

Rapporteur Report on Session 1.4

On International Designations and Global Governance

Chair: Albert Mumma (Kenya)

Presentations by: Michael Jeffrey (Canada); Sarah Titchen (Australia); Jane Robertson (UK); Roger Wilson (UK); Alain Lambert (Belgium), Anita Breyer, (Germany)

Rapporteur: Maria Socorro Z. Manguiat

Michael JEFFERY: *Overview Presentation*

Prof Jeffery drew attention to the rapid evolution of new approaches and the proliferation of global initiatives that causes some confusion due to a lack of coherence, further exacerbated by the different governance structures for each. He defined international environmental governance for protected areas to be primarily about how to determine objectives and how to attain them, stressing that governance is a means to an end rather than an end in itself, and enumerated its elements. He also mentioned that modern paradigm for PAs that now considers not only protection, but the social and economic aspects as well, and whose process requires public participation.

He then went on to mention the principal global initiatives for PAs to discern any trends at the international level. He also mentioned some notable regional agreements, which are further elaborated on in his paper. He then discussed some emerging principles and tools that have a relevance to PAs. Based on the foregoing discussion, he noted key challenges in international PA governance, including public participation and access to justice.

Sarah TITCHEN: *World Heritage Convention*

Ms Titchen spoke of the complexities of governance for world heritage, particularly some recent challenges and initiatives. Challenges include considering local values and local benefits while working globally. Another is the need to balance State sovereignty with the need to safeguard value and the interest of the international community. These challenges were reflected in the recent issues that faced the Convention. For these challenges, the conclusions indicated that the spirit and object of the Convention authorized reactive monitoring, inclusion of sites in the list of World Heritage in Danger and deletion from the World Heritage List without the consent of the State Party in whose territory these sights are found.

Ms Titchen also explained the opportunities for involvement of communities in World Heritage conservation and the next steps that the WHC will take.

Question and Answer

The discussion focused on how synergies could be achieved. There was also an acknowledgment of the need to develop guidelines for the establishment of transboundary heritage sites.

Jo MULONGOY: *Convention on Biological Diversity (not present)*

Jane ROBERTSON: *Man and the Biosphere Programme*

Ms Robertson gave a summary of UNESCO's (MAB) programme. She noted the three functions of biosphere reserves (BRs), namely, conservation (now associated with biodiversity), sustainable development (SD) and scientific research and cooperation, a field tool for the MAB work. While fixed principles are associated with BRs, these principles have diverse applications, different status and competences at local and national levels. She

observed that biospheres are not generally recognized at the national level and shared the results of a study on the ways that countries have attempted to establish BRs, noting the unique features, advantages and disadvantages of each option. She also noted lessons learned from the establishment of biosphere reserves all over the world, including particular challenges of transboundary reserves. She stressed that the UNESCO label can be a powerful incentive for cooperative work and acknowledged that the BR concept is attractive at the international level, but suffers from some degree of marginalisation by the conservation community because it does not fall within any of the IUCN categories. The way forward is to apply the MAB's fixed principles flexibly and to adapt to change.

(For more information, log on to www.unesco.org/mab)

Roger WILSON: “W” Regional Park Programme

Mr Wilson presented the case of a transboundary reserve, “W” and the “WAPO”, which covers sectors of four nations, Niger, Burkina Faso, Togo, Benin. Due to the features of the area that make it unique and valuable, this single ecosystem includes several designations, i.e., portions of it are a transboundary man and biosphere reserve, world heritage site, man and biosphere reserve, Ramsar Wetland of International Significance.

Mr Wilson described the pressures currently facing the area. Challenges to governance include how to manage one ecosystem while ensuring meaningful participation and an adequate response to the concerns of all interested parties, and retaining coherent policy expressed through actions validated at each level. A particular challenge has been how to involve pastoralists in the process.

Anita Breyer: Natura 2000

Ms Breyer described the process of setting up Natura 2000, a coherent ecological network of protected areas in the EU (15 State members) that is based on a European Commission Directive that compels member States to translate it into national law. She highlighted the value added of Natura 2000, which includes the establishment of new protected areas, upgraded protection for existing PAs, and EU-wide coherence. The network is expected to be set up by next year and will include 20,000 PAs covering 600,000 sq. km.

Alain LAMBERT: Ramsar Convention

Mr Lambert gave an overview of the Ramsar Convention. He also presented the Ramsar Convention's new strategic plan. Finally he updated participants on developments at the recent Global Biodiversity Forum held at the WTO meeting in Cancun. A copy of the recommendations may be found in www.gbf.ch (no. 18).

General Discussion

There was agreement that there should be some framework under which PAs can be managed in a unifying way, with the question being the shape of the framework at different levels. Discussion focused on the pros and cons of a binding or non-binding framework, with participants offering their experience in these various approaches.

Eva Juul Jensen (Denmark) proposed the following text for a recommendation on WPC Recommendation 5.16, but no support was gathered for this proposal:

“Enhance synergy between existing international agreements up to CBD COP in order to improve the management of existing PAs, including buffer zones, as well as to consider how to increase the PAs into a global ecological network.”

Conclusions and Recommendations (as summarized by the Chair)

1. Clearly, there is a growing body of law that constitutes the governance framework for the management of PAs, and that body of law is made up of hard law and principles that constitute soft law. That body of law does not, at the moment, show clear synergies that exist for purposes of the management of PAs.

2. There is need for a move towards effective implementation, e.g., no longer just focusing on the quantity of sites but also on the quality and representativeness of the sites in terms of wide ecological issues. An example of this move is Natura 2000.
3. The question of governance as process, and how with questions of flexibility in terms of looking at PAs, their nature, scope and involving communities in the management of sites, is a theme to be picked up at future discussions. For this purpose, “W” Regional Park is one PA where a lot of “thinking outside of the box” will be necessary, due to the scale and complexity of the site.
4. The question of trying to respond to community concerns is encapsulated in the concept of Sustainable Development, for once you engage communities in the management of PAs you will need to ensure meeting basic needs.