams together in a clear way forward that will ensure that protected and conserved areas can play their full role.  The Green-Listed Gran Paradiso National Park provided a suitable setting from which to view future needs and prospects, to engage the participants, and to commit to a programme of action.

### Highlighted conclusions:

As the participants took stock of the insights and understanding achieved collectively in Gran Paradiso, they embraced and committed to:

- Building bridges between the different tools and methods for assessing and enhancing management effectiveness (PAME) and governance effectiveness assessment (PAGEA), and finding and exploiting synergies to achieve greater understanding and impact at scale.
- Taking advantage of BIOPAMA to emphasise the importance of data, analysis, decision-support and policy outreach, based on quantitative, comparable, scalable and repeatable approaches.
- Using PAME and PAGEA approaches, including IMET, with enhanced ecological monitoring as stepping-stones towards successful protected and conserved areas as exemplified by the IUCN Green List Standard.

- Expanding the deliberate use of monitoring biodiversity, cultural values, ecosystem services and other natural values as a fundamental component of the decision-making cycle.
- Systematically incorporating PA Governance and Equity assessment, including in national and regional contexts, into all protected and conserved area assessments, as a basis for evaluation of priorities and decisions.
- Emphasising the importance of the BIOPAMA Regional Observatories in the ACP regions for supporting prioritisation and decision-making for improved PA outcomes.
- Using the BIOPAMA Action Component to align with and support the broader application of PAME and PAGEA in the ACP regions
- Documenting lessons learned and communicating these, including through the PANORAMA.
- Expanding reference to the IUCN Green List Standard and commitments towards green listing.
- Working together across regions and partner institutions including within the BIOPAMA partnership to build on strengths and strive for sustainability into the future.
- Leveraging the work in BIOPAMA as one actor in a wider suite of programmes, including GEF, and to act as a multiplier for enhanced impact, including in decisions at CBD COP15.
- Using the powerful platforms in regional congresses, the IUCN World Conservation Congress and the CBD COP15 in Kunming, China, to put BIOPAMA "on the map" as a powerful integrator that supports successful conservation as a foundation for sustainable development.

    Progress on these high-level commitments will be followed-up and reported to the BIOPAMA Steering Committee at its annual meeting.

Key messages, and more detailed recommended actions from the five intersecting streams were:

1. **Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Assessment (PAME)**

The systematic assessment of protected and conserved areas is a powerful tool to enhance effectiveness, so that outcomes for biodiversity and society are achieved. There is a well-established linkage between management effectiveness and biodiversity outcomes, although achieving biodiversity outcomes is a function of several factors, including governance. It is therefore recommended that:

- Systematic application of management effectiveness assessments to cover all relevant components, including biodiversity outcomes, is required.
- In partnership with PA managers and agencies, PAME should be used to identify how management can be enhanced towards achieving outcomes; it should encourage managers and not be used to place them under scrutiny.
- That assessment e assessment should be embedded in the management institutions involved, as the process is as important as the findings.
- It should involve all relevant stakeholders, and data, knowledge and understanding, should be shared appropriately, while also being maintained in a global database.
- A comprehensive approach be taken, to ensure that management effectiveness is coupled with good governance and proper ecological design, as outlined in the IUCN's Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas.

## 2. Governance and Equity Assessment (PAGEA)

Good governance and achieving equity underpin effective management and are determinants of conservation success, whether at the national or regional system scale or site scale. Participatory, and transparent governance assessments can identify how the legitimate interests of rights-holders and stakeholders can be enhanced, and how poor governance can be addressed. This is key for securing well-being and healthy social-ecological systems fully respecting traditional and cultural expressions. It is therefore recommended that:

- Protected area Governance and Equity Assessments are applied systematically across protected and conserved area systems and sites, together with management effectiveness assessment.
- Specific efforts be made to develop capacity and competence through learning programmes, for undertaking and responding to governance and equity assessment.
- Beyond assessments, encourage engagement and recognition of diverse governance arrangements/mechanisms in protected and conserved areas, including OECMs.
- Global databases should include the findings of governance and equity assessments and the actions to enhance these.
- Case studies be collated for learning and understanding of the role and power of good governance, and develop "state of the art" assessment systems.

## 3. Monitoring and assessing biodiversity

Understanding whether biodiversity outcomes are being achieved is fundamental to effective governance and management programmes, yet is a challenge for many managers. There are blockages around many aspects of monitoring, from indicator selection to data collection, from data storage and analysis to data use in management decision-making. Monitoring and assessment of biodiversity (and other PA values) therefore needs to be properly resourced, standardised and consistently applied. It is recommended that:

- A monitoring system needs to be defined by PA managers, in partnership with communities and other stakeholders, which answers relevant questions related to the desired objectives and outcomes of the PA, and produces knowledge in an appropriate format and timely fashion to inform management decisions.
- The monitoring system should be integrated across scales of species, ecosystems and landscapes, and focus on specific outcomes including the achievement of ecological thresholds that provide a transparent report on the condition of biodiversity.
- The sustainability of PA monitoring could be enhanced, by capacity building, and the integration of short-term project-level initiatives into the ongoing roles of relevant authorities.
- A range of actors, including staff, citizens, indigenous peoples, communities and academics should be involved in monitoring, and results shared and communicated in formats (such as maps and dashboards) that facilitate easy interpretation and use in decision-making.

- Many PA managers would benefit from the production of standardized guidelines on biodiversity outcome monitoring, including templates and tools, ideas on how to enhance participatory monitoring, and examples of best practice.

## 4. The Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool (IMET)

IMET is a PAME tool developed in the BIOPAMA programme focused on an integrated "planning, monitoring, evaluation" approach. IMET allows for the integration of site level assessments with contextual information as a basis for decision-making both in systems and sites. It has great potential to be further developed - through new or enhanced modules covering law enforcement, planning and monitoring, governance of ecosystem services, all of which are focused on providing improved operational support to park managers at site level. IMET is a fully-fledged PAME tool, which can provide essential information for assessment against the IUCN Green List Standard and for Green Listing evaluations. It is therefore recommended that:

- IMET and the information contained in the BIOPAMA Regional Observatories should be integrated closely
- Access to IMET results is promoted as a benefit for the PAs and their management agencies, with clear data sharing arrangements put in place in agreement with the national authorities
- The application of IMET should be significantly expanded, across different kinds of PAs, and into new regions, and made more accessible through training and other capacity development. IMET has an established model of "coaches" and various training modules that can serve to expand knowledge of the tool, the process and analysis of results.
- IMET can be closely integrated as a tool for information gathering and analysis feeding into the Green Listing Process.
- Cross-walks between IMET and the Global Database on PAME (GD-PAME) should demonstrate that it is possible to generate a common reporting format, together with other PAME tools, linked directly to the corresponding PAs in the World Database of Protected Areas (WDPA).
- Efforts to communicate IMET are increased, including its potential for use in non-ACP countries

## 5. The IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas

The Green List is an evidence-based sustainability standard allowing for the strengthening and recognition of sites that achieve conservation of biodiversity and cultural values, as well as related ecosystem services, contributions to climate change adaptation and mitigation, and for social outcomes. The Green List can be used to identify strengths and weaknesses of protected and conserved areas that can be addressed through appropriate investments and actions. It is therefore recommended that:

- The Green List process is adapted to receive input from other diagnostic tools, such as PAME, PAGE and IMET, and does not replace these; it is possible to translate findings from these tools into the Green List process.

- The Green List Standard should be used an opportunity to assert the need for clear documentation of the evidence of a site's ability to meet all conditions for good governance, effective management and sound ecological design as foundations for biodiversity outcomes and contribution to the challenges of the climate crisis.
- The Green List can be embedded into the regional institutions and observatories across BIOPAMA, increasing efficiencies, as well as with other programmes such as World Heritage, Biosphere Reserves.
- A balance should be achieved between the costs of implementing processes, the credibility of the system, and the benefits of being engaged. The Green List business plan should support this as an objective.
- Green List resources, communications and processes should be accessible in more languages, and Green List mentors and IMET coaches could be trained in both systems.
- There is a need for more site-level training on how to implement the criteria of the Green List standard, and sharing of good practices (related to PAME and PA governance, as well as climate change in protected areas) amongst sites.