Protected Areas in the 21st Century: From Islands to Networks

24-29 November 1997

Albany
Western Australia

CONFERENCE REPORT

Draft of 6 January 1998

IUCN
The World Conservation Union

World Headquarters

Rue Mauverney 28

CH-1196 Gland

Switzerland

Tel.: ++ 4122-999 00 01
Fax: ++ 4122-999 00 02
E-mail: mail@hq.iucn.org
Telex: 419624 iucn ch

IUCN
The World Conservation Union

Protected Areas in the 21st Century: From Islands to Networks

Introduction to draft Conference Report

This document is the draft conference report from the above conference, held in Albany, Western Australia, from 24-29 November 1997.

This draft report will be revised in the light of any comments received. It will then be incorporated within the full proceedings which will include all papers delivered at the Conference. The final document will be published and distributed in 1998.

Any comments that you have on this draft report would be appreciated and should be sent to me by 28 February 1998. Thank you.

David Sheppard
Head
Programme on Protected Areas

Tel: ++41-22-9990162
Fax: ++41-22-9990015
Email: day@hq.iucn.org

13 January 1998

Table of Contents

Draft

Protected Areas in the 21st Century: From Islands to Networks

CONFERENCE REPORT

Draft of 6 January 1998

Symposium Title	**Protected Areas in the 21st Century: From Islands to Networks**
Convened by	**IUCN, World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)**
Conference Date	**24-29 November 1997**
Location	**Albany, Western Australia**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SUPPORT

1. IUCN and its World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) are pleased to acknowledge the generous support of numerous sponsors, as listed in Annex F. The particularly generous assistance from the host country, Australia, and the Australian States of Western Australia and New South Wales are gratefully acknowledged.

OBJECTIVES

2. The symposium objectives were:

- To review the status of protected areas 5 years after the World Parks Congress in 1992, and the principal challenges facing them at the threshold of the 21st century;

- To consider elements of a new vision for protected areas along the lines above; and

- To identify the actions needed to promote the new vision, up to and beyond the Congress in 2002, and through the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

PARTICIPATION

3. Participants who attended this meeting are listed in Annex G.

KEY ISSUES RAISED IN PLENARY PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

Plenary Session 1: Introduction

4. The symposium was opened by **Adrian Phillips**, Chair of the WCPA, who welcomed the participants on behalf of IUCN and the Commission, presented the origins of the event in the decisions taken at the IVth World Congress on National Parks and Protected Areas (Caracas, Venezuela, 1992) and explained the symposium objectives. The welcome speech was provided by **Cheryl Edwardes, the Western Australian Minister for the Environment**. Opening remarks were then also provided by Dr Peter Bridgewater, on behalf of **Senator Robert Hill, Commonwealth Minister of the Environment**, by Ms Diane Tarte, IUCN Councillor, on behalf of **Yolanda Kakabadse, IUCN President**, and by **Dr Syd Shea**, Executive Director of Conservation and Land Management in Western Australia. Copies of the welcome speech and opening remarks by Ms Edwardes, Senator Hill and Yolanda Kakabadse are provided in full in Annex H to this report.

5. These opening statements highlighted the magnitude and nature of the challenges facing protected areas as we move into the 21st Century. The IUCN President, Yolanda Kakabadse, suggested that "we are on the edge now of a much bigger and more fundamental game: ensuring the sustainability -- the survival in some cases -- of parks around the world". She challenged WCPA to face this stark prospect and to adapt ways of thinking and approaches to adjust to new circumstances. Such remarks, focused at the global level were also mirrored by introductory remarks from Australian representatives. Senator Hill noted the uniqueness of Australia, as a result of geographic isolation for over 40 million years, and noted that Australia is the custodian of about 10% of the world's biological diversity. The many environmental problems posed by post-European settlement in Australia such as land salinisation and land degradation, were noted by Syd Shea and Cheryl Edwardes. The need for innovative approaches, tailored to the specific social and environmental circumstances of each country were emphasised. In the context of Australia, this has involved, for example, the development of community land care systems and innovative funding mechanisms

such as the Natural Heritage Trust, a A$1.25 billion investment in the future of Australia's environment.

6. **Lee Thomas, WCPA Regional Vice Chair for Australia/New Zealand**, provided an introduction to the objectives, structure and proposed outputs from the symposium. The following proposed outputs were noted:

- a strategy for the effective implementation of the next World Parks Congress, to be held in Africa, in 2002;
- a comprehensive assessment of the implementation of the Caracas Action Plan, adopted at the IVth World Parks Congress in Caracas, Venezuela in 1992;
- a charter for the world's protected areas, appropriate to the needs of the 21st century;
- a focused campaign document to promote a new vision of protected areas, as a guide to the world's protected area constituency over the next 5 years;
- ideas as to how best to pursue protected area claims through the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- guidance to WCPA in terms of achieving the above outputs.

7. **David Sheppard, Head of the IUCN Programme on Protected Areas**, reviewed progress in implementing the Caracas Action Plan adopted at the IV World Parks congress in Caracas, Venezuela in 1992. This review analysed each of the objectives outlined in the Caracas Action Plan:

- Objective 1: To integrate protected areas into larger planning framework;
- Objective 2: To expand support for protected areas;
- Objective 3: To strengthen the capacity to manage protected areas;
- Objective 4: To expand international cooperation in the finance, development, and management of protected areas.

8. This review noted significant achievements since Caracas, including increased recognition for protected areas in national strategies for biodiversity, better involvement of local people in the establishment and management of protected areas, and increased funding for protected areas, particularly through the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

9. However, the review issued an important "health" warning. Even though there has been a significant increase in the world-wide protected area estate since Caracas, and the many innovative and interesting developments in the field of protected areas, the reality is that, in many protected areas, environmental conditions continue to deteriorate, biodiversity is in retreat, local communities feel alienated from protected area objectives, and managers are poorly resourced. The review described approaches adopted by protected area managers to cope with these challenges. Many have been innovative and break with the way in which things

have been done in the past. Nonetheless, the review noted that the overall impression of progress made since Caracas against the increasing pressures on protected areas, can, at best, be described as "running fast to stand still". The review concluded that it is still very much in the balance as to whether protected areas will survive and prosper into the next century when new and still more daunting challenges will certainly arise.

10. A review of the state of the world's protected areas at the end of the 20th century was provided by **Michael Green and James Paine, from the World Conservation Monitoring Centre** in the United Kingdom. This paper was accompanied by detailed statistics and tables and reviewed trends in protected areas around the world. The paper noted that protected areas now cover a total area of more than 13 million sq km., representing approximately 9% of the Earth's total land area, an area larger than Canada. While this network is extensive when viewed from a global perspective there are many gaps at national levels. The rapid expansion in the network since the early 1990s contradicts the widely held view that opportunities to expand the protected area network are diminishing. Expansion of the protected area estate has been both on land and at sea, with many new marine protected areas established since 1992.

11. The extent to which the world's protected area network is representative of the world's major biomes was noted. It was suggested that certain biomes, including evergreen *sclerophyllous,* temperate and needleleaf forests are poorly represented, as well as desert ecosystems. Least well represented are temperate grassland biomes and lake systems, with only 1% of these under protection. While significant progress had been made in the establishment of protected areas on land and sea, the issue of management effectiveness has emerged as a major challenge: many protected areas, although officially designated, do not effectively achieve conservation objectives.

Plenary Session 2: Enlarging and Linking "Protected Area Islands" -- A Vision for the 21st Century

12. **Kenton Miller, Vice President, World Resources Institute and Lawrence Hamilton, WCPA Vice Chair for Mountains**, introduced the concept of bioregional planning as the key to the future viability of protected areas in the 21st Century. This presentation noted that the value of highly protected core areas is greater than ever, but that most of these are too small and many are "islands" surrounded by incompatible uses. They cannot, therefore, adequately conserve biodiversity and provide other potential environmental services. With rising human populations, conversion of wildlands, climate change, pressures on the coastal zone and other pressures, a new strategy is needed to ensure that both terrestrial and marine protected areas can play their most effective role in ensuring human well-being and the survival of nature into the next century. The vision outlined by Miller and Hamilton is one of sacrosanct core areas, surrounded by buffer areas, connected by corridors and all set within bioregional programmes which link conservation with ecologically sustainable development.

13. A number of supporting case studies were also presented to the symposium, from Brazil: (Serra do Mar - **Salvana Campallo**), USA/Canada in relation to the Yellowstone to Yukon corridor (**Louisa Wilcock**), the European Ecological Network EECONET (**Graham Bennett**) and the Central American Biological Corridor (**Alberto Salas**). The application of the bioregional concept to the marine environment was outlined by **Graeme Kelleher, WCPA Theme Vice Chair for Marine**. A number of issues arose from the case study presentations and from plenary discussion. These are outlined below:

- The potential pressures on protected areas in the 21st century are daunting. Unless new and innovative approaches are applied, the protected area system as we know it will not survive;
- There is a need to change the traditional "island syndrome" in relation to the establishment and management of protected areas. Protected areas cannot be considered in isolation from surrounding patterns of land/sea use. There is a need to adopt bioregional approaches which move concepts of protected areas from islands to networks;
- Bioregional approaches should be based on totally protected core areas, such as national parks, and surrounded and linked by patterns of "biodiversity friendly" land/sea use. The cores need to be "networked" to allow for genetic continuity. Such approaches are not about opening up core areas for resource exploitation, but should provide for ecologically sustainable use in the rest of the bioregion. Zoning needs to be done on a participatory basis, and based on biological as well as socio-cultural values;
- It is impossible to apply one model to suit all countries and all circumstances. The bioregional approach is a generally applicable model, but it will be applied in different ways, depending on scale, habitats, species and land use. What will "work" in Cameroon may not "work" in Australia, for example. There is a need for a diversity of approaches to suit the unique circumstances of each country and each site. The scale will vary, as will the character of the initiators (NGO's, scientists, governments or donors) and the underlying reason for the initiative. Nevertheless, it is important to draw common lessons from experience around the world;
- Pragmatic approaches must be applied to bioregional planning - it is not an academic exercise. It is particularly important that key decision makers and target groups are convinced of the arguments in favour of such approaches. Benefits must be identified and clearly articulated, at the appropriate level. Local communities, for example, will often be more interested in "cash flow" than "gene flow", or water quality and supply rather than the conservation of tree frogs or sea turtles. Institutional arrangements must also be put in place to plan and implement the bioregional approach. However, it must be realised that "benefits" may not flow evenly to all local communities; and the benefits of conservation, though long term, may be small when compared with the large and short term attractions of resource exploitation..
- Stakeholders have to be consulted and involved at all stages from pre-planning to implementation. "Stakeholders", however, are not synonymous with "vested interests". Decision making communities should be balanced between long term,

public interest representatives and "vested interests". Consultation does not mean, however, that all stakeholders get everything they want. Decisions have to be made and it is important that they are based on rational criteria, such as: ecological and socio-cultural relevance; potential to deliver tangible benefits; credibility; intergenerational equity; the precautionary approach; and sustainability;

- WCPA has a role in promoting the application of the bioregional approach and in encouraging information flow and providing advice. The key role, however, rests with the management agencies responsible for protected areas, whether they be government, non-government, community or the private sector. Donors also can play an important role and need to support relevant bioregional initiatives. Longer term funding is often preferable to large quantities of funding in a short time frame. Management agencies responsible for regional and local planning can also lead in the implementation of bioregional planning; and.
- The Symposium noted with great interest the various initiatives under way around the world to improve ecological connectivity. It recognised the great importance of these initiatives and their potential contribution to improving ecological coherence and resilience. WCPA strongly supports the wider application of the bioregional model as an effective approach to the conservation of biodiversity and as an appropriate framework within which to reconcile the needs of conservation and development.

Plenary Session 3: Special Session on the World Heritage Convention

15. **Bing Lucas**, WCPA Theme Vice Chair for Natural Heritage, provided an illustrated presentation in relation to the World Heritage Convention. This traced the origins of the convention and explored the issues relating to the establishment and management of World Heritage sites. It introduced the concept of cultural landscapes, and its application in regions such as the Pacific. The importance of ensuring effective management to protect the integrity of world heritage sites was emphasised, along with some "success stories" of the World Heritage Convention.

16. **Martin Wardrop from the Australian Heritage Commission** outlined a number of issues relating to World Heritage in Australia and also looked forward in relation to the likely scenarios after five and twenty-five years.

17. Issues raised in plenary discussions included:

- The important role played by the World Heritage Convention in promoting the conservation of protected areas containing outstanding universal values. The Convention provides an important tool to assist governments in dealing with potentially unsustainable development activities which impact on sites of high biological diversity;
- The adoption and promotion of the cultural landscape concept is a very significant recent development. A number of sites have been nominated under this category, such as the Philippines Rice Terraces, which reflect a long and harmonious interaction of man and nature. The application of this concept to other sites has

great potential in many parts of the world, but still needs to be promoted and better understood by protected areas managers and institutions. IUCN and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre (WHC) should work together to promote application of this concept;

- There is a growing recognition of the important role that indigenous peoples can play in the protection and management of World Heritage Sites. Australia is well advanced in this work as are a number of countries in South America. There is a growing need for IUCN to distil this experience to assist more effective application within World Heritage sites;
- Many World Heritage Sites face severe threats. Priority should therefore be given to the more effective management of World Heritage sites particularly those at risk. There is a general feeling that the WHC is providing little advice to its contracting parties on how to improve the effective management of WH sites. IUCN should consider this issue as a priority in its future work with the Convention in order to provide guidance on the type of management that needs to be applied to ensure long term quality and viability of World Heritage sites;
- There is concern about the lack of natural specialists as part of country delegations to meetings of the World Heritage Committee. This makes it difficult to raise the importance of World Heritage natural sites and the problems they face. It was recommended that IUCN should play more attention to using its advocacy role to remedy this situation;
- The important role of NGOs as "watchdogs" to ensure the quality and integrity of WH sites was stressed. This role should be recognized and promoted by the WHC and IUCN should enhance the capacity of national and local NGOs to assist them to monitor and assess the state and trends relating to WH sites. Monitoring of WH sites should be a high priority for the WHC, this task would be enhanced by using the capacity of different partners, including national and international NGOs; and
- World Heritage sites must not become isolated from the rest of the protected area system: they must not become elitist and separate. Instead they should be standard bearers, used to raise the quality and effectiveness of protected area management throughout the world.

Plenary Session 4: The New Context for Protected Areas: (a) The Changing Perspective for Resources and Land-Use

18. The lead paper was provided by **Dr Peter Bridgewater from Environment Australia**. This paper noted the importance of flexibility in relation to the definition of protected areas and the way in which protected area management prescriptions are applied. It noted the importance of partnership models involving cooperation with relevant bodies rather than strict legal frameworks. Protected areas cannot survive on their own and thus, in the 21st century, protected area managers need to develop ways of working with sectors such as forestry, agriculture, and fisheries so that the full range of conservation objectives can be achieved. The importance of understanding the role of global change, such as climate change, in relation to

changing conservation paradigms was emphasised. Models and approaches, such as the biosphere reserve model, need to be more effectively and widely implemented. Opportunities, such as those provided by the Convention on Biological Diversity need to be taken full advantage of, in addition to better application of other conservation related conventions. This should be linked to the development of medium to long-term goals and strategies, rather than focusing on quick, easy and temporary solutions. The paper suggested that if protected area managers are to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity, then protected areas must be more effectively planned in the matrix of sustainably managed land uses; the need is for a broader landscape approach to planning.

19. Panel presentations addressed a number of different perspectives including forestry in Brazil (**José Marcio Ayres, Brazil**), fisheries and marine protected areas (**Ioesfatu Reti, Western Samoa**), tourism (**Paul Eagles, Canada**), and integrated land-use planning (**Pedro Rosabal, IUCN-Gland**). These presentation noted potential linkage between protected area objectives and those of other sectors. However, it is rare for these connections to be achieved in reality. Linkages such as those between the establishment of marine protected areas and the protection of fisheries resources need to be clearly identified and promoted with relevant fishery agencies, for example. The potential for cooperation and linkage with the tourism industry is also vital, and this has not yet been addressed adequately.

20. The following points emerged in the plenary debate:

- This session reinforced the view that prospects for protected areas in the 21st century are daunting and again emphasised the importance of adopting a bioregional approach to protected areas. The fundamental issue is how to blend biodiversity conservation with sustainable human development. There is a need to ensure conservation of core areas and to provide resilience through effective conservation management outside of protected areas. Such integrated management is increasingly important to address problems stemming from global change. Regardless of the challenges ahead, there are signs in many regions of the world that the pace of the establishment of protected areas is growing, which is creating new opportunities for the introduction of conservation planning approaches at the landscape level;
- Management of protected areas is increasingly focused on how to manage human interactions on land and at sea. A combination of the Biosphere Reserve concept with the IUCN protected area management categories, particularly categories V and VI, provides a new and powerful means of promoting biodiversity conservation. The CBD provides an opportunity to advance the role of protected areas in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development, but this potential has yet to be fully realised;
- Protected areas must build new alliances as well as consolidating existing ones. The church and the military were suggested as providing potentially new partners for protected areas.

- There is a need to build linkages with sustainable and low impact **agriculture** and to emphasise the value of protected areas for aspects of agriculture, such as the protection of water resources, and genetic resources, and as a source of provence for seeds. Australian models such as the Australian Landcare approach and the (mainly) North American stewardship approach offer useful models of how to achieve this objective;
- The relationship between marine conservation and the viability of the **fisheries** industry is little understood. Fisheries interests need to be made aware that marine conservation is directly related to their core business. There is a need to move beyond localised and site specific management to broad area management. Local communities on the coast also need to be closely involved; innovative models such as the South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme offer a model of how this can be achieved;
- **Tourism** offers both positive and negative impact for protected areas. On the positive side, it can provide a vehicle for increasing revenue to agencies managing protected areas, often under scenarios of declining budgets. It can also provide a useful vehicle for building local support and pride in the conservation of the natural environment. On the negative side, however, it can lead to damaging environmental impacts and the benefits from tourism may not return to local communities living around protected areas. There is thus a need for tourism in protected areas to be carefully managed and also for clearly defined tourism strategies and policies. These should include the potential for return of revenues to individual protected areas. The approach of the New South Wales (Australia) National Parks and Wildlife Service provides a model for this. There is also a need for better information regarding tourism to assist strategic planning and to develop tourism-related skills within protected area agencies;
- There is a need for protected area issues to be more closely integrated with broader land and sea planning systems. It is important that protected area interests are "at the table" when it comes to land/sea use planning mechanisms and activities, such as the Oceans Policy process in Australia. While legal mechanism will generally be used in such processes, legal constraints should not be considered as a major impediment in implementing these new arrangements. Land/sea use planning is about making decisions and tradeoffs - protected area values and interests must be represented;
- Indigenous peoples have to be more involved in protected area establishment and management. This is often a convergence of interests of indigenous peoples and protected area managers. Mechanisms need to be developed to allow this, and the experience from around the world, from countries, such as Brazil, needs to be reviewed and applied. WCPA has a role to play here.

Plenary Session 5: The New Context for Protected Areas: (b) The Changing Nature of Society

21. The lead paper was provided by **Jeff McNeely, IUCN Chief Scientist**. He noted that trends in social, economic, political, and cultural fields will have a major impact on the way in which protected areas are established and managed in the 21st

century. The paper suggested the following imperatives for protected area management in the 21st century (a) incorporating changing demographic trends in protected area management; (b) building stronger support with urban populations; (c) forming partnerships with the private sector, governments and local communities, often facilitated by NGOs; (d) becoming more alert to the implications of climate change; (e) being proactive in demonstrating benefits of protected areas to the functions of modern society; and (f) embracing change as a guiding concept. The paper suggests that the pace of change in relation to conservation is likely to accelerate, requiring innovative and effective ways of adapting to these changes. Many such changes will threaten the integrity of protected areas, but others offer significant opportunities.

22. Panel presentations were provided by **Natalia Danilina, Russia** (Privatisation of Land and Protected Areas); **Gonzalo Ovedio, WWF** (Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas); **Lynn Holowesko, Bahamas** (The Role of Land Trusts); **Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend** (Co-management of Protected Areas); and **Robin Kruk, Australia (Working with the Private Sector)**. A common theme through all panel presentation was the need to establish creative partnerships with new sectors and to ensure that those involved in protected areas play a leading and pro-active role in relation to the initiation and implementation of such partnerships.

23. The following issues were noted in plenary discussion:

- Rapid change is a fact of life in relation to protected area management as we move into the 21st century. Protected area management must adapt to this or fail.
- In many areas of the world, particularly in the previous Soviet Union and parts of Eastern Europe, the privatisation of land, including land previously managed for nature conservation, is occurring rapidly. This is often driven by financial imperatives without due regard to impacts on biodiversity conservation. There is a need to ensure that conservation factors are incorporated within privatisation decision-making and that, where threats exist, such as in relation to the networks of Zapovedniks in Russia, these are clearly identified and acted upon. However, privatisation offers potential benefits to protected areas, such as can be seen in parts of Africa. It is critical, however, that protected area agencies are setting the agenda and that privatisation is being used to achieve conservation objectives;
- The role of indigenous peoples in relation to protected areas is becoming increasingly important in many regions of the world. In Latin America, for example, the Santa Marta Congress (the first Latin American Parks Congress), held in Colombia in May 1997, highlighted the critical role of indigenous peoples and the need to foster and develop creative working arrangements to conserve biodiversity. A number of models were also highlighted in relation to the Australian situation, where co-management arrangements with indigenous peoples are being successfully implemented e.g. in relation to the Kakadu and Uluru National Parks. Such arrangements need to be examined for their potential application elsewhere. In most cases, the objectives of indigenous peoples and the objectives of protected area managers coincide. However, in the absence of forums where both parties can articulate their viewpoints, the situation is often one of unnecessary conflict.

The potential for closer work between WCPA and key agencies, such as WWF, in relation to this issue was noted;

- The increasing role of land trusts as a vehicle to achieve conservation was noted in the presentation by Lynn Holowesko, and other presenters. Such trusts offer substantial advantages in relation to generating resources for protected areas. The role of land trusts is not limited to developed countries; such models are equally applicable in developing countries as are associated tools such as conservation easements and financial incentives;
- The increasing use of co-management models was underlined by Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, and reinforced by a number of symposium participants. Such models can take many forms, but most involve a substantial role for local stakeholders in the establishment and management of protected areas. It is important to build on the strengths and attributes of different organisations and to ensure that co-management approaches are tailored to local circumstances. Such models help to address many of the deep rooted and traditional problems associated with protected area management which often stem from poor or limited communication between management authorities and local communities. Examples from India and Latin America were highlighted in relation to such models.
- The need for protected areas to be more closely involved with the private sector was underlined by Robin Kruk. The private sector is an increasingly important partner for protected area managers, however, it is critical that the interface between commercial activities and protected areas be managed within the context of ecologically sustainable limits. Protected area agency staff should develop appropriate skills in aspects such as commercial operations and concession management. In many parts of the world such skills are often not in existence and this constrains effective protected area management. The trend in many parts of the world towards decreasing government revenue for protected area management underlines the critical importance of the private sector in future. Protected area agencies which manage their relationship with the private sector in a positive and pro-active manner are more likely to be succeed. The Natal Parks Board in South Africa provides an example of this approach.
- Several speakers identified decentralisation and devolution as significant issues for protected area management. The role of provincial, municipal and local government in protected area management has increased in many countries It is essential that this constituency of protected areas be full involved.

Plenary Session 6: Local Forum

24. An evening local forum focusing on a range of local conservation and environmental issues, was held. The forum involved local speakers from a land care group, an agricultural representative, and a representative of the tourism industry. Presentations were followed by general discussion and an evening reception, hosted jointly by the Albany Shire and Albany Town Council. Issues raised in the local forum included:

- The Local Forum emphasised the need to persuade local people and others about the importance of biodiversity conservation. This has to be done in a locally applicable and specific way, identifying the concerns of local people and encouraging them to develop appropriate solutions and actions;
- Local farmer groups are very active in promoting organic agriculture to reverse environmental problems such as the increasing salinization of soils. A Regional Partnership Group is promoting environmental awareness between community farmer groups, and improving their skills. This process aims to improve farm productivity and reverse the trend of migration of young people away from agriculture;
- Water is a fundamental concern for the local community. Most people were not fully aware of the increasing problems of salinization and the deterioration of the quality of the inland and coastal waters. Since the LANDCARE group started to operate in the region, several measures have been implemented and as a result phosphate inputs to coastal waters and aquifers have been reduced and the quality of water has improved. Community groups are now participating in the preparation of a management plan for the coastal zone, through the "Albany Harbour Planning Group";
- Tourism is another key factor influencing the community. This has grown rapidly in recent years, especially in the Fitzgerald River Biosphere Reserve. With the return of whales to this area, the tourism pressures have increased substantially in association with whale watching activities. Tourism is providing additional income to the community but there are still concerns about how it is promoted and developed. The need for greater involvement of community groups in the planning and implementation of tourism was noted; and
- Some international participants noted the differences relating to management issues which they face in their own countries, especially related to indigenous peoples living in and around protected areas and the increasing pressures to meet their basic needs. It was recognized that the approach and process used at Albany to involve local people in the management of the Fitzgerald Biosphere Reserve has been successful and that similar approaches, tailored to national and local circumstances, are currently under way in different parts of the world. Symposium participants appreciated the value of this exchange with the people of Albany, and recognized its relevance to the objectives of the symposium.

Plenary Session 7: Enhancing the Capacity to Manage

25. The introductory paper by **Hemendra Penwar**, from India, noted that protected area managers and protected area management in general must adapt to a completely new agenda in the 21st century. Protected area managers in the 21st century will need to strengthen their traditional expertise, while developing critical new additional skills such as in the fields of economic, communications, and negotiation. However, successful management will depend also on a "sympathetic" environment, particularly in relation to access to appropriate technology and information and also adequate mechanisms for securing financial resources and achieving effective institutions.

26. Panel presentations were provided by **Jeff McNeely, IUCN** (in relation to Sustainable Financing); **Michael Green, WCMC** (in relation to Information Collection, Management and Dissemination); and **Michael Beresford, UK** (in relation to Training and the Development of Protected Area Management).

27. The following key issues were raised in plenary discussions:

- Protected areas and their surrounding bioregion, must be managed by competent personnel, in cooperation with stakeholders. Protected area personnel includes managers, scientists and social workers in government and non-government sectors;
- Protected area managers will need to adapt to a new agenda in the 21st century. The new managers will need to strengthen their traditional expertise but also develop new competencies (e.g. socio-economic knowledge, communications and negotiating skills). But successful management will depend on a sympathetic environment, e.g. access to information, and to both state of the art scientific knowledge and traditional knowledge; adequate finance; effective institutions; and a favourable policy environment;
- The information base for managers needs to be expanded:
    - ethnic knowledge must be incorporated into protected area management;
    - there is a need to improve the application of science to management;
    - NGOs need more information on the science base for management of PAs; and
    - appropriate extension is required to help protected area managers communicate to local communities a greater awareness of the values associated with protected areas.
- In relation to <u>financing protected areas</u>, the problem may not just be underfunding of protected areas but perverse incentives (usually by governments) which encourage counter productive economic distortions. However, there are a whole series of economic instruments that can be implemented directly that apply to protected areas, as outlined in the presentation by McNeely. The following points were noted in relation to financing:
    - carbon offset funding represents a new opportunity;
    - protected areas need to be given recognition of their <u>full</u> economic value;
    - protected areas need to retain a greater share of the income that they generate;
    - appropriate incentives should be given to the private sector, NGOs, indigenous peoples and local communities; and

- measures should be established that encourage the urban 'elite' users to help pay for protected areas.

- In relation to information management:

  - Access to high quality information and expertise must be improved;
  - Access to the Internet is a very powerful tool but its use needs restraint and judgement. The availability of the Internet is also much greater for developed than developing countries;
  - There is much difficult-to-access-information, such as in the "grey" literature. This can be made more available through such mechanisms as the proposed Protected Areas Resource Centre (PARC), being developed by WCPA/WCMC.

- In relation to the Training of Protected Area Managers training must change to include new skills, new methods of thinking and of operating. It must focus more on the point where conservation requirements and community needs intersect. The new protected area professionals must be able to accommodate the needs of co-management. Therefore, skills in working with communities needs to be encouraged as well as traditional biological skills. In some countries there is enough professional training capacity and some graduates find difficulty in finding work in protected area management. There is also a problem in retraining personnel in existing positions due to isolation, low pay, no infrastructure and poor equipment. Improvements in these aspects can enhance the capacity to manage. Finally, better networking is needed to remove the isolation which impairs the capacity of trained personnel, and erodes morale.

- In relation to capacity building in traditional or community owned protected areas, the priority is to build the capacity of local people in relevant aspects of protected area management. to be the managers, using local processes and structures, with outside support from professionals as required. Capacity development should reflect local needs and issues.

Plenary Session 8: New Opportunities and Partnerships with the Private Sector and Global Alliances

28. Two private sector perspectives on protected area were provided by **Trevor Sandwith, South Africa**, (in relation to protected area collaboration with the private sector) and by **Peter Valentine, Australia** (in relation to cooperation with the tourist industry). Trevor Sandwith described collaboration with the private sector in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. The Natal Parks Board provides an effective model for nature conservation. This has been largely due to a deliberate policy of on-going engagement with communities at all levels, including politicians, user-groups, protected area neighbours, farmers, hunters and visitors. A key feature of the Natal Parks Board has been to increase the revenue base so that it

is increasingly free of dependence on State subsidies for nature conservation. The Board has aggressively and strategically promoted the economic use of the natural resource base to ensure that there are convincing arguments for its maintenance. The private sector has played a key role in this transformation. The private sector is involved at many levels, including in joint venture schemes, such as the development of new tourism facilities in protected areas and in relation to the establishment of a capital trust for nature conservation. This trust includes a number of corporate sponsorships and also has a trading arm which markets clothing and commemorative artworks.

29. The presentation by **Peter Valentine** focused on positive and negative impacts associated with tourism in and around protected areas. The need to look for new mechanisms was emphasised, such as in relation to private enterprise development and the development of guides and training services within private tourism operators. Tourism, in many parts of the world, is a growth area and there will be serious and long term consequences if protected area managers are not involved in the planning and implementation of tourism.

30. Presentations were then provided on behalf of the GEF by **Walter Lusigi,** UNDP by **John Hough**, UNESCO/MAB programme by **Jane Robertson**, and FAO by **Ken Thelen** (in relation to the Santa Marta Congress). These presentations underlined the increasingly important role of donors in funding protected areas, and the growing emphasis placed on biodiversity conservation within donor agencies. In many cases this has been associated with the employment of additional professional conservation staff, which has helped to bring about a shift in organisational direction for some of the key donor agencies. The high level of complementarity between the bioregional approach advocated at the symposium and the biosphere reserve concept was noted by Jane Robertson. The need for effective and strategic partnership with the UNESCO/MAB programme was stressed: in this respect, UNESCO welcomed WCPA's plans to establish a Vice Chair for Biosphere Reserves to help promote collaboration.

31. The following issues were raised in plenary discussions:

- The need for donor funding to be targeted at clearly identified national priorities
- That priorities be clearly identified at the level of individual protected areas. It is very important to clearly identify objectives and performance indicators at this level. This is also a point in relation to protected area activities in many countries. The value of a clearly developed and articulated vision, coupled with clear objectives and performance indicators, can be seen in the example of the Natal Parks Board;
- The need for better partnerships between government and non-government sectors, and between relevant agencies and donors, was emphasised. Such partnerships must build on the respective strengths of different agencies to ensure better biodiversity conservation;
- A number of suggestions were made for future priorities for donor funding.
    - to place greater emphasis on protected area projects which demonstrate practical bioregional applications and support the development of sustainable institutions;

- to ensure long-term sustainability to avoid the chance of project failure after the end of the specific donor subvention;
- to support successful projects and also to learn from the mistakes associated with less successful projects;
- to move away from an isolated project focus to more of a programmatic and longer term focus;
- to address solutions rather than symptoms, such as in relation to poverty alleviation, which, unless adequately addressed, will clearly threaten protected area viability in many developing countries.

- The importance of key conservation events and meetings in shaping the agenda was noted. The values of such events can be clearly seen particularly in relation to the Latin American Parks Congress, held in Santa Marta in Colombia, May 1997, for example. The Albany Symposium, will also be a significant factor in shaping the way in which protected areas are addressed in the next century.
- The importance of a range of institutional arrangements was noted. Models which provide flexibility and some level of autonomy, such as the parastatal arrangements in Eastern Africa, are particularly valuable. However, it is important that governments do not abdicate their role in conservation and also that institutional arrangements are tailored to the unique circumstances of each country; and
- In relation to tourism and protected areas, it was agreed that there was a need for better interaction and collaboration between tourism and protected area agencies. Protected area agencies have to be more skilled in this area, which will require the acquisition and development of new skills.

CONFERENCE OUTPUTS

Conference Output 1: Road to Africa 2002

32. This plenary session addressed the issue of planning for the next World Parks Congress to be held in Africa in 2002. The final output on this topic is attached as Annex A.

33. In introducing this topic, Jeff McNeely noted some lessons from his involvement in the implementation of the IIIrd and IVth World Parks Congresses. These were:

- The need for the World Parks Congress to focus on "real life" problems and issues and also to seek to identify solutions and outputs which address these problems;
- To ensure that the congress reaches out to other constituencies and that it is not an "IUCN meeting". It is critical to bring in key partners such as the World Bank, GEF, UNDP, European Commission, etc. It is also important to clarify what type of outputs such partners would also seek from the World Parks Congress itself;
- To ensure that this is clearly a global meeting which focuses on global problems rather than regional or national problems. There is potential for holding regional

meetings prior to the World Parks Congress to feed into the global agenda of the Congress;

- The need to build on exemplary approaches to protected area management and to show models which work;
- The need to use the event to elevate the political profile of protected areas;
- The need to have a special focus on Africa and to use the meeting to highlight specific issues and problems relating to the African environment;
- The need to identify the venue and date as quickly as possible;
- The need to limit the recommendations arising from the congress; and
- The need to bring in new blood, new ideas, new thinking.

34. The plenary discussion which followed and resulted in a number of specific recommendations for the next congress. As a result of this, a paper on the "Road to Africa" was produced and is attached as Annex A to this report. This paper outlines the following:

- the background to the 2002 congress;
- general principles for planning the next congress;
- key logistical issues to be addressed, including where and when;
- the content of the meeting;
- who should participate;
- what kind of event; and
- what happens next?

Conference Output 2: Message from Albany

35. A working group of the Symposium produced a one page draft document entitled "Imperatives for Protected Areas". This provides a one-page statement outlining the key issues relating to protected areas as we move to the 21st Century and it specifically calls for all members of the protected area community:

- to rethink -- to place protected areas in a broader context;
- to reorient -- to expand beyond the traditional role of establishing and managing protected areas by emphasising the bioregional approach, and working for the compatible management of surrounding areas.
- to respond to global concerns such as climate change and biodiversity;
- to reach out -- to establish partnerships with neighbours and other key stakeholders.

36. The document adopted by the Symposium is attached as Annex B. It was agreed that this statement should be widely circulated to relevant individuals and organisations.

Conference Output 3: Campaign Document For Protected Areas: From Islands to Networks

37. A draft project proposal for a ten-year campaign for the WCPA to expand and link critical areas of land and sea to support sustainable development in the 21st Century, was tabled and intensively reviewed by the symposium. This campaign proposal was endorsed and the proposal is attached as Annex C to this document. The symposium agreed:

- WCPA will finalise the papers from the symposium, publish a proceedings volume and report on the concept and cases of bioregional planning with maps;
- A consortium of partner organisations will prepare and submit the proposal to donors, including GEF; and
- The Campaign will endorse and encourage support for high priority bioregional programmes.

Conference Output 4: New Directions for WCPA

38. A paper was prepared on this topic by David Sheppard, IUCN Programme on Protected Areas. This posed a number of discussion questions and these were addressed by a working group of the symposium. The final results from this discussion are outlined in Annex D of this report. These form recommendations to the WCPA Steering Committee in relation to:

- the relevance of protected areas in a changing world;
- the protected areas profession and WCPA;
- WCPA membership;
- WCPA resources;
- WCPA integration;
- marketing and communication;
- WCPA and the Convention on Biological Diversity.

The full report is attached as Annex D to this document.

Conference Output 5: Protected Areas and the Convention on Biological Diversity

40. A paper was prepared on this topic by WCPA Chair Adrian Phillips. This suggested specific ways in which protected areas could be more effectively

integrated within the CBD and also how to raise the profile of protected areas in the Convention. This was discussed by the Albany symposium and endorsed. The symposium also agreed that a message should be sent to the next COP meeting of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The message and the background paper prepared by WCPA Chair are at Annex E to this document.

Jce/albanypapers/albanyreport
19.1.98

ANNEX A

CONFERENCE OUTPUT 1:

ROAD TO AFRICA 2002

ANNEX A: THE ROAD TO AFRICA 2002

BACKGROUND

1. The IV World Congress on National Parks and Protected Areas was held in Caracas, Venezuela in 1992. Previous congresses were held in Seattle, Washington, USA (1st) in 1962; Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks, USA (2nd) in 1972; Bali, Indonesia (3rd) in 1982.
2. Participants at the Albany (Western Australia) Symposium in November, 1997 discussed aspects relating to the planning and implementation of the next World Parks Congress, to be held in Africa in 2002 and raised the following points.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

1. It is essential to start planning for the next World Parks Congress now. Such planning needs to include the formation of a Congress Steering Committee, definition of key objectives and outputs, and the implementation of a clear and effective fund-raising strategy.
2. The Congress should be focused on solving problems and developing outputs which promote and consolidate the key role of protected areas in ensuring biodiversity conservation and ecologically sustainable development on this planet.
3. The Congress should be a global meeting. It is desirable to combine efforts to the development of this event with other relevant initiatives, such as the global conference of the International Ranger Federation and the World Wilderness Congress. It might be linked with regional and thematic meetings such as the proposed African Biosphere Reserve Conference.
4. The Congress should be used to reach out to relevant partners and organisations, and build new partnerships. It should involve existing and potential partners from the private sector to learn from their experience and to enhance their contribution to protected areas . The Congress should be a participatory event. It should facilitate other groups, including representatives from local communities and indigenous groups, and individuals to "feed in" to the Congress itself.
5. The event should be used to elevate the political profile of protected areas - it should demonstrate to key decision and policy makers that protected areas are essential.
6. The Congress should be used to catalyse and mobilise action and support for protected areas at all levels, but particularly focused on support from local communities and indigenous peoples.
7. Given that the Congress will usher in the next century there should be a particular focus on broadening the time horizon beyond the traditional 10 year span of the Parks Congress and setting an agenda up to and beyond the year 2100. The Congress should set a "100 year vision" for protected areas. It should address the basic question: "where are protected areas going in the 21st century ?"

8. There should be a special focus on "youth" and "women and the use of resources of protected areas" - there should be a conscious effort to bring in "new blood" and new ideas, to ensure that the Congress has a future oriented focus. The Congress should nurture the conservation leaders of the future.
9. The Congress should be used generally as an opportunity to seize the agenda and to ensure that protected areas regain their place as the integral tool to achieve biodiversity conservation and ecologically sustainable development at national levels. The Congress should capitalise on the fact that we are at the beginning of the new century, to assist with capture of the agenda.
10. The Congress should be used to provide a special focus on Africa.
11. The Congress should draw out the lessons, both good and bad, from practical case studies and projects. The implications for the future of protected areas in the 21st century should be identified.
12. The Congress should include especial events to raise the profile of key celebrations related to the protected areas movement.

KEY ISSUES

Where and when ?

1. The venue and the dates of the Congress should be established as soon as possible. The process for the identification of the host country should be clear and transparent. Any invitation to host the conference should clearly set out the financial and other logistical implications of hosting such an event.
2. There should be clear criteria to assist in the identification of the host country, such as, for example: (a) can the country host an event which may have 1,500 or more delegates (At Caracas were 1,800 delegates) - does it have the necessary infrastructure ? (b) can the host country provide financial support, either directly or through the mobilisation of private sector funding; and (c) is there local human resources skilled in the implementation of large events. Ideally the process of identifying which country should host the Congress should be based on a consensus between relevant African countries and a clear political commitment at the highest level.
3. If the Congress is held in Eastern or Southern Africa, the ideal time for holding the event would be September or October in 2002.

Content

1. The Congress should be based around a number of key themes and objectives, that link to the Caracas Action Plan. For each of the objectives, a number of specific outputs would be identified. These outputs would be linked to a number of case studies at different levels (global, regional, national, local), often focused on "best practice" and "lessons learned". The outputs would be worked on between 1998 and 2002 and "delivered" at the Congress. A course of follow up action should then be identified at the Congress itself in relation to each objective and output.

2. Given that the event will be held in Africa, there should be an opportunity to "showcase" African achievements and challenges. A special African session should be incorporated within the conference programme, which would aim to build a sense of pride in African achievements. Field trips will be design to highlight African experience.

3. A special session on "conservation through the eyes of youth" could also be included within the Congress programme. This session should be organised by different groups (school children, young professionals, others) and the presentation of "Youth Awards" should be considered at the Congress, but also these awards should be promoted at country level. The potential of linkage with the environmental educational programmes of UNESCO should be explored as well as with the IUCN Commission on Education and Communication in order to develop an on going programme for youth and protected areas.

4. Some possible objectives/themes were suggested by delegates to the Albany Symposium. These included:

- Islands to Networks/Bioregional Planning, following on from the Albany Symposium. This would be specifically linked with the Campaign Document arising from Albany;
- Demonstrating the Benefits or Mainstreaming Protected Areas into the Sustainable Development Agenda, demonstrating the links between protected areas and ecologically sustainable development and demonstrating the many benefits from protected areas to society, including for species conservation, recreation, and for spiritual purposes. Also, demonstrating benefits at a level appropriate to the target audience. Benefits should be examined at all levels and should include the contribution of protected areas to democratisation and peace processes;
- Building the Support, how to be proactive rather than reactive, how to use the Congress as a vehicle to build support for protected areas at all levels, both in the lead up to, as well as after, the Congress. Building support would be particularly focused on two levels: political and local. Also, this would address partnerships with key sectors such as the private sector;
- Addressing the implementation/credibility gap, placing an emphasis on monitoring and evaluation of protected areas at all levels. This should be the result of a 1998-2000 assessment programme which should address the quality of management of protected areas at country level. Results from this programme should be presented at the Congress, including a ranking of countries by the quality of protected areas management;
- Applying science and technology to protected areas, examining the more effective application of science in aspects such as the identification of gaps and priorities for reserve selection. Recognising that some countries have taken a 10% -12% target for protected areas as a ceiling, which is now seen to be inadequate by itself , this team will extend our understanding of the latest science behind ecosystem management and ensure this knowledge is widely disseminated and applied. The role that technology can play to

ensure more effective protected area management in the 21st century will be also discussed;

- Building the protected area institutions of the 21st century, what are the factors which will ensure viability of institutions? What is the role of the private sector ? How can sustainable finance for protected areas be generated ?; and
- People and protected areas, focused on the full range of models and approaches for involving people in the establishment and effective management of protected areas: co-management, collaborative management, community based management, stewardship etc.

Who should participate ?

Among others the following categories are suggested:

- Leaders, male and female, in the protected areas community;
- WCPA members;
- IUCN family;
- Major partners from the key sectors affected by, and affecting, protected areas (e.g. agriculture, fisheries, mining, tourism);
- Governments representatives;
- Representatives of NGOs involved in protected areas at all levels;
- Representatives from the private sector involved on protected areas management;
- Representatives of local communities/grass roots organisations;
- Principal donors supporting protected areas activities;
- Rangers and others working "on the front line";
- Representatives from Global and Regional Conventions relevant to protected areas (CBD, Ramsar, ATCM, Climate Change, World Heritage); and
- Young conservation leaders of the 21st century.
- Influential stakeholders and "change agents" - people who are in a position to mobilise and energise opinions at all levels, when they return to their homes after the Congress.

Participation at the Congress would be open to all but there would be specific invitations to selected individuals, to ensure: 1) coverage of the key categories mentioned above, 2) gender balance, 3) balance between terrestrial and marine experts, 4) geographical balance.

What kind of event ?

1. The Congress would be designed to maximise participation from delegates; a heavy emphasis would be placed on workshop sessions. Practically oriented field trips would be integrated into the programme. The agenda should be flexible to

allow time for discussions in formal and informal working groups, but at the same time ensuring a well focused programme.

2. Several options are arising as to scale. Under either option, use would be made of technology to deliver a "virtual" conference to ensure a much wider outreach beyond the specific participants at the event itself. Options could include:
3. A relatively limited number of participants (e.g. 500), tightly focused and invited
4. A broader event, (e.g. several thousand) to enable the protected area constituency to come together, celebrate and refocus the commitment to protected areas.
5. It was the consensus of the Africa 2002 Steering Group, which met during the Albany Symposium, that the latter option is more appropriate i.e. a larger event to celebrate and refocus the commitment to protected areas.

<u>What happens next ?</u>

1. It is proposed that two groups be formed: (a) an Steering Group (approximately 10 persons), with major oversight of activities, and; (b) a broader consultative group (approximately 30 persons) which is consulted on major issues relating to the Congress, and would be linked for communications by an email list server.
2. The process from here should be based on the following principles: (a) involvement of key partners; (b) linkage to the objectives/outputs previously mentioned; (c) linkage to specific events/activities which would lead into the Congress, including regional events; (d)linkage to grass roots, community level activities; and (e)the need to secure adequate human and financial resources to make this a reality.
3. In relation to funding, a range of sources and approaches will need to be approached/applied, including appropriate corporate sponsorship.

ANNEX B

CONFERENCE OUTPUT 2:

IMPERATIVES FOR PROTECTED AREAS

ANNEX B: IMPERATIVES FOR PROTECTED AREAS

A new alliance is sought among all stakeholders at the local, national, regional and global levels to pool their talents and capacities to realise a new vision for protected areas in the bioregional context.

Protected areas are special places on land and sea which are managed for conservation purposes. The current global system comprises some 30,000 sites, covering about 13,2 million sq. km. (almost the size of Antarctica). They are of various kinds. Many have cultural components and support appropriate sustainable use. They play a key role in conserving natural ecosystems and, where managed effectively, contribute substantially to sustainable development.

Protected areas provide options for humanity in a rapidly changing world. They ensure the continuing flow of ecosystems services, including maintaining water and air quality and the availability of soil nutrients and act as carbon sinks. They provide economic benefits and contribute to spiritual, mental and physical well-being. Protected areas also helps fulfil our ethical responsibility to respect nature.

This role is challenged by various factors such as macroeconomics policies, rural poverty, land tenure issues, habitat fragmentation, climate change, and inadequate funding, inadequate management capacity and lack of political commitment. There is insufficient appreciation of the linkage between protected areas and the realisation of human expectations.

If in the 21st Century, humanity is to have:

- security for habitats and species;
- an environment which is productive, healthy and harmonious;
- restored productivity of soils, forests, water, air and seas; and
- sustainable use of the biosphere and natural resources for food security;

Then we call on all members of the protected areas community to:

Rethink: We need to place protected areas in their broader context so as to demonstrate that they contribute to local economies and human welfare as integral components of a productive and secure environment. We need to ensure that our sites are selected and managed primarily for their biodiversity and ecosystem service values, while considering the livelihoods of the communities dependent upon them. Our communication strategies need to convey this new image.

Reorient: We need to expand on our principal role of establishing and managing protected areas by emphasising the bioregional approach, and working for the compatible management of surrounding areas. We need to connect them with nature-friendly corridors to form a conservation matrix using a range of protected areas types.

Respond: We need to respond to global concerns about issues such as biodiversity, climate change, desertification, international waters and peace, and emphasise the role protected areas can play in addressing these.

Reach-out: We need to establish partnerships and encourage co-operation with neighbours and other stakeholders, promote stewardship, enhance the use of relevant information, and develop and strengthen the policies, economic and other instruments which support protected areas objectives.

Our efforts need to be complemented by those of other public and private organisations and interests that have the required skills and capabilities, and especially by those with authority and responsibility over natural resources as to realise this vision.

November 28, 1997
Albany, Australia

ANNEX C

CONFERENCE OUTPUT 3:

CAMPAIGN DOCUMENT FOR PROTECTED AREAS: FROM ISLANDS TO NETWORKS

ANNEX C: CAMPAIGN DOCUMENT FOR PROTECTED AREAS: FROM ISLANDS TO NETWORKS

--A 10-year campaign of the World Commission on Protected Areas to expand and link critical areas on land and sea to support sustainable development in the 21st Century--

Reference: Draft Project Proposal November 23, 1997, discussed at the Symposium: From Islands to Networks, 24-29, I997, Albany, Australia. (attached below)

Summary:

1. WCPA will: finalize the papers from the Symposium, publish a proceedings volume and a report on the concept and cases on bioregional planning with associated maps, provide information and an exhibit at the CBD/COP4, and prepare and disseminate a brochure on the concept and examples of bioregional planning. WCPA will incorporate and promote this concept into its program between now and 2002 and will report on the progress of the Campaign to the 5th World Protected Areas Congress in 2002.

2. WCPA, together with a range of other national, regional, international organizations, such as WCMC, WWF, WRI, AIDEnv, FAO Network, BCC, UNESCO/MAB, and SSC, will prepare and submit a proposal to donors, including GEF for Project Development Fund, to develop a full proposal for the following elements of the Campaign:

- Establish an information, dissemination, and communication network;
- Assess current initiatives, key players, and needs;
- Document and evaluate successful and failing initiatives, and publish "lessons learned";
- Analyze best practices to support preparation of guidelines;
- Prepare guidelines from these experiences through regional workshops, on e.g., science and reserve design, institutional arrangements for implementation, forming partnerships, economic incentives; management effectiveness in biodiversity conservation, etc.
- Provide a mechanism for the exchange of experiences among bioregional programs;
- Provide capacity building opportunities;
- Propose potential criteria for the selection of priority areas for investment and action;
- Offer technical assistance from network members to incipient bioregional programs; and,
- Establish a monitoring and evaluation mechanism.

3. The proposal will incorporate the following characteristics:

- Individual bioregional projects will serve as "demonstration areas" in both developing and developed countries;
- Contribution of Biosphere Reserves as a model;
- Partnering (twinning) between initiatives will be encouraged;
- Promotion of regional coalitions, especially where featured ecosystems cross international boundaries;

4. The Campaign will endorse, encourage and provide technical advice and guidelines to high priority bioregional programs in countries, seek project development funds, through established channels, to encourage them to develop, implement and evaluate their own projects.

Attachment (below)

Project proposal November 23, 1997 discussed at the Symposium: From Islands to Networks, Albany, Australia.

Second Draft
November 23, 1997
Albany, Australia
by Kenton Miller and Larry Hamilton

Draft Project Proposal

--A 10-year Campaign of the World Commission on Protected Areas to expand and link critical areas on land and sea to support sustainable development in the 21st Century--

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to briefly propose an action-oriented project for WCPA to focus on the challenges posed by the fragmentation of the world's remaining wild terrestrial, coastal and marine areas, and the insularization of those areas already under protective management. The increasing spiritual, economic, and overall ecosystem values associated with particular geographic sites is being recognized just as public budgets for natural resources management are being reduced in the face of growing social demands. The potential to achieve sustainable development goals will depend significantly upon the success at which these vital areas are maintained, restored and carefully used.

This proposal is offered for consideration by WCPA. It contains a framework for an ambitious 10-year project that would involve, and indeed need, the input of IUCN's Regional Offices, and the WCPA Vice Chairs and members. Should the Commission see this line of highly-focused action as a valuable and appropriate component of its work for the coming decade, then efforts can be initiated to incorporate views and comments from WCPA members, further elaborate the proposal, and begin to seek funding.

Background

There now exist a global estate of more than 30,000 sites in 150 countries where governments, communities, private and other groups are seeking to protect plant and animal life and habitats, natural resources like water and timber, and highly valued landscapes.

In the face of accelerated change in climate and population, and the domestication and degradation of more and more of the land and sea scape over the coming decades, scientists, resource managers and conservationists are

calling for increased protection and restoration of biodiversity and the maintenance of the fundamental ecosystem services that sustain the human environment. Our awareness of the values associated with the services of nature have increased owing to environmental economics and other research and experience. The economic contribution of many wild areas to the provision of clean water, air, and nutrient and detritus cycling, outstrips major world industries.Our awareness of the spiritual and re-creational values of wild nature also seems to be increasing among a politically active portion of many societies.

Three fundamental changes in the approach to managing protected areas are emerging:

Recognition that such areas as wetlands, estuaries, upstream catchments and other sites that are rich in biodiversity and critical to ecosystem processes, are directly linked to the potential for sustainable development today and the future;

Rescaling the planning and management of these areas to cover whole ecosystem; and,

Reorganizing institutions to promote this change in approach with consistent policies and incentives.

Urgency

Fragmentation and domestication of the land and water scape is increasing, and apparently unstopable in the short run. While reversals in these trends can be anticipated in the longer term as population stabilizes and urbanizes, the risk of the loss of species and genetic varieties, and of sites critical to ecosystem function and services, is far too high to wait.

Opportunity

There is growing awareness of the values related to biodiversity and ecosystem services, and their direct relationship to the potential for sustainable development. International and national debate now offers the opening to integrate and "mainstream" protected area management as a vital component of development and investment policy.

The Convention on Biological Diversity, along with the other global agreements on Climate Change, Land Degradation, Forests, World Heritage, and Man and the Biosphere, offer solutions and tools to address the issues of biodiversity loss, sequestration of carbon, reduction of land degradation and

deforestation. Shifting to sustainable resource use is a common thread in all such international initiatives.

Goal

The goal of this initiative is to help ensure that:

1. Those areas that are vital for sustaining and enriching life on Earth receive needed protection and management. This specifically covers those relatively wild core sites where species, their genetic variation, and ecosystem processes are maintained and restored.

2. These areas are planned and managed at geographic scales that embrace entire ecosystems. In so doing, the management approach will promote stewardship, and the cooperation of neighboring jurisdictions, property owners, and communities through participatory, incentive-based programs.

3. These bioregional areas are linked with nature-friendly corridors of appropriate dimensions to permit adaptation to global changes, migration and colonization.

Why WCPA?

WCPA is a unique global team of individual professionals from all over the world, dedicated to the proper management of all types of protected areas. Many of WCPA's members have jurisdictional responsibility for these areas, and all have deep personal commitment in ensuring that such areas play their central role in securing sustainable development.

Objective

WCPA seeks to promote and demonstrate the essential role played by all IUCN Categories of protected areas in advancing the principles and practice of bioegional planning and management. This will be accomplished over an intense and focused 10-year initiative, financed by the international community and national and local sources, to bring key sites under appropriate management, and to incorporate these areas in voluntary, cooperative bioregional programs, connected by nature-friendly corridors.

How

Lead by a high-level steering group convened by the WCPA, closely linked to the convention secretariats and the GEF secretariat, the initiative will:

1. Select eco-regions of high biodiversity priority where action and investment will be focused. The WWF Global 200 Ecoregions analysis and other existing, priority-setting tools will be consulted for this purpose.

2. Empower regional and national teams in a limited number of priority countries with special start-up grants, training opportunities, information and guidelines, and technical assistance on bioregional planning and management. The IUCN Regional and National Offices, and the Commission Regional Vice-Chairs will be invited to play a central role in this work. Cross-boundary ecosystems, and parks for peace, will receive particular interest.

3. Monitor progress, capture and synthesize what is being learned from the actual field experience, revise guidelines accordingly, and report to the conventions, governments and other stakeholders, on progress of the initiative..

Activities of the Initiative

Some of the activities of the initiative might include the following:

1. Establish criteria that identify and help select those sites critical for the protection, maintenance and restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services. These criteria will be complementary to those already established for the other entirely valid and important objectives of protected area management. Such sites are to be connected to other sites by guvver zones and corridors of nature-friendly land and water use.

2. Develop guideline manuals on bioregional planning and management, priority setting, financial mechanisms, and institutional development for bioregional management. These will draw from world-wide emerging experience in the establishment of bioregional programs and corridors.

3. Strengthen the networking capacity of WCPA to link those working on these bioregional projects.

4. Expand the CBD Clearing House Mechanism to include information and knowledge on protected area management.

5. Establish a roster of technical experts prepared to assist governments and communities as they plan their bioregional programs

6. Establish a Bioregional Fund to provide start-up grants to high-priority programs. Such a fund may be administered by IUCN/WCPA or directly through the GEF.

7. Prepare and display information on the objectives and opportunities for bioregional planning and management in support of the international conventions, and national and local economic development.

Timetable

Over a ten-year period:

Proposal to GEF for planning grant ($200,000)

Recommendations to CBD/COP4 (May 1998) on the role of protected areas in Article 8 and in support of sustainable development, Clearing House Mechanism to include information on protected areas, and role of WCPA as the community of professionals prepared to assist the Parties in this area of work.

Exhibit at Bratislava (COP4) on the role and opportunity of protected areas for biodiversity and ecosystem services.

With GEF funds, staff up WCPA to develop full proposal, in cooperation with Regional Vice Chairs, and IUCN Regional and National offices, and local experts and scientists

Expand WCPA networking capacity in Gland and in the regions

Establish teams to prepare guideline manuals, and eventually to provide field testing with interested countries

Initiate dialogue on nature-friendly resource use (agriculture, forestry, fisheries, wildlife, etc.) via the Global Biodiversity Forum, targeting the SBSTTA to call for action and investment to develop new technologies to "mainstream" biodiversity within overall regional land use in those regions of high biodiversity value.

Measure of Success

Each year, 10 new (or re-scaled) bioregional programs will be initiated, containing one or more significant wild core areas, nested within cooperative programs with adjacent land/water owners or jurisdictions, linked by nature-friendly corridors;

By year 5, at the time of the 5th World Protected Areas Congress, 50 programs will be under way, and an evaluation of progress presented to the Congress, seeking further guidance, endorsement, and support.

Budget

Resources:

Personnel at IUCN Hq, regional and national offices:

Exhibit and materials at COPs

GEF planning grant

5 Guideline manuals

Clearing House Mechanism (CBD) section on Protected Areas (Article 8)

Experts roster for technical assistance and training

Global Biodiversity Workshops on Nature-Friendly Resource Use Opportunities

Technical Assistance missions

Bioregional FUND to support start-up grants to local teams.

$US 4.6 million/first 5 years

ANNEX D

CONFERENCE OUTPUT 4:

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR WCPA

ANNEX D: DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE IUCN WCPA STEERING COMMITTEE

Preamble

At this intermediate stage on the road from Caracas to Africa the WCPA commits itself to securing the ecological, social, cultural, economic, and political integration of protected areas into society, and the survival of their values and functions by

- maintaining and strengthening its current programmes;
- embracing new directions;
- refocusing its efforts;
- establishing new alliances;
- building its constituency, and
- increasing its effectiveness.

In particular the following are recommended:

Relevance of protected areas in a changing world

1. WCPA should promote well managed protected areas as an integral element of national efforts to achieve biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. They should be seen as the core of integrated ecosystem planning and management, the whole complex being aimed at securing sustainable development.

2. WCPA should increase its emphasis on the promotion of category V and VI protected areas in order to promote integrated ecosystem planning.

3. WCPA should be researching, demonstrating and promoting the economic, social and ecological benefits of protected areas operating in the context of integrated ecosystem management, such as the Biosphere Reserve approach. The involvement of local communities and society at large should be stressed.

The protected areas profession and WCPA

4. WCPA should promote pride in the achievements of protected areas.

5. WCPA should establish a protected areas profession open to all practitioners, both with and without formal qualifications.

6. WCPA should work positively with kindred organisations such as the International Ranger Federation.

7. WCPA is the only international organisation which brings together all relevant professions involved in protected areas, including law and the social, physical and biological sciences, in order to achieve integrated ecosystem management at both national, regional and international levels.

WCPA Membership

8. WCPA should have open ended membership based on already established criteria.

9. Membership should be determined by the Chair on the advise of the vice-chairs in accordance with the membership criteria.

10. Membership should be reviewed regularly and active members reappointed after each World Conservation Congress.

11. WCPA should establish a membership fee with special provisions for those who cannot afford to pay. The amount to be determined and the method of payment should be worked out in consultation with the vice-chairs.

12. Membership should be based on individual contribution, not institutional affiliation, and institutions should not be considered for membership.

13. In addition to its present arrangements involving regional and thematic vice-chairs and specialist working groups, in order to harness and involve the considerable expertise within the WCPA network, the WCPA should encourage subject specialist groups as done in the Species Survival Commission.

14. Task forces are encouraged provided the Secretariat has appropriate resources to service them.

15. Where sufficient enthusiasm exists the formation of national activities should be encouraged.

16. Regional and thematic newsletters should be encouraged in as much as they are self-funded and managed.

17. Regional action plans for WCPA should be encouraged only where there is a realistic likelihood of such plans being implemented.

18. Communication within WCPA should be enhanced by using e-mail and other information technology innovations while continuing current means of communication to areas which lack electronic means.

19. Members working on WCPA tasks should normally not expect a salary except when such work is supported by specific financing mechanisms.

20. WCPA should encourage and assist members to be involved in externally funded projects as well as IUCN projects.

Resources:

21. WCPA should further encourage donors to use its networks. However, charging fees for this service should be considered.

22. The Secretariat in Gland should be allocated more human and financial resources in order to more effectively support the WCPA network. These could be moderately augmented from a WCPA membership fee.

23. WCPA vice-chairs should be encouraged to seek innovative mechanisms for obtaining additional resources.

24. Given that many donor agencies have regional foci, the funding by them of regional WCPA activities should be encouraged.

25. All fund raising should be co-ordinated with IUCN's other financing campaigns to avoid overlapping approaches to donors.

26. WCPA should establish a system for accounting for members voluntary contributions of time, expertise, and travel expenses, and use these accounts to leverage additional resources from outside sources.

Integration

27. WCPA should pursue special linkages (including joint working groups) with other organisations, agencies and groups with interests that intersect those of WCPA. These might include conservation agencies and organisations, NGO's, religious groups, indigenous and local community groups, scientists, educationalists, aid agencies, water, forestry, agriculture, fisheries and tourism agencies, and the military.

28. WCPA vice-chairs should maintain close contact with national and regional committees and fora and should have a designated focal point of contact within each IUCN regional and country office. WCPA should cooperate closely with other IUCN Commissions.

29. WCPA should continue to collaborate closely with WCMC in order to better service the information needs of its constituency, including through the establishment of international, regional, and national Protected Area Resource Centres (PARC).

30. WCPA should better integrate its efforts in the marine, freshwater and terrestrial environments.

31. WCPA should encourage learning from diverse protected area experiences, ensuring regional balance and cross-fertilisation in all its activities including task forces, workshops, and subject specialist groups.

32. The WCPA steering committee should review its structure and task forces to ensure they are capable of responding to the new directions.

Marketing and Communication

33. WCPA should develop a marketing and communication programme to demonstrate and promote the benefits of its activities.

34. WCPA must, within the context of its mission, demonstrate to donors:

    a) the advantages flowing from the use of WCPA networks, in particular:

        - access to the best available expertise and a multiplier effect through the network
        - the economic and environmental benefits of WCPA programmes
        - the effective use of its information technologies such as the Protected Area Resource Centres (PARC's)

    b) that protected areas can achieve development objectives at the same time as environment objectives, through for example, nature based tourism, improved fishery catches through protecting nursery and replenishment areas, clean freshwater supplies, reduced pollution and improved public health and local community self-reliance.

WCPA and the Convention on Biological Diversity

WCPA will incorporate and follow-up in its programme the Albany output in relation to the role of the commission in the CBD process.

November 28, 1997
Albany, Australia

ANNEX E

CONFERENCE OUTPUT 5:

PROTECTED AREAS AND THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

ANNEX E: PROTECTED AREAS AND THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Objective:

To send a message to the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity highlighting the value of Protected Areas in enabling nations implement the Convention.

Message to the Conference of the Parties

The Albany Symposium, considering the key role of protected areas in biodiversity conservation, believes that efforts should be made to mainstream Protected Areas in the work plan of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention.

To achieve this, it is agreed that the Director General of IUCN send a message to IUCN State and Agency members. The message would link Protected Areas to the in-situ conservation, sustainable use, and benefit sharing objectives of the Convention.

- The message should be focused on in situ conservation.
- It should be substantially in the form of the paper circulated and attached hereto.
- It should clearly relate Protected Areas to the Work Program of the Convention.

The IUCN message will be sent to the three members of WCPA most directly linked to the Convention through their participation as representatives of their respective States. Those members are Australia, Bahamas and Indonesia.

In order to develop support for this initiative, the representatives of those Countries will work through their respective National Committees and the Regional political groups of the Convention with whom they are each associated.

It is anticipated that sufficient support should be generated prior to the Meeting of the Conference of the Parties in May 1998 to have the message brought to the floor of the Conference with the objective of

- Calling for a resolution of the Parties in support of the message
- Getting the principles of the message injected into the Work Program.

It is noted that WCPA's new publication of National Systems Plans should be published prior to the meeting in Bratislava.

Attachment

Paper by A. Phillips on Protected Areas and the Convention on Biological Diversity.

PROTECTED AREAS AND THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Discussion Paper by WCPA for review at the Albany symposium

Adrian Phillips
Chair, World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)

Summary

Protected areas are essential to biodiversity conservation, and must be at the heart of efforts to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity. But, while they are specifically mentioned in Article 8 of the Convention, protected areas have not yet received focused attention from the COP. The purpose of this paper is to propose that an initiative be taken to raise the profile of protected areas in the implementation of the Convention.

Introduction

Protected areas are essential for biodiversity conservation. "Well known as national parks and nature reserves, they also encompass more recent concepts such as sustainable use reserves, wilderness areas and heritage sites. With proper management to effectively conserve biological diversity, a good network of protected areas forms ... the pinnacle of a nation's efforts to protect biodiversity, ensuring that the most valuable sites and representative populations of important species are conserved in a variety of ways. The network complements other measures taken to conserve biodiversity outside protected areas." (Glowka et al 1994, p.39). Quite apart from biodiversity conservation, protected areas also provide societies around the world with a wide range of environmental services as well having material and non-material values of many kinds.

The global network of 27,400 protected areas of various types now cover approximately 10% of the total land area of the world's nations. The fact that nearly every country has set up protected areas is evidence of governments' commitment to ensuring that this generation passes on to future generations a world at least as diverse and productive as the one we now enjoy. This commitment has been bolstered by similar actions taken by many sectors of civil society.

But despite the numerous initiatives taken at international, national and local levels in support of protected areas, more such areas are needed in many countries, existing protected areas everywhere are under threat, and these threats mount year by year. The main dangers are the ever-increasing demands for land and resources to meet human needs, especially in poorer countries. Pollution, climate change and excessive tourism add to the pressures. Too often protected areas lack political support and are poorly funded.

So there is an increasing credibility gap. On the one hand, the values of protected areas are clear, and indeed more and more such areas are being set up: on the other hand, progress is often thwarted by the ever greater pressures placed on these areas. The rhetoric which often accompanies the establishment of protected areas has to be contrasted with the reality of there being many "paper parks" - protected areas legally in existence, but not functioning in practice.

This dilemma cannot be resolved by a strategy based solely on law enforcement, nor can it be dealt with only within the areas themselves. Instead protected areas must be planned and managed with, and through, local communities wherever possible, not against them; developed as part of sustainable strategies for poverty alleviation and economic and social advancement in rural areas; and encompassed within broader bioregional strategies incorporating lands around or between more strictly protected core areas. The need is to utilise a wide range of protected areas approaches, including areas in which people live and make a living, and involve all levels of government and all sectors of civil society. While the scale of the crisis facing the world's protected areas is well documented, there is now also wide understanding of the required response.

The Convention on Biological Diversity

The CBD provides an opportunity to help mobilise a more effective integrated response than has been possible hitherto. Article 8 of the Convention (In situ Conservation) calls on each Contracting Party to:

- establish a system of protected areas or areas where special measures need to be taken to conserve biological diversity (8a);
- develop guidelines for the selection, establishment and management of protected areas or areas where special measures need to be taken to conserve biological diversity (8b);
- regulate or manage biological resources important for the conservation of biological diversity whether within or outside protected areas, with a view to ensuring their conservation and sustainable use (8c);
- promote environmentally sound and sustainable development in areas adjacent to protected areas with a view to furthering protection of these areas (8e).

There are also many other parts of the CBD which are relevant to protected areas (e.g. training, research, education), although the distinctive role which such areas can play in each of these is not usually identified.

In its decisions, the Conference of the Parties (COP) has specifically addressed the importance of establishing and consolidating representative systems of marine and coastal protected areas; emphasized the importance of protected areas in contributing to the conservation of in situ forest biodiversity; and recommended the development of a

thematic approach to the compilation and dissemination of information on protected areas.

Despite these welcome initial developments, so far the CBD has not yet been able to promote action which would have a significant impact by reversing the destructive trends affecting the world's protected areas. IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) believes, however, that the crisis facing the world's protected areas represents one of the biggest challenges to the COP of the CBD. Without effective systems of protected areas, there can be no long term in situ conservation of biological diversity; and ex situ measures alone can never be more than a very partial substitute.

The text of CBD is very general in setting out obligations for Contracting Parties towards protected areas. WCPA believes that the COP should develop a general work programme so as to raise the profile of protected areas within the CBD - with the over-riding purpose of enhancing the future prospects for biodiversity conservation through protected areas worldwide.

By consolidating and disseminating experience in the effective planning and management of protected areas, such a work programme developed within the framework of the CBD, would increase greatly the impact of Article 8. It would also bring together the implications for protected areas of those articles of the CBD which do not explicitly address in-situ conservation.

The work programme could lead to a number of important measures taken by the COP. At one end of the range of options is the possible eventual adoption of a protocol on protected areas; another possibility is the development of an annex to the CBD on protected areas; but much can also be achieved through decisions of the COP. At this stage, WCPA has no preference: what matters is that process of raising the profile of protected areas is embarked upon soon, and with determination.

The Planning and Management of Protected Areas

Much work has been done by the worldwide community of people working in protected areas in recent years to improve the quality of planning and management. Examples are the Fourth World Congress on National Parks and Protected Areas, Caracas, Venezuela (1992), numerous IUCN/WCPA publications, and resolutions of the IUCN General Assembly and (in 1996) of its World Conservation Congress (WCC), e.g. WCC Recommendation 1.35. Along with other international measures (e.g. the World Heritage and Ramsar Conventions), and through a wealth of other experience at the national and local levels, there has developed a corpus of best practice in the planning and management of protected areas which can be drawn upon in the suggested work programme.

The Possible Scope of a CBD Work Programme on Protected Areas

The following elements could form the basis of the proposed work programme for the COP, leading to measures to encourage Contracting Parties to:

1. Develop a national system plan for protected areas.

   [The implications of this are set out in draft guidance from IUCN/WCPA, due for publication by IUCN and the University of Wales, Cardiff in a few months time. A Guide to the Convention on Biological Diversity (Glowka et al, 1994) says that the word "system" "implies that the protected areas of a Party or region should be chosen in a logical way, and together would form a network, in which the various components conserve different portions of biological diversity" (p.39). Clearly this needs planning. The CBD requires countries to put in place a national system of protected areas, however the concept of a plan to guide this is only hinted at in Article 8b: the need for a national system plan should be made clear. Such a plan could form part of the National Biodiversity Strategy called for under Article 6b; if not, it should be closely linked to the strategy].

2. Establish new protected areas in priority areas for biodiversity conservation.

   [This is implicit already in Article 8a, but a more explicit requirement to consider the need to set up new areas would help governments to give higher priority to neglected ecosystems, e.g. in the marine environment.]

3. Set up protected areas with a range of management objectives.

   [WCC Recommendation 1.35 urges countries to "apply the IUCN system of protected areas categories which both provide strict protection primarily in order to protect nature and which provide for a balance of conservation and the sustainable use of natural resource to help meet the needs of local people". The six categories are:

   I Strict Nature Reserve/Wilderness Area: protected area managed mainly for science or wilderness protection;

   II National Park: protected area managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation;

   III Natural Monument: protected area managed mainly for conservation of specific features;

   IV Habitat/Species Management Area: protected area managed mainly for conservation through management intervention;

   V Protected Landscape/seascape: protected area managed mainly for landscape/seascape conservation and recreation; and

   VI Managed Resource Protected Area: protected area managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural resources. (IUCN, 1994)]

4. Put in place the legal or other means to plan and manage protected areas, including measures to enforce laws etc.

[IUCN advice on this says: "Implementing Articles 8a and 8b requires a firm legal base under which government authorities can establish and manage protected areas" (Glowka et al, 1994, p.40). However, in some countries laws are supplemented or complemented by custom or tradition. None of this effort is of much value, however, without the power of enforcement].

5. Adopt and implement management plans (or similar measures) at the site level for individual protected areas, or groups of related protected areas.

   [The need for a framework for site management as provided for by a management plan is widely recognised as a necessary means of ensuring that the areas in question can be managed effectively. Plans must however be implemented if they are to be of real value].

6. Adopt bio-regional approaches to planning and management.

   [Strictly protected core areas on land and at sea need to be buffered by support zones (see Article 8e). Where appropriate, they should also be linked by corridors of ecologically-friendly land uses, and include also the restoration of degraded ecosystems -see Article 8f. The bioregional approach, with its emphasis on inter-linked networks of protected areas rather than "islands", is rapidly emerging as a central thrust of much work on the design of protected areas systems for the future, e.g. to help cope with the consequences of climate change. See also WCC Resolution 1.35].

7. Integrate protected areas planning and management with all sectors of government policy.

   [Protected areas need to be integrated with policies for resource conservation, (e.g. agriculture, forestry, (freshwater and marine fisheries), other aspects of economic development (e.g. transport, tourism, industry, energy, minerals, and urban and infrastructure development) and other government use of land (e.g. for defence)].

8. Monitor the effectiveness with which protected areas are managed.

   [Monitoring and evaluation systems are needed to improve decision making in the field (adaptive management), review protected area policies, enhance accountability, and justify resource allocations].

9. Ensure the special place of protected areas in environmental assessment procedures.

   [Article 14 requires Contracting Parties to introduce appropriate procedures for environmental impact assessment. It is desirable that the special place of protected areas is recognised in national legislation etc.].

10. Adopt or remove economic incentives affecting protected areas.

    [There is a need for economic incentives to support protected areas, and to remove so called "perverse" incentives which threaten protected areas. Action here is one of the most important practical measures open to governments in furthering the aims of the CBD. It would also help Parties to ensure that the requirements of Article 11 (Incentive Measures) are applied to protected areas as elsewhere].

11. Provide a national framework level to encourage an appropriate range of organisations to set up and manage protected areas.

    [WCC Recommendation 1.35 speaks of "affirming the essential role of national governments in protected areas planning and management" but also providing "a fuller role to be played by provincial and local governments, indigenous peoples, other local communities, NGOs and private organisations and individuals". However, as signatories to the CBD, governments will wish to provide a framework for such efforts, which could be provided by the national system plan - see above].

12. Adopt public participation, collaborative management and stakeholder involvement in the planning and management of protected areas.

    [This has been recommended in numerous IUCN resolutions (e.g. WCC 1.42), IUCN publications, CBD resolutions and other advice].

13. Recognise the rights of indigenous peoples, as well as of local communities, to their lands or territories and resources that fall within protected areas.

    [Traditional cultural integrity and the traditional rights of indigenous peoples and other local communities "can often be supported by protected areas policies and practices which safeguard traditional forms of sustainable resource use" (WCC Recommendation 1.35)].

14. Include protected areas in policies of public education and awareness.

    [Article 13a contains general requirements about public education to encourage the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. The need here is for more explicit encouragement to Parties to include protected areas within public education and awareness programmes].

15. Put in place programmes of scientific study and research to underpin biodiversity conservation efforts in protected areas.

    Article 12b contains general requirements about research to underpin the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. The need here is for more explicit encouragement to Parties to include protected areas within such programmes of scientific study].

16. Link in-situ and ex-situ conservation.

[The CBD sees in-situ conservation as the principal means of conserving biodiversity. However, Article 9 places obligations on Parties to adopt measures for ex-situ conservation. It is important that there are appropriate links been these two complementary approaches to conservation].

17. Adopt policies on bio-prospecting and access to genetic resources in protected areas.

Article 15 deals with access to genetic resources. Many of these will be found in protected areas, and it is highly desirable therefore that Parties adopt polices and procedures relating to bio-prospecting and access to resources for such areas].

18. Set up trans-frontier protected areas through co-operative arrangements with neighbouring countries.

[In order to conserve shared biodiversity resources in situ, many countries will need to establish more trans-frontier protected areas, and to draw up agreements on their collaborative management].

19. Build capacity in-country through training for protected areas.

[The importance of strengthening the training of professional staff at all levels engaged in protected areas management is widely recognised. The need here is to make the linkage with the obligations on Parties under Article 12 on Research and Training].

20. Request countries to collect, exchange and disseminate information about protected areas.

The exchange of information about biodiversity is the subject of Article 17. In respect of protected areas, there would be great value in encouraging Contracting Parties voluntarily to provide regular up-dated reports to IUCN Environmental Law Centre (ELC) and the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC). The ELC maintains a global data base on environmental law, and WCMC maintains the global data base on the status of the world's protected areas. Their ability to assist countries to meet their CBD obligations is greatly helped by the receipt of timely reports on status and distribution of protected areas].

21. Include protected areas within reports of the Contracting Parties.

[Article 26 calls for national reports from Contracting Parties to be presented to the COP on measures to implement the CBD. These should include appropriate reports on progress with protected areas, e.g. in respect of the foregoing list of items].

Next steps

This paper is for review at the Albany Symposium "Protected Areas in the 21st. Century - From Island to Networks". It is hoped that the meeting will assist in shaping the proposal, and endorse the principle of promoting a work programme on protected areas within the CBD.

It is also hoped that key individuals from a number of Contracting Parties will be prepared to indicate their support for this idea and willingness to explore within their governments how to progress it within the COP.

IUCN, principally through its World Commission on Protected Areas and the Commission on Environmental Law, and through the Protected Areas and Environmental Law Programmes of the IUCN Secretariat, will be ready to assist in the preparation of the work programme.

The next World Parks Congress (Africa, 2002) would be a good target to set for the adoption of key measures arising out of the work programme.

References

Glowka et al (1994) A Guide to the Convention on Biological Diversity, IUCN, Gland and Cambridge

IUCN (1994) Guidelines for Protected Area Management Categories, IUCN, Gland and Cambridge

ANNEX F

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SUPPORT

Annex F: ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SUPPORT

This conference has been made possible by the generous support of a number of organisations and this is gratefully acknowledged here. In particular, IUCN would like to thank the following for their support:

- UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Programme;
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre;
- USAID;
- US National Park Service;
- United States State Department;
- World Bank, Environment Department;
- World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF);
- United Nations Environment Programme;
- Environment Australia:
- CALM (Conservation and Land Management), Western Australia;
- New South Wales, National Parks and Wildlife Service;
- Keidenren Nature Trust, Japan;
- FAO
- Government of the Netherlands

ANNEX G

PARTICIPANT LIST

Albany Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century - From Islands to Networks

Albany Western Australia, 23-29 November 1997

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
1. Mr. Faisal	ABU-IZZEDDIN	Project Manager Protected Areas Project Ministry of the Environment P.O. Box 113-5474 Beirut LEBANON	Fax: 9611-418910 Tel: 9611-522222 Email: <Faisal@moe.gov.lb>	LEBANON
2. Dr. Stephan	AMEND	Advisor for Nature Conservation Projects Postfach 5180 D-65726 Eschborn GERMANY	Fax: ++49 6796-79-7123 Tel: ++49 6796-79-1244 Email: <stephan.amend@gtz.de>	GERMANY
3. Ms. Diane	ANSTEY	Regional Sales Manager British Airways - Western Australia 77 St. George's Terrace Perth Western Australia 6000 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61-9-221-3285	AUSTRALIA
4. Dr. Jose Marcio	AYRES	Senior Conservation Zoologist - Deputy Chair IUCN-SSC Sociedad Civil Mamiraua Dept. de Anthropologia Universidad Federal do Pará Caixa Postal 531 Belém Pará 66073-250 Brazil	Fax: 55-91-249-6369 Tel: 55-91-2290069 Email: ayreswcs@libnet.com.br	Brazil

Albany Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century - From Islands to Networks

Albany Western Australia, 23-29 November 1997

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
5. Dr. Graham	BENNETT	Director European Affairs Aidenvironment Donker Curtiusstraat 7-523 1051 JL Amsterdam NETHERLANDS	Fax: 31-20-686 6251 Tel: 31-20-686 8111 Email: <bennett@aidenvironment.antenna.nl>	NETHERLANDS
6. Mr. Mike	BERESFORD	Maes-y-Cilyn Glaspwll Machynlleth Powys SY20 8UA Wales UNITED KINGDOM	Tel/Fax: 44-1654-703 838 Email: <cf.sh@virgin.net>	UNITED KINGDOM
7. Ms. Seema	BHATT	Coordinator (South Asia) Biodiversity Conservation Network c/o Development Alternatives B-32, Tara Crescent Qutab Industrial Area New Delhi 110 016 INDIA	Fax: 91 11 68-66031 Tel: 91 11 66-5370, 69-67938 Email: bcn@sdalt.ernet.in	INDIA
8. Ms. Grazia	BORRINI-FEYERABEND	Head Social Policy Group IUCN - HQ Rue Mauverney 28 1196 Gland SWITZERLAND		SWITZERLAND

Albany Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century - From Islands to Networks

Albany Western Australia, 23-29 November 1997

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
9. Prof. Li	BOSHENG	Institute of Botany Chinese Academy of Sciences 20 Nanxincun Xiangshan, Haidian District Beijing 100093 P.R. of CHINA	Fax: 86 -10-625-90348 Tel: 86-10-625-42950 Email: <libs@sun.ihep.ac.cn>	P.R. of CHINA
10. Mr. Peter	BRIDGEWATER	Head Environment Australia Biodiversity Group GPO Box 636 Canberra, ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61-6-250 0228	AUSTRALIA
11. Ms. Jessica	BROWN	Vice President Atlantic Center for the Environment Quebec-Labrador Foundation 55 South Main Street Ipswich, MA 01938 UNITED STATES	Fax: 1-508-356 7322 Tel: 1-508-356 0038 Email: j.brown@qlf.org	UNITED STATES
12. Ms. Susan	BUGGEY	470 Laurier Ave. West, #1002 Ottawa Ontario K1R 7W9 CANADA	Fax: 1-613-230-8661 Tel: 1-613-230-9144 Email: susan.buggey@sympatico.ca	CANADA
13. Dr. Silvana	CAMPELLO	Principal Tangará Environment & Tourism Consultants Rua Percy murray 5-1103 Rio de Janeiro 22071-040 BRAZIL	Fax: 55-21-991-2516 Email: tangara@infolink.com.br	BRAZIL

Albany Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century - From Islands to Networks

Albany Western Australia, 23-29 November 1997

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
14. Mr Stuart	CHAPE	IUCN-Country Representative Lao PDR PO Box 4340 15 Fa Ngum Road VIENTIANE LAO PDR	Fax: 856 21 216 127 Tel: 856 21 216 401 Email: <iucnlao@loxinfo.co.th	LAO PDR
15. Mr. John	COOPER	Vice-Chair IUCN Antarctic Advisory Committee BirdLife International c/o Avian Demography Unit University of CapeTown Rhondebosch 7707 SOUTH AFRICA	Fax: 27-21-650 3295 Tel: 27-21-650-3308 (cell. 083-750-3486) Email: <jcooper@botzoo.uct.ac.za>	SOUTH AFRICA
16. Mrs. Natalia	DANILINA	Environmental Education Centre "Zapovedniks" Institute of Economics, 15th floor Nachimovsky pr. 32 Moscow 117218 RUSSIA	Tel/Fax: 7-095-129 0688 Email: <zapchin@glasnet.ru> <chipmunk@glasnet.ru>	RUSSIA
17. Mr. Doan	DIEM	Deputy Chair Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development / Forest Protection Department 164 Tran Quang Khai St. Hanoi VIETNAM	Fax: 84-4-825 2695 Tel: 84-4-825 2632 Email: <VPAP@netnam.org.vn>	VIETNAM

Albany Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century - From Islands to Networks

Albany Western Australia, 23-29 November 1997

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
18. Dr. Paul F.	EAGLES	Professor University of Waterloo Department of recreation & Leisure Studies Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3GI CANADA	Fax: 1-519-746 6776 Tel: 1-519-888-4567 ext. 2716 Email: <eagles@healthy.uwaterloo.ca>	CANADA
19. The Honorable Ms. Cheryl	EDWARDES	Western Australia Minister for the Environment Office of the Minister of the Environment, Employment and Training 18th Floor, Allendale Square 77 St. George's Terrace Perth Western Australia 6000 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61 89 221-4665 / 4668	AUSTRALIA
20. Mr. Harold	EIDSVIK	10915 Prentice Place Sidney, BC V8L 5H7 CANADA	Fax: 1-250-656 0768 Tel: 1-250-656 0736 Email: <Heidsvik@aol.com>	CANADA
21. Ms. Penny	FIGGIS	Vice President Australian Conservation Foundation 4 Woolcott Street Waverton, NSW 1201 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61-2-9957 6815 Tel: 61-22-9922 5275 Email: <figdon@ozemail.com.au>	AUSTRALIA
22. Dr. Gustavo	FONSECA	Vice-President Conservation International Av. Antonio Abrhao Caram 820/302 Belo Horizonte MG 31275-000 BRAZIL	Tel/Fax: 55-31-441 1795 Email: <G.Fonseca@Conservation.org.br>	BRAZIL

Albany Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century - From Islands to Networks

Albany Western Australia, 23-29 November 1997

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
23. Dr. Michael	GREEN	World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) 219 Huntingdon Road Cambridge CB3 0DL UNITED KINGDOM	Fax: 44-1223-277 136 Tel: 44-1223-277 314 Email: michael.green@wcmc.org.uk	UNITED KINGDOM
24. Dr. Chandra Prasad	GURUNG	c/o JICA Jordan Office P.O. Box 926355 Amman 11110 JORDAN	Fax: 962 6 814-148 (Res) Tel: 962 6 619-641 (Res) Email:< cgurung@go.com.jo>	JORDAN
25. Dr. Christopher	HAILS	Programme Director WWF International Avenue du Mont-Blanc CH-1196 Gland SWITZERLAND	Fax: 41-22-364 0640 Tel: 41-22-364 9526 Email: <Hails@wwfnet.org>	SWITZERLAND
26. Prof. Lawrence	HAMILTON	Islands and Highlands Environmental Consultancy 324 Bittersweet Lane Charlotte, Vertmont 05445 UNITED STATES	Tel/Fax: 1-802-425 6509 Email: <LSX2_hamilton@together.org>	UNITED STATES
27. Mr. Chris	HAYNES	Director of Regional Services Regional Services Department of Conservation & Land Management PO Box 104 Como, WA 6154 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61-8-9386 1578 Tel: 61-8-9442 0300 Email:	AUSTRALIA

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
28. Mr. Patrick	HOLLAND	Policy Advisor to the Minister for the Environment Ministry of the Environment Level 9 St. James Centre 111 Elizabeth St. Sydney AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61-2-9233 3617	AUSTRALIA
29. Ms. Lynn	HOLOWESKO	WCPA Deputy Chair PO Box N-942 Nassau N.P. BAHAMAS	Fax: 1-242-324 2932 Tel: 1-242-327 4691 Email: <lholowesko@bahamas.net.bs>	BAHAMAS
30. Dr. John	HOUGH	GEF Coordinator UNDP 1102 Bedford Road Pleasantville NY 10570-3911 UNITED STATES	Fax: 1-212-906 6362 Tel: 1-212-906-5560 / 5078 Email: <jhough@nygate.undp.org>	UNITED STATES
31. Mr. Keith	JOHNSTON	Principal Policy Analyst New Zealand Department of Conservation PO Box 10-420 Wellington NEW ZEALAND	Fax: 64-4-471 3100 Tel: 64-4-471 3130 Email: <KJohnston@doc.govt.nz>	NEW ZEALAND
32. Mr. Graeme	KELLEHER	12 Marulda Street Aranda, Canberra ACT 2614 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61 2 6247-5761 Tel: 61 2 6251-1402 Email: <g.kelleher@gbrmpa.gov.au>	AUSTRALIA

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
33. Mr. Kunio	KIKUCHI	Deputy Director General Nature Conservation Bureau Environment Agency 1-2-2 Kasumigaseki Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo 100 JAPAN	Fax: 81-3-350 892 78	JAPAN
34. Mr. Ashish	KOTHARI	Lecturer in Environmental Studies Indian Institute of Public Administration Apt. 5 Shree Dutta Krupa 908 Deccan Gymkhana Pune 411004 INDIA	Tel/Fax: 91-212-354239 Email: <Ashish@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in>	INDIA
35. Ms. Robyn	KRUK	Director General NSW National Parks & Wildlife Service PO Box 1967 Hurstville, NSW 2220 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61-2-9585 6455 Email: <Rhonda.Rhutkis@nsw.gov.au>	AUSTRALIA
36. Mr. Gai	KULA	WCPA Regional Vice Chair for the Pacific Conservation International (PHG) P.O. Box 106 Waigani Port Moresby PAPUA NEW GUINEA	Fax: 675 325-4234 Tel: 675 325-4234	PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Albany Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century - From Islands to Networks

Albany Western Australia, 23-29 November 1997

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
37. Dr. Chee Chiew	LEONG	Deputy Chief Executive Officer National Parks Board 7 Maxwell Rd., 5th Storey Annexe B, MND Complex Singapore 069111 SINGAPORE	Fax: 65 325-2280 Tel: 65 222-1211	SINGAPORE
38. Mr. P. H. C. (Bing)	LUCAS	1/268 Main Road Tawa, Wellington 6006 NEW ZEALAND	Fax: 64-4-232 9129	NEW ZEALAND
39. Mr. Walter	LUSIGI	GEF - Secretariat 1818 H Street NW Washington D.C. 20433 UNITED STATES	Fax: 1 202 522-3240/5 Tel: 1 202 473-3297 Email: <WLusigi@worldbank.org>	UNITED STATES
40. Dr. Kathy	MACKINNON	Biodiversity Specialist The World Bank Group 1818 H Street Washington D.C. 20433 USA	Fax: 1 202 522-3256 Tel: 1 202 458-4682	USA
41. Mr. Jeff	McNEELY	Chief Scientist IUCN - HQ Rue Mauverney 28 1196 Gland SWITZERLAND	Fax: 41 22 999 0025 Tel: 41 22 999 0284 Email: JAM@hq.iucn.org	SWITZERLAND

Albany Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century - From Islands to Networks

Albany Western Australia, 23-29 November 1997

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
42. Ms. Sue	MILLER	SPREP P.O. Box 240 Apia WESTERN SAMOA	Fax: 685-20231 Tel: 685-21929 Email: <smiller@talofa.net>	WESTERN SAMOA
43. Dr. Kenton	MILLER	Vice President and Director Biological Resources & Institutions World Resources Institute 1709 New York Avenue, NW Washington DC 20006 UNITED STATES	Fax: 1-202-638 0036 Tel: 1-202-662-2582 Email: <Kenton@wri.org>	UNITED STATES
44. Mr. Mavuso	MSIMANG	Chief Executive National Parks Board P.O. Box 787 Pretoria 0001 SOUTH AFRICA	Fax: 27-12-343-2832	SOUTH AFRICA
45. Dr. Marshall	MURPHREE	Director Centre for Applied Social Sciences University of Zimbabwe Box MP 167 Mount Pleasant Harare ZIMBABWE	Fax: 263 -4 307-134 or 333-407	ZIMBABWE

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
46. Dr Jean	NGOG NJE	Directeur Ecole pour la Formation des Spécialistes de la Faune B.P. 271 Garoua CAMEROON	Fax: 237-27-3135/2022 Tel: 237 - 271125	CAMEROON
47. Mr. Olav	NORD-VARHAUG	Head of National Park Division Directorate for Nature Management Tungasletta 2 N-7005 Trondheim NORWAY	Fax: 47-73-915 433 Tel: 47-73-580 500 Email: olav.nord-varhaug@dn.dep.no	NORWAY
48. Mr. Moses	OKUA	Commissioner for Wildlife Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities P.O. Box 4241 Kampala UGANDA	Fax: 256-041-242427 Tel: 256-041-233365	UGANDA
49. Mr. Gonzalo	OVIEDO	Forest Officer WWF International Avenue du Mont-Blanc 1196 Gland SWITZERLAND	Fax: 41-22-364 0640 Tel: 41-22-995-0214 Email: <GOviedo@wwfnet.org>	SWITZERLAND
50. Ms. Jeanne	PAGNAN	Environmental Consultant Twin Dolphins Consultants 53 Brouage Aylmer, Quebec J9J 1J5 CANADA	Fax: 1-819-777 1767 Email: <Jpagnan@compuserve.com>	CANADA

Albany Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century - From Islands to Networks

Albany Western Australia, 23-29 November 1997

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
51. Mr. H. S.	PANWAR	B11700 Vasant Kunj New Delhi 110070 INDIA	Fax: 91-11-689-9277 Tel: 91-11-689-2760 Email: <gefp@slt.lk>	INDIA
52. Prof. Adrian	PHILLIPS	Chair, World Commission on Protected Areas - WCPA 2 The Old Rectory Dumbleton near Evesham WR11 6TG UNITED KINGDOM	Fax: 44-1386-882 094 Email: <AdrianP@wcpa.demon.co.uk>	UNITED KINGDOM
53. Mr. Mike	PORTER	Parks Canada Jules Léger Bldg. 4th Floor 25 Eddy Street Hull Québec K1A 0M5 CANADA	Fax: 1-819-997-5883 Email: <mike_porter@pch.gc.ca>	CANADA
54. Ms. Natatua	PRESCOTT	Ministry of Lands Survey & Natural Resources P.O. Box 5 Nuku'alofa TONGA	Fax: 676-23216 Tel: 676-23611	TONGA
55. Mr. Kishore	RAO	Ministry of Environment and Forests Paryavaran Bhawan CGO Complex Lodi Road New Delhi 110 003 INDIA	Fax: 91-11-462 6837 Tel: 91-11-436-0957 Email: <KRao@envfor.delhi.nic.in>	INDIA

Albany Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century - From Islands to Networks

Albany Western Australia, 23-29 November 1997

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
56. Mr. Iosefatu (Joe)	RETI	Programme Manager, SPBCP Biodiversity Conservation Programme SPREP PO Box 240 Apia WESTERN SAMOA	Fax: 685-20231 Tel: 685-21929 Email: <sprep@talofa.net>	WESTERN SAMOA
57. Dr. Juan	RITA LARRUCEA	Dep. De Biologia Ambiental Universitat de les Illes de Balears Palma de Mallorca 07071 SPAIN	Fax: 34 71 173-184 Email: <dbsjrl0@ps.uib.es>	SPAIN
58. Ms. Jane	ROBERTSON	Programme Specialist Division of Ecological Sciences UNESCO 1 rue Miollis F-75732 Paris Cedex 15 FRANCE	Fax: 33-1-4568 5804 Tel: 33-1-4568 4067 Email: <j.robertson@unesco.org>	FRANCE
59. Dr Robbie	ROBINSON	P.O. Box 339 Newlands 7725 South Africa	Fax: 27 21 6830683 Tel: 27 21 612557 Email: <DrRobbie@icon.co.za>	South Africa
60. Mr. Pedro	ROSABAL	Programme Officer - IUCN Programme on Protected Areas IUCN - the World Conservation Union Rue de Mauverney 28 Gland 1196 SWITZERLAND	Fax: 41 22 999 0015 Tel: 41 22 999 0163 Email: <PMR@hq.iucn.org>	SWITZERLAND

Albany Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century - From Islands to Networks

Albany Western Australia, 23-29 November 1997

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
61. Mr. Tom	ROTHERHAM	IUCN - Programme on Protected Areas IUCN - the World Conservation Union Rue de Mauverney 28 Gland 1196 SWITZERLAND	Fax: 41 22 999 0015 Tel: 41 22 999 0161 Email: <TOR@hq.iucn.org>	SWITZERLAND
62. Mr. Graeme	RUNDLE	WA National Parks and Reserves Association P.O. Box 270 Maylands Western Australia 6051 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61 8 9311-8383 Tel: 61 8 9299-7024	AUSTRALIA
63. Mr. Alberto	SALAS	IUCN Central America ORMA San Juan COSTA RICA	Fax: 506-240-9934 Tel: 506-236-2733 Email: <uicncr@sol.racsa.co.cr>	COSTA RICA
64. Mr Trevor	SANDWITH	Head: Planning Natal Parks Board P.O. Box 662 Pietermaritzburg 3200 South Africa	Fax: 27 331 471 173 Tel: 27 331 471 961 Email: <trevors@npb.co.za>	South Africa
65. Dr. S. K.	SHARMA	President Environment Society of India Karuna Sadan Sector 11-B Chandigarh 160 001 INDIA	Fax: 91-0172-600-531	INDIA

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
66. Dr. Uday R.	SHARMA	Director General H.M.D. Ministry of Forest & Soil Conservation Department of National Parks & Wildlife Conservation PO Box 860 Kathmandu NEPAL	Fax: 977-1-227 675 Tel: 977-1-220 912/850	NEPAL
67. Dr. Syd	SHEA	Executive Director Department of Conservation & Land Management Locked Bag 104 Ventley Delivery Centre, WA 6983 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61-9-386 7112 Tel: 61-9-442 0325 Email: <syds@calm.wa.gov.au>	AUSTRALIA
68. Mr. David	SHEPPARD	Head, IUCN Programme on Protected Areas IUCN - the World Conservation Union Rue de Mauverney 28 Gland 1196 SWITZERLAND	Fax: 41 22 999-0015 Tel: 41 22 999-0162 Email: <DAS@hq.iucn.org>	SWITZERLAND
69. Mr. Evgeny	SHVARTS	Chair Biological Conservation Centre P.O. Box 4 Moscow 127276 RUSSIA	Fax/ Tel: 7 095 482-1888 / 125-5773 Email: <Biodivers@glasnet.ru> <atlas@glasnet.ru>	RUSSIA

Albany Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century - From Islands to Networks
Albany Western Australia, 23-29 November 1997

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
70. Dr. Michael	SOUKUP	Associate Director for Natural Resources US Department of the Interior National Parks Service PO Box 37127 Washington, DC 20013-7127 UNITED STATES	Fax: 1-202-273-4431 Tel: 1-202-208-3884 Email: Mike_Soukup@nps.gov>	UNITED STATES
71. Mr. Gustavo	SUAREZ DE FREITAS	ProNaturaleza Parque Blume 106 con Avenida General Córdoba 518 Apartado 18-1393 Miraflores, Lima 18 PERU	Fax: 51-1-441 2151 Tel: 51-1-4413800 / 08207 Email: <fpcn@mail.cosapidata.com.pe>	PERU
72. Mr. Effendy A.	SUMARDJA	Assistant Minister for environmental Planning State Ministry for Environment Jl. D.I. Panjaitan, Kebon Nanas Jakarta 13410 INDONESIA	Fax: 62-21-858 0087	INDONESIA
73. Mr. Young-Joon	SUNWOO	Director Ministry of the Environment The 2nd Government Complex Building Kwacheon City 427-760 REPUBLIC OF KOREA	Fax: 82-2-504-4439 Tel: 82-2-500-4248 Email: <SunwooYJ@shinbiro.com>	REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
74. Ms. Diane	TARTE	IUCN Regional Councillor Executive Officer Australian Marine Conservation Society PO Box 3139 Yeronga Queensland 4104 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61-7-3892 5814 Tel: 61-7-3848 5235 Email: <dtarte@ozemail.com.au>	AUSTRALIA
75. Mr. Ken D.	THELEN	Senior Forestry Officer FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean Casilla 10095 Santiago CHILE	Fax: 562-337-2101 Tel: 562-337-2214 Email: <kyran.thelen@field.fao.org>	CHILE
76. Mr. Lee	THOMAS	WCPA Regional Vice Chair for Australia and New Zealand Biodiversity Group Environment Australia Nature Conservation House 153 Emu Bank Belconnen A.C.T. 2617 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61 6 250-0349 Tel: 61 6 250-0201 Email: <lee.thomas@dest.gov.au>	AUSTRALIA
77. Mr. Peter	VALENTINE	Senior Lecturer Tropical Environmental Studies and Geography James Cook University Townsville, QLD 4811 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61 7 4781-4020 Tel: 61 7 4781-4441 Email: <Peter.Valentine@jcu.edu.au>	AUSTRALIA

Albany Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century - From Islands to Networks

Albany Western Australia, 23-29 November 1997

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
78. Ms. Joyce	WAFULA	Kenya Wildlife Service c/o Aberdares Country Club P.O. Box 22 NYERI KENYA	Fax: 254-171-55224 Tel: 254-171-55465	KENYA
79. Mr. Martin	WARDROP	Australian Heritage Commission GPO Box 1567 Canberra A.C.T. 2601 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61 2 6217-2095 Tel: 61 2 6217-2121	AUSTRALIA
80. Dr. John	WATSON	Department of Conservation and Land Management 120 Albany Highway Albany WA 6330 AUSTRALIA	Fax: 61 8 9841 3329 Tel: 61 8 9842 4500	AUSTRALIA
81. Ms. Louisa	WILLCOX	Wild Forever 234 East Mendenhall Suite A Bozeman Montana 59715 U.S.A.	Fax: 1 406-582-9417 Tel: (O) 1 406-582-8365 (H) 1 406-222-1485 Email: <llwillcox@aol.com> <wildgriz@aol.com>	U.S.A.
82. Prof. Mrs. Xianying	ZHAO	Secretary General The Chinese National Committee for MAB Chinese Academy ofSciences 52 Sanlihe Road Beijing 100864 P. R. CHINA	Fax: 86-10-685 12 458 (11095) Tel: 86 10 685-97542 Email: <cmabz@public.bta.net.cn>	P. R. CHINA

Participant		Address	Fax / Tel / Email	Country
83. Mr. Joseph	ZONGO	Regional Vice Chair for Western and Central Africa A/C Mission UICN au Burkina-Faso 01 BP 3133 Ouagadougou 01 BURKINA-FASO	Fax: 226-301351 & 226-301232 Tel: 226-313154 Email: <RBF1@hq.iucn.infonet.com>	BURKINA-FASO
84. Mrs. Marija	ZUPANCIC-VICAR	Rodine 51 Zirovnica 4274 SLOVENIA	Tel/Fax: 386-64-803 015 Email: <m.z.vicar@g-kabel.si>	SLOVENIA

ANNEX H

WELCOME ADDRESS AND OPENING REMARKS

PAPERS FROM:

- The Hon. Sheryl Edwardes, Western Australia Minister for the Environment; (not available for this draft, it will be included in the final proceedings)
- The Hon Senator Robert Hill, Commonwealth Minister for the Environment;
- Ms Yolanda Kakabadse, President of IUCN – The World Conservation Union.

Address from the Hon. Senator Robert Hill, Commonwealth Minister for the Environment

Albany Symposium, 24-29 November 1997 Albany, Western Australia

I am delighted to welcome you all to Albany and to Australia. I know you have an intensive week of work ahead, and while I know you will visit the Fitzgerald River Biosphere Reserve, I hope you will be able to see some of our other protected areas, of which we are very proud. We have a good record for protected area management, and especially our nomination and management of natural World Heritage sites.

I must especially stress the emphasis the Australian Government is placing on delivering an enhanced protected area network through the National Reserves System component of the Natural Heritage Trust.

The Natural Heritage Trust is a $1.25 billion investment in the future of Australia and it represents two fundamental departures from the past:

- Firstly, for the first time in the country's history, biodiversity conservation and sustainable agriculture will be addressed in an integrated way both on and off reserves across the entire Australian landscape; and

- Secondly, the Trust channels far greater resources into local and regional communities, empowering Australians to undertake on-ground works to address fundamental causes of environmental degradation, rather than the symptoms.

The integration of biodiversity and agriculture is reflected in the joint management of the Natural Heritage Trust between the Minister for the Environment, and the Minister for Primary Industries.

One of the components of the National Heritage Trust is the National Reserve System which aims to increase the area of habitat protected in reserves. It particularly emphasises ecological communities which are under-represented, and aims to improve the management of existing reserves for biodiversity conservation.

Priority areas will be determined against the set of interim scientific guidelines recently endorsed by ANZECC, a joint council of the Australian and State conservation ministers. And for the first time, community groups will be able to apply for National Reserves System funding, where their projects are of high merit and likely to result in improved conservation outcomes.

But if the Natural Heritage Trust is to achieve the major changes necessary in the way we manage the Australian landscape, the focus must be on empowering local people to develop sustainable land use practices. By doing this, it helps them recognise the links between the long term sustainability of agriculture and the conservation of biodiversity.

Australia is a unique continent, as a result of its geographic isolation for over 40 million years. We are now the custodians of about 10% of the world's biological diversity. When Europeans arrived 200 years ago, they brought with them agricultural practices developed for European landscapes. We have learnt to our cost that many of these practices simply don't work in our landscapes. Through our world leading community based landcare movement, a d resources of the Natural Heritage Trust, we are building a unique model of sustainable development upon the ecological reality of our variable climate, low nutrient soils, oceans and our unique biological diversity.

I believe that there are three fundamental changes that need to be made to the way we are currently approaching biodiversity conservation in Australia:

- Our management of native vegetation must be properly integrated into the whole of landscape management;

- We must stop managing national parks as islands, and rather treat them as key parts of a broader landscape; and

- We must not put too much effort into single species recovery plans at the expense of securing habitat for these species.

I know these three themes will be familiar to you, and that you will be talking about them all in a more global sense.

Another of the areas we are keenly interested in and indeed actively pursuing, is the establishment of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas – and the mechanisms for managing such areas. I encourage you during this week to make sure your deliberations extend to the coasts and oceans, as too often it seems we have a sole focus on the land.

I also understand you are examining the relationship between the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas and the convention on Biological Diversity. I am especially interested to hear your deliberations on this matter, as Australia has played an important role in the development of that Convention. We would, of course, support initiatives which make the operation of the Convention more flexible and transparent.

I know you will be addressing these themes, as well as others, during the next week, and look forward to hearing the results of your deliberations. Australia's problems and opportunities are different from those of Africa, Asia, Latin America or Europe – and we look forward to learning from the exchange of experiences that will no doubt occur during this week.

Albany is a great location for your event, and so I hope your week will be productive – I know it will be enjoyable!

I also hope that many of you will be able to take time out to see some more of this beautiful nation of ours.

Statement by IUCN President
Yolanda Kakabadse,

Albany Symposium, 24-29 November 1997
Albany, Western Australia

I had very much hoped to be with you all personally here in Albany, not only to be back in Australia and to enjoy this country's wonderful environment and hospitality, but also to meet and exchange views with you about the future of protected areas - one of the most important issues before IUCN as we approach our 50th anniversary.

This is a particularly timely moment to be having a brainstorming like this not just because of the 50th anniversary of a Union many of whose roots lie in the philosophy and practice of protected areas management, but also because we are midway between the 10-yearly Global Parks Congresses of WCPA and, most important of all, because we are three years out from the new millennium and the new century.

Why should the new century provoke new thinking among protected areas people? Because as it progresses the pressures on terrestrial protected areas in particular will grow exponentially. As populations continue to expand in the first half at least of the 21st century and as the legitimate demands of the developing world for the fruits of economic development enjoyed by others are pursued, the pressures to turn protected areas over to food or industrial production, to urbanization and to high-volume tourism often directed by the private sector will pose huge new problems in most regions of the world. The US economist Lester Brown claims that one percent of China's arable land is being lost annually to roads, housing, airports, factories. That cannot be sustained. What might be the implications for that great country's parks and reserves? I do not know the answer; I simply pose the question as an example of the pressures protected areas are going to face in the future and the need for this key Commission to be thinking ahead.

I am challenging you here. Your record as the source of some of the most imaginative ideas about park management is historically impressive. But I would suggest that we are on the edge now of a much bigger and more fundamental game: ensuring the sustainability - the survival in some cases - of parks around the world. I am challenging you to face this stark prospect and to adapt your ways of thinking and your approaches to adjust to the new circumstances.

I am suggesting gently to you that this Commission may have to address the sustainability of the global protected areas system as a priority issue - and that you will increasingly need to use the knowledge and techniques of resource economists, sustainable development practitioners and communicators to address this issue. Indeed we will all need to work with new constituencies, including the private sector, and reach out to them notably the indigenous peoples groups that have all too often been alienated from our conservation efforts.

I am asking you, in essence, to get more political in your approaches - not in a party political sense but in the sense of going beyond your orthodox strategic planning approaches to addressing and trying to make a real impact on public opinion and on policy and decision makers around the world.

The vital role of protected areas in fostering ecological sustainability is imperfectly understood. To be provocative, I suspect that it is imperfectly understood even by most people in this gathering today. It is certainly not comprehended by Treasury officials, by aid agency officials, by climate change specialists, by tourist operators, let alone the taxpayers of most countries.

Let me be more specific: it is not enough, in making the case for more money for parks, to explain that climate change will have adverse effects on most parks. The way to make an impact is to point out the positive effects that forest and marine parks, for example, have as carbon sinks. They contribute to the solution, not the problem. But such a case needs to be backed up by the hard facts of science and economics.

Similarly, if climate change does bring more storms and heavy rainfall, the value of parks in protecting catchments and coastlines will be even greater than today - but rarely if ever do I see this case argued.

Protected areas - and the work of WCPA - have so much to give to the world, arguably even more so in light of the challenges of the 21st century. But we need to make these arguments and build the linkages to the wider agendas of the societies that will benefit from and need to invest in protected areas. Only if societies are convinced of the importance of protected areas will governments do what is needed. Only then will the development assistance agencies provide many of the much needed funds. And only with this support will WCPA be able to make the same contribution in the next 50 years that it has made in the past.

I apologise for raising more questions than solutions. This reflects my belief - shared I know by the Director General - that this Albany meeting in this great land of Australia provides a rare opportunity to address fundamental issues. Let's seize that opportunity.

Let me close by thanking all those who have helped make this meeting happen: Australian Government (Biodiversity Group and the Australian Heritage Commission, and AusAid); Western Australia, Conservation and Land Management Agency; New South Wales National Parks Service; Keidenran, Japan; US National Parks Service; UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere Programme and the World Heritage Centre; and the World Resources Institute. This range of supporters underlines the spirit of partnership that is central to the work of IUCN and WCPA. We are grateful to them all.

I wish you well in your deliberations.