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Biodiversity loss: Protected areas as a solution?
All declared extinct in the last 7 years
Figure 20: The Global Living Planet Index: 1970 to 2014

Average abundance of 16,704 populations representing 4,005 species monitored across the globe declined by 60%. The white line shows the index values and the shaded areas represent the statistical certainty surrounding the trend (range: -50% to -67%)\(^1\).
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2018: Aiming higher

https://www.wwf.org.uk/updates/living-planet-report-2018
“Although biologists cannot say precisely how many species there are, or exactly how many have gone extinct in any time interval, we can confidently conclude that modern extinction rates are exceptionally high, that they are increasing, and that they suggest a mass extinction under way—the sixth of its kind in Earth’s 4.5 billion years of history.”

Ceballos et al., 2015
“By 2020, at least 17% of terrestrial and inland water, and 10% of coastal and marine areas,...are conserved through effectively and equitably managed ..... protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures”

(Aichi Target 11 of the CBD)
“For me this is an issue about justice - justice between generations. There seems to be something fundamentally wrong with us destroying our oceans so our children and grandchildren have absolutely nothing.”

Lewis Pugh, UN oceans patron
Protected areas: Global benefits at local cost?
Parks plagued by problems
(Lele et al., 2010)

- Exclusionary approach of 3 types:
  - Complete physical displacement (up to 14m in Africa)
  - Economic displacement – restrictions on resource use
  - Cultural displacement – restricted access
- Mixed conservation success
  - Often in inaccessible sites, less subject to degrading pressures in the first place
  - Leakage of pressures to surrounding areas
  - Alienation of local communities -> adversaries
- About half of protected areas are established on lands traditionally occupied and used by indigenous peoples (Stevens, 2014)
Victoria Tauli Corpuz: UN Special Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council on the rights of indigenous people

Report to the UN highlights concern about:

“the human rights violations that conservation measures have caused indigenous peoples worldwide, notably by the expropriation of land, forced displacement, denial of self-governance, lack of access to livelihoods and loss of culture and spiritual sites, non-recognition of their own authorities and denial of access to justice and reparation, including restitution and compensation”

(Tauli Corpuz, 2016:6)
In a study of 34 PAs....

- Biodiversity is declining, poaching persists
- Consistent neglect and some outright violations of human rights
- Creation of 26 PAs led to partial or complete displacement of local people
- PAs diminish already strained livelihoods (while extractive industries flourish)
- Indigenous people suffer disproportionately

https://theecologist.org/2017/sep/05/survival-international-abandons-complaint-against-wwf-violating-indigenous-rights
Respondents perceive a net cost from biodiversity offset
Those who bear the costs do not receive the benefits
Madagascar: Costs of biodiversity offsets (Bidaud et al., 2017)

Timelag between livelihood restrictions and development benefits

“You see, this is the problem with Ambatovy: they forbid first our livelihood income and only give an alternative once we are already suffering.”

Start of project

Development activities

Conservation restrictions
Madagascar: Compensating the costs of protected areas (Poudyal et al., 2016, 2018)

• Corridor Ankeniheny Zahamena (CAZ) established as an IUCN Category VI protected area in 2015, with World Bank support

• Aim: stop shifting cultivation, hunting and timber extraction

• WB’s social safeguards require that all people whose sources of income and standard of living would be negatively affected by the restrictions are identified as ‘people affected by the project’ (PAPs)
Only 50% of eligible hhs were identified as PAPs.
Less than 50% of these received compensation. Total cost of compensation = $120 per hh x 1800hh = US$0.25m
NPV of opportunity cost = $2400 per hh x 5-6000 hh = US$13-15m
Looking for a solution
Contributing strands of work...

Project on equity in the context of PES

Examining equity, assessing equity
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Contributing strands of work...

Just ecosystem management (Sikor, UEA)

Ecosystem services, wellbeing and justice (Sikor and Dawson, UEA)

Social assessment of protected areas (Franks, IIED)
‘Equity, justice and well-being in ecosystem governance’ workshop at IIED in March 2015.
ESPA Regional Opportunities Fund: Small grants scheme

To provide the PA community with a framework for achieving more just and equitable governance of new and existing PAs at both site and systems level.

£75,000 (from 1st Oct 2015 for 12 months)
Phase 1: Framework development

Nov 2015: Workshop to develop framework
Phase 2: Validation of framework

- Jan 2016 – IUCN and UNEP-WCMC meeting on Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas

- March 2016, Uganda – CBD Secretariat capacity-building meeting for national reps included a session on equity

- April – July 2016  Field validation
  - Three sites chosen based on region (East Africa), field contacts, different governance systems and types of equity issue
Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Uganda

Equity issues:
- Recognition of Batwa
- Distribution of tourism revenue
- Restrictions of Multiple-use programme
- Human-wildlife conflict
Amani Nature Reserve, Tanzania
Loita Forest, Kenya
Confirmed framework dimensions and principles
- No omissions
- No redundancy

Highlighted some areas for clarification
- Gender
- ‘relevant actors’
- ‘trade-offs’
- Timeliness of promised actions

Strong support for more work at national (systems) level
The equity framework
Recognition

1. Recognition and respect for human rights
2. Recognition and respect for statutory and customary property rights
3. Recognition and respect for the rights of Indigenous Peoples, women and marginalized groups
4. Recognition of different identities, values, knowledge systems and institutions
5. Recognition of all relevant actors and their diverse interests, capacities and powers to influence
6. Non-discrimination by age, ethnic origin, language, gender, class and beliefs
Procedure

7. Full and effective participation of all relevant actors in decision-making
8. Clearly defined and agreed responsibilities of actors
9. Accountability for actions and inactions
10. Access to justice, including an effective dispute-resolution process
11. Transparency supported by timely access to relevant information in appropriate forms
12. FPIC for actions that may affect the property rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities
13. Identification and assessment of costs, benefits and risks and their distribution and trade-offs

14. Effective mitigation of any costs to Indigenous Peoples and local communities

15. Benefits shared among relevant actors according to one or more of the following criteria:
   - equally between relevant actors or
   - according to contribution to conservation, costs incurred, recognised rights and/or the priorities of the poorest

16. Benefits to present generations do not compromise benefits to future generations
Enabling conditions

1. Legal, political and social recognition of all protected area governance types
2. Relevant actors have awareness and capacity to achieve recognition and participate effectively
3. Alignment of statutory and customary laws and norms
4. An adaptive, learning approach
Phase 3: Reflection and dissemination

**Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 - Equitable Management**

**Current global status:**
No agreed or standardised methodology yet to track progress.

Social and governance assessments being piloted to help advance protected area equity and effectiveness.

As of 2016, 90% of WDPA entries report governance type.

Governance arrangements in protected area systems are increasingly inclusive of communities and private sector actors.

**What is needed for achievement?**
Mapping of all governance types for all protected areas.

- Increasing the number of co-managed, privately managed and Indigenous and local community managed protected areas.
- Governance and social assessments carried out at protected area system and site levels, to establish baselines and identify relevant actions.

---

**Equity** is generally assessed through three interlinked aspects or dimensions: recognition, procedure, and distribution, where “recognition” is the acknowledgement of and respect for the legitimate rights, values, interests and priorities of individuals and communities. “Procedure” refers to inclusiveness of rule and decision-making; finally, “distribution” implies that costs and benefits resulting from the implementation and management of protected areas must be equitably shared amongst relevant actors. These are set in and shaped by the prevailing enabling conditions.

**PARKS**

The International Journal of Protected Areas and Conservation

---

**Developing capacity for a protected planet**

---
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Achieving change on the ground
IUCN’s Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas

Certification scheme to improve quality of protected and conserved areas
Pursuing influence through the CBD

- Championed by Phil Franks (IIED) and Barbara Lang (GIZ)
- CBD Side event at COP 13 (Dec 2016)
- SBSTTA (July 2018)
- CBD COP 14 (Nov 2018)
Zafra-Calva et al. (2019): Over half of respondents indicated that there are still significant challenges to be addressed in achieving equitably managed PAs, particularly in ensuring effective participation in decision-making, transparent procedures, access to justice in conflicting situations, and the recognition of the rights and diversity of local people.
What have I learned about science-policy impact?

- Keep the faith – wait for the right ‘hook’
- Serendipity
- Networks, networks, networks
- Boundary organisations, and professional communicators
- Advantage of outsider looking in
- Keep talking to your funders

http://pudgemountain.deviantart.com/art/Long-and-Winding-Road-Ahead-Sign-
For discussion

• How to improve performance in protected areas of different governance types? Who is responsible?
• How to overcome the policy gap between standards and implementation (e.g. for biodiversity offsets)?
• Does greater equity/justice lead to better conservation outcomes?
• Can protected areas become a model for the wider landscape?

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1sWe8Q7aC40 (4min film summarising equity framework)
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