



UNITED  
NATIONS

EP

UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.22/Inf.20



UNITED NATIONS  
ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME  
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

19 January 2016  
Original: English

19<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the  
Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment  
and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean and its Protocols

Athens, Greece, 9-12 February 2016

### **Agenda item 3: Thematic Decisions**

**Evolution and linkages between the “Regional Working Programme for the Coastal and Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean Sea including the High Sea” (2009) and the draft “Roadmap for a Comprehensive Coherent Network of Well-Managed MPAs to Achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean” (2016)**

For environmental and economic reasons, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

**Evolution and linkages between the “Regional Working Programme for the Coastal and Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean Sea including the High Sea” (2009) and the draft “Roadmap for a Comprehensive Coherent Network of Well-Managed MPAs to Achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean” (2016)**

**1. Table summarizing the relevant context and main features of the “Regional Working Programme” and the “draft Roadmap”**

	<b>Regional Working Programme for the Coastal and Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean Sea including the High Sea</b>	<b>Draft Roadmap for a Comprehensive Coherent Network of Well-Managed MPAs to Achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean</b>
<b>Targeted CBD global objective</b>	<b>Programme of Work on Protected Areas (CBD, 2004):</b> “[...] complete by 2010 terrestrially and 2012 in the marine environments the establishment of comprehensive and ecologically representative national and regional systems of protected areas.”	<b>Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets (CBD, 2010):</b> <b>Aichi Biodiversity Target 11:</b> “By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascapes.”
<b>Mandate for elaboration</b>	COP 14 (Portoroz, Slovenia, November 2005)	COP 18 (Istanbul, Turkey, December 2013)
<b>Year of elaboration</b>	2009	2015
<b>Date of (expected) adoption by Barcelona Convention’s COP</b>	November 2009	February 2016
<b>Duration</b>	5 years (2010-2014)	5 years (2016-2020)
<b>Relevant UNEP/MAP strategic programme</b>	Five-Year Strategic Programme of Work (2010-2014) extended for one additional year (2015) by COP 18	UNEP/MAP Mid-Term Strategy 2016-2021

<b>Type of activities (Scope)</b>	Carrying out evaluations and assessments at national and regional levels; Identifying priorities; Setting up strategies; Building capacities; establishing exchange and networking fora.	<p><u>At national level:</u> Carrying out national reviews and assessments; Setting-up and implementing appropriate legal and institutional reforms, mechanisms, action plans, measures, etc.; Building capacities.</p> <p><u>At regional/international level:</u> Providing technical assistance; Disseminating technical tools and harmonizing approaches; Collecting data and elaborating region-wide assessments; Building capacities; Facilitating cross-boundary processes; Applying compliance mechanisms as appropriate.</p>
<b>Responsible for execution</b>	Relevant national authorities of the Contracting Parties with the assistance of SPA/RAC, ACCOBAMS, IUCN, MedPAN, and WWF-MedPO.	Contracting Parties / Regional and international organizations (with differentiated proposed actions for each group).

## 2. Correlation table between the 2009 Regional Working Programme's and the draft Roadmap's proposed activities

The table below provides a correlation between the 2009 “Regional Working Programme for the Coastal and Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean Sea including the High Sea” (hereinafter referred to as “Regional Working Programme”) and the draft “Roadmap for a Comprehensive Coherent Network of Well-Managed MPAs to Achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean” proposed for adoption by COP 19 (hereinafter referred to as “draft Roadmap”). This exercise was requested by the Meeting of MAP Focal Points held in Athens, Greece, on 13-16 October 2015, and intends to avoid duplications and clarify the mutual links and functions between both operational documents.

The first column provides the Proposed activities under the Regional Working Programme's four Elements, whereas the second column provides the corresponding Suggested actions under the draft Roadmap.

In both columns, when a Proposed activity or a Suggested action is meant to be implemented by the Contracting Parties, this is indicated by “(CPs)”, when it is meant to be implemented by regional and international organizations, this is indicated by “(Reg. & Intl. Org.)”, and when it is meant to be implemented by the Contracting Parties with the support of international organizations, this is indicated “(CPs, Reg. & Intl. Org)”.

The third column of the table provides comments by the Secretariat on the progress made in implementing the “Regional Working Programme” since 2010, and eventually on the operational linkages between the previous “Regional Working Programme” activities and the proposed “draft Roadmap” suggested actions.

Regional Working Programme for the Coastal and Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean Sea including the High Sea (2009)	Draft Roadmap for a Comprehensive Coherent Network of Well-Managed MPAs to Achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean	Comments
<b>ELEMENT 1: To assess the representativity and effectiveness of the existing Mediterranean network of marine and coastal protected areas.</b>		
<p><b>Proposed activity 1.1: Evaluate, at national level, the status, the representativity and the effectiveness of the marine and coastal protected areas.</b> Expected results: In each participating country, a comprehensive assessment of marine and coastal protected areas is carried out at national level (analysis of strengths and gaps including: identification of under-represented ecosystems, identification of areas in urgent need of rehabilitation and restoration of habitats, key threats to</p>	<p><b>Suggested action 1.1)</b> Undertake, at national level, gap analysis to identify the ecosystems and other components of marine biodiversity that are under-represented in the existing MPA system. The gap analysis should take into account the wide range of objectives for specially protected areas as provided for by the SPA/BD Protocol (Part II, Section One). The gap analysis should also identify the needed steps to enhance connectivity among Mediterranean MPAs. The gap analysis should be conducted through a scientifically based process that also ensures the full and effective participation of stakeholders (local communities, sea users, scientists, NGOs, etc.). (CPs)</p>	<p><i>National level assessments of Mediterranean marine and coastal protected areas' representativity were made in only a limited number of countries with the support of regional organizations.</i></p> <p><i>At regional level, the Status report of marine protected areas in the Mediterranean Sea elaborated in 2012 by MedPAN in collaboration with SPA/RAC, assessed the representativity of MPAs mainly in relation with the presence of key species and habitat.</i></p> <p><i>The draft Roadmap suggests to the Contracting Parties to perform their national MPA systems gap analysis, while taking into account connectivity aspects as provided for by</i></p>

<p>protected areas existing and potential forms of conservation, governance systems, lessons learned, identification of potential bilateral or multilateral protected areas, evaluation of <b>needs (technical assistance, financial, trainings, etc.)</b>).</p>	<p><b>Suggested action 1.5)</b> Disseminate technical tools for <b>gap analysis</b> and MPA system planning and facilitate exchange of experiences and best practices, and where necessary, provide assistance to national authorities on these issues. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p>	<p><i>Aichi Target 11, and also the wide range of objectives for SPAs as provided for by the SPA/BD Protocol. It is also suggested that relevant regional and international organizations assist national authorities in this task and provide the needed technical tools and approaches.</i></p>
<p>(CPs)</p>	<p><b>Suggested action 4.2)</b> Assess the <b>financial needs and gaps</b> for MPAs and <b>develop funding strategies</b>, making use as appropriate of innovative funding approaches and ensuring a proper marketing of the services and benefits generated by MPAs. Applying the concepts of “user/payer” and “payment for (marine) ecosystem services” would help securing diversified and significant financial resources for natural resources conservation and particularly for MPAs. <i>(CPs)</i></p>	<p><i>SPA/RAC, MedPAN and WWF-MedPO collaborated during the last five years in carrying out region-wide assessments and providing three strategic documents on Mediterranean MPA needs in terms of: (i) technical tools (Development of guidebooks for marine protected areas managers in the Mediterranean: Assessment, 2012), (ii) capacity building (Capacity Building Strategy to enhance the management of MPAs in the Mediterranean Sea, 2012), and (iii) financial needs (Sustainable financing of Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean: A financial analysis, 2015).</i></p> <p><i>The main conclusion of the study on MPA financial needs was that Mediterranean MPAs are underfunded and that these levels of funding are even at risk of worsening. The study recommended that the Mediterranean countries should undertake studies on their MPA system management needs and elaborate sound financial strategies and planning for them.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore 52% of the Contracting Parties reported having financial resources difficulties in setting up SPAs and/or in elaborating and implementing management plans for them. In the same line, 57% of the countries report not having established funding mechanisms for managing and promoting protected areas.</i></p> <p><i>In this regard, the draft Roadmap proposes to the Contracting Parties to develop MPA funding strategies, making use of innovative funding sources such as ecosystem services approaches as per Aichi Target 11.</i></p>

<p><b>Proposed activity 1.2: Compile a regional synthesis on the status, the representativity and the effectiveness of the marine and coastal protected areas.</b> Expected results: Gaps, strengths and needs of the Mediterranean network of marine and coastal protected areas evaluated on the basis of the outcomes of the national evaluations (Activity 1.1). (Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</p>	<p><b>Suggested action 1.7)</b> Ensure the continued functioning, updating and improvement of a <b>regional database of protected areas</b>, including regional inventories of sites of conservation interest. (Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</p> <p><b>Suggested action 1.9)</b> Undertake by the end of 2019 an <b>assessment of the status of the Mediterranean network of MPAs</b> with the view of evaluating the progress made by the Mediterranean countries towards achieving the Aichi Target 11 (encouraging countries to notify the designation to the regional database MAPAMED). (Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</p>	<p><i>In 2009, a “Regional synthesis on the representativity of Mediterranean Marine Protected Areas” was elaborated by SPA/RAC.</i></p> <p><i>In 2012, a more comprehensive regional assessment “Status of marine protected areas in the Mediterranean Sea” was elaborated by MedPAN in collaboration with SPA/RAC. This report used the data gathered by the Database of Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean, MAPAMED, established and managed by MedPAN and SPA/RAC since 2011.</i></p> <p><i>The Roadmap proposes to continue updating and improving the regional database of MPAs thereby allowing to undertake regional assessments and in particular the 2019 assessment that will allow evaluating the progress of Mediterranean countries towards achieving Aichi Target 11.</i></p>
<p><b>Proposed activity 1.3: Regional expert (Country representatives) meeting on the representativity of the Mediterranean network of MPAs.</b> Expected results: Needs and actions required for the development of a comprehensive and ecologically representative system of Mediterranean marine and coastal protected areas identified, taking into account the views and opinions of the country representative experts. (Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</p>	<p>–</p>	<p><i>This one-time activity was completed in 2009, as during the Ninth Meeting of Focal Points for SPAs (Floriana, Malta, 3-6 June 2009), the “Regional synthesis on the representativity of Mediterranean Marine Protected Areas” was presented and discussed by country experts (national focal points for SPAs).</i></p>
<p><b>ELEMENT 2: To make the Mediterranean network of marine and coastal protected areas more comprehensive and more representative of the ecological features of the region.</b></p>		
<p><b>Proposed activity 2.1: Identification of preliminary priority conservation areas.</b> Expected results: The <b>areas</b> which are</p>	<p><b>Suggested action 1.3)</b> Identify specific <b>hotspots</b>, in particular within Mediterranean areas meeting <b>EBSA</b> criteria and contained in the CBD EBSA repository and</p>	<p><i>The identification of priority conservation areas in the Mediterranean marine and coastal zone was carried out in many Mediterranean countries. The Natura 2000</i></p>

<p><b>most ecologically critical</b> for the Mediterranean are identified, including <b>High Seas</b> areas, <b>transboundary</b> areas and areas suitable for ecological <b>corridors</b>. This will be done according to the methodology and the criteria described in Section 1 of this document, including the subdivision of the Mediterranean into ecoregions. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p>	<p>information-sharing system, applying scientific, environmental methodologies and criteria (focusing on important and fragile ecosystems, habitats and species) that deserve urgent conservation and protection or restoration and engage in discussions, wherever appropriate and possible, with neighbouring National Governments in the designation of <b>transboundary MPAs</b> or <b>area-based conservation measures</b>, extending over multiple jurisdictions and/or into ABNJ, also taking advantage from <b>lessons learned</b> in similar previous experiences (e.g. the Pelagos Sanctuary Agreement). <i>(CPs)</i></p> <p><b>Suggested action 1.6)</b> Offer assistance to national authorities and, where needed, facilitate the multilateral processes for the <b>identification of potential MPA sites including in ABNJ</b>, and where appropriate facilitating bilateral initiatives. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p>	<p><i>framework was the main driver for this activity in EU-member countries. In other Mediterranean countries, the assistance provided by international organizations allowed to carry out inventories of marine and coastal sites as candidate areas for MPA establishment. Concerning the development of MPAs in zones of conservation interest located in ABNJ, initiatives are underway for the establishment of SPAMIs in the areas of the Alboran Sea, the Sicily Channel/Tunisian Plateau and the Adriatic Sea. In this context, meetings were organised for consultation among the concerned countries, within the framework of the MedOpenSea project coordinated by SPA/RAC and financially supported by the EU. The identification of the sites to be covered by the SPAMIs in the three areas takes into account the EBSAs identified in the Mediterranean and adopted by the CBD in 2014.</i></p> <p><i>The draft Roadmap recommends to the Contracting Parties, with the support of international organizations, to continue efforts in the direction of identifying specific hotspots and designating transboundary MPAs and other effective area-based conservation measures, including in ABNJ, as provided for by Aichi Target 11.</i></p>
<p><b>Proposed activity 2.2: Strengthening of the Mediterranean network of marine and coastal protected areas through the creation of new protected areas, and where appropriate the extension of existing ones, in accordance with the results of the Activity 2.1 (Identification of priority conservation areas).</b> Expected results: The creation by 2012 of a coherent and ecologically representative Mediterranean network of marine and coastal protected areas. <i>(CPs, Reg. &amp; Intl.</i></p>	<p><b>Suggested action 1.4)</b> Establish and implement national plans to formally <b>designate</b> and/or <b>extend</b>, as appropriate, <b>MPAs</b> and <b>other area-based marine management measures</b> to address under-representation identified by the gap analysis, taking into account the engagement from <b>Aichi Target 11</b>. The elaboration of the national plans should be conducted through a scientifically based process that also ensures the full and effective participation of stakeholders (local communities, sea users, scientists, NGOs, etc.). <i>(CPs)</i></p>	<p><i>During the last five years, most of the Mediterranean countries deployed an effort to extend their national networks of marine and coastal protected areas, especially by declaring new MPAs and sometimes by extending existing ones. However, in terms of surface areas covered by MPAs in the Mediterranean, the available evaluations show that an important effort is still needed to make the Mediterranean network of MPAs more comprehensive and more representative of the ecological features of the region.</i> <i>In Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries, regional organizations played a central role in the</i></p>

<p><i>Org.)</i></p>		<p><i>development of the network of marine and coastal protected areas. Indeed, most of the initiatives undertaken in this filed were with the support of the regional organizations through technical and financial assistance (e.g. MedPartnership, MedMPAnet, MedKeyHabitats, MedPAN South, MedPAN North, SEA-Med, PIM initiative, IUCN-Med Marine programme, ...).</i></p> <p><i>The draft Roadmap recommends to the Contracting Parties, with the support of international organizations, to continue efforts in designating new MPAs and extending existent ones, and to make use of other effective area-based conservation measures, in order to reach surface coverage objectives provided for by Aichi Target 11.</i></p>
	<p><b><u>Suggested action 4.3)</u> Secure the financial resources necessary to the establishment of MPAs during their initial years; MPAs being indeed more dependent on steady financial resources during their first development stages (planning and creation). Achieving the Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean requires a special financial effort from States to boost the establishment and management of new MPAs. (CPs)</b></p>	<p><i>The 2015 financial analysis of Mediterranean MPAs showed that these are more dependent on national budgets in their pioneer than in their autonomous phase. Mediterranean pioneer MPAs have actually a lesser financial autonomy resulting from a lower diversity of funding and a larger portion of international and private funds (donors).</i></p> <p><i>The draft Roadmap suggests to the Contracting Parties to secure financial resources for establishing MPAs and for sustaining them during their pioneer initial phases. Achieving Aichi targets in the region, including Aichi Target 11, requires a special financial effort from the Contracting Parties, as per Aichi Target 20 regarding financial resources mobilization.</i></p>
	<p><b><u>Suggested action 1.2)</u> Identify and propose area-based conservation/management measures or candidate MPAs for listing in the regionally and globally recognized area-based management classifications, including, in particular, SPAMIs, GFCM's Fishery Restricted Areas (FRAs), UNESCO's Biosphere Reserves</b></p>	<p><i>While earlier CBD targets had a clear focus on MPAs, Aichi Target 11 explicitly recognizes that other spatial/area-based conservation measures, not recognized or recorded as MPAs, may also achieve important conservation gains.</i></p>

	<p>and World Heritage Sites. (CPs)</p> <p><b>Suggested action 1.8)</b> Facilitate the application of the existing <b>compliance mechanisms</b> to monitor the implementation of the MPA related measures adopted to meet the commitments taken by Mediterranean Governments. (Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</p> <p><b>Suggested action 4.8)</b> Facilitate, through coordination and technical assistance, fundraising for joint <b>scientific surveys</b> in Mediterranean high sea zones with the view of providing data for the establishment of <b>SPAMIs, FRAs</b> or the implementation of other relevant area-based conservation measures. (Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</p>	<p><i>The draft Roadmap’s proposed actions here recommend to the Contracting Parties to take advantage of the array of area-based conservation measures allowed by various international conventions and agreements, such as the Barcelona Convention’s SPAMIs, the FAO/GFCM’s FRAs, the UNESCO’s Biosphere Reserves and World Heritage sites, or the IMO’s PSSAs, etc.</i></p> <p><i>In this regard, international organizations are invited to provide support in undertaking scientific surveys for the establishment of prospective SPAMIs, FRAs and other relevant area-based conservation measures, and also to apply, as appropriate and relevant, compliance mechanisms set up in the framework of environmental conventions (e.g. CBD, Barcelona Convention, GFCM, ACCOBAMS, IMO, etc.) in order to assess the proper and timely implementation of MPA related obligations, and chiefly the CBD biodiversity Target 11.</i></p>
<p><b>ELEMENT 3: To improve the management of the Mediterranean marine and coastal protected areas.</b></p>		
<p><b>Proposed activity 3.1: Evaluation of the management of each Mediterranean marine and coastal protected area.</b> Expected results: (i) The <b>management effectiveness</b> of the Mediterranean marine and coastal protected areas is <b>evaluated</b> and (ii) recommendations for the <b>improvement of the management</b> of the Mediterranean MPAs. (CPs, Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</p>	<p><b>Suggested action 2.1)</b> Review, and where necessary, amend existing <b>institutional and legal systems</b> applicable to MPAs. It is particularly important to (i) break down governance barriers that impede the adequate functioning of institutions and other bodies in charge of <b>MPA management</b>, (ii) establish institutional arrangements that ensure efficient <b>surveillance and enforcement of legal measures</b>, and (iii) promote <b>participatory management</b> in particular through the creation of consultation mechanisms at national and local level. (CPs)</p> <p><b>Suggested action 2.2)</b> Assess the <b>effectiveness</b> of the existing <b>governance and management system for each MPA</b>, using and further developing management effectiveness indicators elaborated for Mediterranean MPAs. It is highly recommended that the assessment be conducted regularly and through a participatory approach</p>	<p><i>Mediterranean countries deployed insufficient efforts in undertaking evaluations of the management of their marine and coastal protected areas recommended under Element 3 of the Regional Working Programme.</i></p> <p><i>The 2012 MedPAN-SPA/RAC “Status of marine protected areas in the Mediterranean Sea” made a preliminary evaluation of MPA management efforts, which showed that only 42% of existent Mediterranean MPAs have management structures in place.</i></p> <p><i>The main other achievements, in relation to Element 3 were: (i) the strengthening of networking among MPA managers thanks to the activities carried out in the framework of the MedPAN network with financial support from donor organisations, (ii) the elaboration of management plans for several MPAs based on recent scientific data collected during dedicated field surveys and</i></p>

	<p>involving MPA managers, scientists, sea users, local communities and NGOs. <i>(CPs)</i></p> <p><b>Suggested action 2.5)</b> Provide assistance to the relevant Contracting Parties in conducting <b>evaluation of the effectiveness of MPA management</b>. Assistance could involve: a) direct support in the conduction of effectiveness assessments; b) the development of harmonized technical tools including guidelines, standards and indicators for the MPA management evaluation, specifically adapted to the Mediterranean context; c) the compilation and dissemination of information on lessons learnt in the context of MPA management, including success and failure stories; and d) elaboration and/or review of existing MPA management plans. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p> <p><b>Suggested action 2.3)</b> Ensure that for each MPA clear <b>objectives</b> and concrete <b>measures</b>, based on the best available knowledge and with appropriate stakeholder involvement, are prepared, adopted, <b>implemented</b> and revised when necessary (inclusive of measures such as zoning, monitoring, enforcement, research), and that all MPAs have <b>adequate management teams</b> in terms of skills and staff number. <i>(CPs)</i></p> <p><b>Suggested action 2.4)</b> Engage in discussions, wherever appropriate, with neighbouring Contracting Parties in the development of <b>joint mechanisms for the management of networks of MPAs</b>, and MPAs extending over multiple jurisdictions and/or into ABNJ, also taking advantage from lessons learned in similar previous experiences. <i>(CPs)</i></p> <p><b>Suggested action 2.7)</b> Facilitate the elaboration of <b>management approaches</b> for MPAs that promote <b>harmonization and complementarities</b> between MPAs.</p>	<p><i>(iii) the organisation of training initiatives, mainly at regional level.</i></p> <p><i>In this perspective, the draft Roadmap proposes to the Contracting Parties to: (i) review institutional and legal systems applicable to MPAs, (ii) assess governance and management systems at individual MPAs level, (iii) endow each MPA with adequate management plans/measures and teams, and (iv) collaborate with neighbouring countries in the management of MPA networks and transboundary MPAs.</i></p> <p><i>Regional and international organizations are encouraged to provide their assistance to the countries through technical support, capacity building and transboundary processes facilitation.</i></p>
--	--	--

	<p><i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p> <p><b>Suggested action 2.8)</b> In order to ensure the <b>effective management of transboundary MPAs</b>, or MPAs extending into ABNJ, offer assistance to Contracting Parties to facilitate the needed multilateral processes, without prejudice to the rights, the present and future claims or legal views of any State relating to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p>	
<p><b>Proposed activity 3.2: Training of the managers and other staff categories of Mediterranean marine and coastal protected areas. This activity will be carried out through the development and implementation of a regional training project whose components will be defined taking into account the gaps and needs identified under the Activity 1.1.</b></p> <p>Expected results: The <b>skills and qualifications</b> of the <b>managers and other categories of staff involved in the management of the Mediterranean marine and coastal protected areas</b> are <b>improved</b>. As part of activity 3.2, a regional programme for the training of protected area staff will be developed. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p>	<p><b>Suggested action 2.6)</b> Strengthen the existing <b>capacity building mechanisms for MPA managers</b>, and promote their coordination into a regional capacity building system, using a wide range of training approaches (e.g. training courses, on the field trainings, online trainings modules, exchange of visits). The system should target also <b>other actors</b> (e.g. enforcement and judiciary authorities, private sector) and <b>decision-makers</b>. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p> <p><b>Suggested action 4.4)</b> Assist MPA managers in <b>enhancing their fundraising capacities</b>, in particular through the development of their business plans, by removing possible legal impediments discouraging or prohibiting autonomous fundraising by MPAs, and using financial management approaches based on efficiency, transparency and adequate financial reporting. <i>(CPs)</i></p> <p><b>Suggested action 4.6)</b> Assist countries to <b>build national capacities for fundraising for MPAs</b> through training activities, promoting exchange of experience and dissemination of information about best practices and innovative funding success in MPAs. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p>	<p><i>As stated above, many international and regional organizations provided a significant effort to the region in terms of capacity building and training targeting MPA managers and practitioners.</i></p> <p><i>However, in order to avoid duplication and make better use of available resources, such international organizations are invited to coordinate and streamline their capacity building efforts targeting MPA managers and also a wider range of actors.</i></p> <p><i>MPA sustainable financing issues having been identified as one of the main impediments to MPA management and enforcement (i.e. 52% of the Mediterranean countries reported having financial resources difficulties in setting up SPAs and/or elaborating and implementing their management plans), the draft Roadmap recommends to the Contracting Parties to undertake efforts in terms of building MPA managers capacities in this regard and allowing MPAs to undertake individual fundraising efforts.</i></p> <p><i>Regional and international organizations are encouraged to assist the countries in their efforts through trainings, exchanges, and best practices sharing.</i></p>
<p><b>Proposed activity 3.3: Elaboration of a regional strategy for the early warning,</b></p>	<p><b>Suggested action 3.7)</b> Provide assistance to Mediterranean countries in integrating MPAs as key</p>	<p><i>In 2009, an action to update the Mediterranean Strategic action programme on Biological diversity, SAP BIO, on</i></p>

<p><b>mitigation of an adaptation to the impacts of Climate change and Invasive species in the Mediterranean MPAs.</b> Expected results: The Mediterranean MPAs are adequately prepared to face the issues of Climate Change and Biological Invasions. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p>	<p>reference areas within the application of the Ecosystem Approach under the Barcelona Convention. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p> <p><b><u>Suggested action 4.9)</u></b> Assist national authorities/MPA managers in carrying out specific (pilot) monitoring activities, in line with Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme, in order to assess the status of the MPAs. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p>	<p><i>climate change issues was conducted by SPA/RAC through a bottom-up interactive participative approach (national overviews, sub-regional, and regional working meetings) led to the preparation of a synthesis document which provides an overview on priority national needs and urgent actions related to vulnerability and impacts of climate change on biodiversity in marine and coastal areas (Ninth Meeting of Focal Points for SPAs (Floriana, Malta, 3-6 June 2009).</i></p> <p><i>With regard to early warning towards invasive alien species, two complementary initiatives have been established: (i) the first by SPA/RAC, consisting in a regional Database on Marine Mediterranean Invasive Alien Species, MAMIAS, due under the provisions of the Barcelona Convention's Action Plan concerning species introductions and invasive species in the Mediterranean, and (ii) the second by IUCN-Med, consisting in an online information system for monitoring invasive non-native species in MPAs, MedMIS.</i></p> <p><i>Minimizing non-indigenous species impacts on native ecosystems is amongst the most important ecological objectives of the Barcelona Convention's EcAp roadmap.</i></p> <p><i>The Aichi Target 11 draft Roadmap proposes here to address the various threats facing marine biodiversity in a holistic and integrated manner in the framework of the EcAp IMAP and to make use of Mediterranean MPAs as pilot monitoring sites of these threats including non-indigenous species, climate change and others.</i></p> <p><i>The Mediterranean MPA network is also meant to play the role of an early warning system of non-indigenous species and climate change impacts.</i></p>
<p><b><u>Proposed activity 3.4:</u> Establish a framework for exchange between</b></p>	<p>–</p>	<p><i>This Regional Working Programme activity was achieved: as since 2010, the Network of Marine Protected Areas</i></p>

<p><b>Mediterranean MPA Managers.</b> Expected results: Exchange and technical mutual assistance between the Mediterranean MPAs managers improved. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p>		<p><i>Managers in the Mediterranean (MedPAN) is run by the MedPAN organization, which is a permanent structure with dedicated funds established in late 2008 in France. The MedPAN network's mission is to promote, through a partnership approach, the sustainability and operation of a network of MPAs in the Mediterranean. To date (January 2016) 100 (Mediterranean) structures are member or partner to MedPAN.</i></p>
<p><b>ELEMENT 4: To strengthen the protected area governance systems and further adapt them to national and regional contexts.</b></p>		
<p><b>Proposed activity 4.1: Evaluate the existing protected area governance types in the Mediterranean countries.</b> Expected results: The <b>protected areas governance systems analysed</b> (strengths, weaknesses, lessons learned) and <b>options</b> for their <b>improvement/strengthening</b> evaluated. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org., CPs)</i></p>	<p><b>Suggested action 4.1)</b> Review, and where necessary, amend existing relevant <b>legal and institutional frameworks</b> with the view of <b>improving the governance</b> of existing MPAs and <b>boosting the creation</b> of new MPAs to urgently increase, in the Mediterranean, the marine surface area that is <b>protected and effectively managed.</b> <i>(CPs)</i></p> <p><b>Suggested action 4.5)</b> Establish national <b>environmental funds and/or other mechanisms</b> for supporting conservation actions and particularly <b>MPAs creation and management.</b> <i>(CPs)</i></p> <p><b>Suggested action 4.7)</b> Invite funding agencies and donors to consider <b>increasing</b> up to appropriate levels the</p>	<p><i>According to the information provided through the online reporting system to the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols, many countries enacted new regulations regarding protected areas providing a clear improvement in the MPAs governance systems. However, the activities recommended under the Regional Working Programme Element 4 regarding the evaluation of existing governance types of protected areas was not implemented. Furthermore, many countries (38%) have reported regulatory and policy frameworks difficulties and administrative management challenges.</i></p> <p><i>The draft Roadmap suggests to the Contracting Parties to perform reviews and amendments of their legal and institutional frameworks in order improve MPA governance and boost achieving Aichi Target 11 in terms of coverage and effective and equitable management.</i></p> <p><i>The current Mediterranean context shows that resources, be them human, financial or equipment related, are often inadequate. This is mainly due to the lack of sustainable financing mechanisms at national level. Indeed according to the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols online reporting system, 52% of Mediterranean countries have financial difficulties in setting up and managing MPAs.</i></p>

	<p><b>funding for MPAs</b> in the five coming years (2016-2020) to assist Mediterranean countries to <b>upgrade the management</b> of MPAs and to undertake the appropriate steps to urgently <b>increase the surface areas</b> covered by MPAs in the Mediterranean. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p>	<p><i>In this concern, the draft Roadmap recommends to the Contracting Parties to establish national environmental funds and/or other mechanisms for supporting conservation actions and particularly MPAs. In the same lines, international and bilateral donor organizations are invited to increase their level of support to MPAs in the five coming years in order to help attaining Aichi Target 11 in the region.</i></p>
<p><b>Proposed activity 4.2: Identify opportunities for the Mediterranean marine and coastal protected areas to contribute to the social and economic development at local and national scale, including poverty alleviation.</b> Expected results: Guidelines available to managers of marine and coastal protected areas on how better <b>integrate</b> their <b>protected areas</b> with their <b>local context</b>. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p>	<p><b>Suggested action 3.1)</b> Ensure <b>conciliation</b> between the <b>conservation</b> objectives and the requirements for the <b>local economic and social development</b> by establishing and implementing adequate measures, such as zoning systems for MPAs that are regularly assessed. <i>(CPs)</i></p> <p><b>Suggested action 3.2)</b> Promote cross-sectorial policies and mechanisms for <b>integrating</b> the <b>MPA national strategies and policies</b> with <b>other human activity sectors</b>, in particular fisheries and tourism, through the development of appropriate governance frameworks, including the related legal and institutional arrangements. These could include, but will not be limited to, cross-sectorial coordination, marine spatial planning legislation, support groups from the business sectors for MPA management, and legal instruments for public-private partnerships. <i>(CPs)</i></p> <p><b>Suggested action 3.5)</b> Provide assistance to the relevant Contracting Parties in further <b>integrating MPAs</b> into their <b>territorial, national heritage, social and economic contexts</b>, in particular through the development of guidelines and promoting exchange of experiences, in promoting the sharing of environmental and socio-economic benefits of Mediterranean MPAs, and the MPAs' integration into the broader context of sustainable use of the marine environment, through the</p>	<p><i>The involvement of local communities in the process of managing protected areas remains very low or inexistent in many Mediterranean countries. The reference to equitable management in Aichi Target 11 underlines the need for right recognition and ensuring stakeholder acceptance of MPAs, engaging them, as appropriate in the designation and management of sites and any potential benefits that might accrue. Principles of equity, power sharing, participation, and sharing of benefits are increasingly a norm in MPAs at local and national levels, and these same principles are being incorporated into government, NGO, and donor policies, and are being used as tools by communities to demand changes in policy and practices.</i></p> <p><i>The draft Roadmap makes here a series of proposals towards improving conciliation between conservation and economic-social development measures and promoting cross-sector integration, civil society involvement and integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes, as per Aichi Target 11 innovative requirements.</i></p>

	<p>implementation of the Ecosystem Approach and taking into account the marine spatial planning approach. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p>	
	<p><b><u>Suggested action 3.3)</u></b> Develop systems enabling <b>civil society to engage</b> effectively in <b>MPA management</b>. <i>(CPs)</i></p>	
	<p><b><u>Suggested action 3.4)</u></b> Establish <b>MPAs</b> in areas particularly <b>suitable</b> for the conservation of <b>living marine resources</b>, both for <b>extractive and non-extractive use</b>, and encourage the <b>equitable sharing of social and economic benefits</b> deriving from MPAs, including for <b>poverty alleviation</b> and for improving the standard of living of local populations, while encouraging conservation and sustainable use of these resources. <i>(CPs)</i></p>	
	<p><b><u>Suggested action 3.6)</u></b> Facilitate, through technical and financial support, <b>stakeholder networking initiatives</b> at national and regional level with the view of (i) generating further <b>synergies</b> between <b>MPAs</b> and other <b>relevant human activity sectors</b>, in particular fisheries and tourism, and (ii) ensuring continued <b>monitoring</b> of the <b>development</b> of these sectors. <i>(Reg. &amp; Intl. Org.)</i></p>	

### **3. Added value of the Draft “Roadmap for a Comprehensive Coherent Network of Well-Managed MPAs to Achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean” (2016) compared to the “Regional Working Programme for the Coastal and Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean Sea including the High Sea” (2009)**

The *draft* “**Roadmap** for a Comprehensive Coherent Network of Well-Managed MPAs to Achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean” submitted for adoption by the Barcelona Convention COP 19, **is fully in line with** the “**Regional Working Programme** for the Coastal and Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean Sea including the High Sea” adopted by COP 14 (Marrakesh, Morocco, November 2009).

However the (i) new global and regional **trends**, (ii) the **developments in concepts**, approaches and methodologies in marine areas conservation, (iii) the **recommendations** and guidance provided by the recent **global and regional fora** (CBD COP 10 and COP 12, the 2012 Forum of Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean, IMPAC 3, the Mediterranean Regional Workshop to facilitate the description of EBSAs, the 6<sup>th</sup> IUCN World Parks Congress), and (iv) the **progress** made at national and regional levels since 2009, make it necessary to design and propose an **updated guiding document on marine protected areas in favour of the Mediterranean region**, through the Barcelona Convention legitimate forum.

Compared to the original 2009 **Regional Working Programme**, the draft **Roadmap** has provided an **added value** both in terms of **substance** and **format**:

#### **3.1.Added value in terms of scope and content: the Aichi Biodiversity Target 11**

The new Roadmap provides a compendium of actions aiming at guiding and harmonizing the efforts of the Contracting Parties towards **achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11** (Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets, CBD, 2010), whereas the **Regional Working Programme** aims at supporting the Contracting Parties to **achieve the CBD’s 2012 target** (Programme of Work on Protected Areas, CBD, 2004).

##### **Programme of Work on Protected Areas (CBD, 2004):**

“ [...] **complete by 2010 terrestrially and 2012 in the marine environments the establishment of comprehensive and ecologically representative national and regional systems of protected areas.**”

##### **Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets (CBD, 2010):**

**Aichi Biodiversity Target 11: “By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascapes.”**

Aichi Target 11 states that “by 2020, [...] at least 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for **biodiversity** and **ecosystem services**, are conserved through effectively and **equitably** managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and **other effective area-based conservation measures**, and **integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes**” (emphasis added).

There is a need to recognize that Aichi Target 11 was not simply a re-affirmation of earlier targets. Indeed, the target calls for a great deal more than simple MPA coverage. The revised language on spatial protection measures presented in Aichi Target 11 includes 4 novel concepts that are important to highlight:

- The addition of the areas of particular importance for ecosystem services;
- The notion of equity;
- The notion of “other effective area-based conservation measures”; and
- The notion of “integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes”.

The Aichi Target 11 points to a need for a much broader perspective, both in terms of what is included in terms of spatial conservation measures, and in terms of the metrics against which such coverage is assessed. Of course measures of spatial extent alone cannot be directly equated to progress in attaining Aichi Target 11.

**(a) Areas of importance for ecosystem services**

Most MPAs have been and are being selected based on criteria of biological and ecological significance. The Barcelona Convention has even initiated a process for addressing the gap in biogeographic coverage in open sea and deep sea – the EBSAs and the SPAMIs in the high sea parallel processes.

A similar process is needed to identify priorities and gaps in the MPA coverage based on their role in enhancing ecosystem services. The greatest efforts towards MPA establishment are currently located away from human populations. Progress towards Aichi Target 11 will require a greater focus on high value local ecosystem service benefits, which will require increasing focus on MPAs and equivalent areas closer to human populations.

**(b) Equity in management**

Many sites set aside for conservation purposes are less effective than intended, due to problems either in site design or in subsequent management, or both. The reference to equitable management underlines the need for right recognition and ensuring stakeholder acceptance of MPAs, engaging them, as appropriate in the designation and management of sites and any potential benefits that might accrue.

Equity issues regularly arise because MPAs will most likely affect user groups disproportionately. There has also been a long history of conservation measures that were seen as top-down and harmful to local communities and users of natural resources. This is now widely acknowledged and there has been a burgeoning of efforts to engage local people in protected areas establishment and management. Principles of equity, power sharing, participation, and sharing of benefits are increasingly a norm in MPAs at local and national levels, and these same principles are being incorporated into government, NGO, and donor policies, and are being used as tools by communities to demand changes in policy and practices.

**(c) Other effective area-based conservation measures**

While earlier targets had a clear focus on MPAs, Aichi Target 11 explicitly recognizes that other spatial conservation measures, not recognized or recorded as MPAs, may also achieve important conservation gains. This wording may help to ensure that existing protected areas that have not been incorporated into formal datasets are ignored, but it also allows for the inclusion of other spatial management interventions that may not meet the definition of a protected area. Part of the motivation for this change in the wording came from a concern by some CBD Parties that protection is widespread even beyond clearly defined protected areas, and that a focus solely on the latter would make it hard, if not impossible, to achieve the target within the timeframe. Parties also argued that this clause was particularly important to ensure the inclusion of areas protected under fisheries regulations.

**(d) Integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes**

It is fundamental to the success of any MPAs that they be considered as part of a wider management strategy, including both marine and terrestrial management measures. Even the best managed MPAs are still vulnerable to stressors from outside their areas (local effects of pollution, overfishing, impacts from warming and acidification). The remaining 90% of the sea will also need to be effectively managed for biodiversity, but also for the sustained supply of ecosystem services on which so many people depend. At the present time there are no regional datasets on wider marine spatial planning, but an understanding

of such measures would be an invaluable contribution to our understanding of progress in marine conservation.

### **3.2.Added value in terms of ensuring the stability of the system of Mediterranean MPAs by enhancing their financial sustainability**

Under its Element 4 (“To strengthen the protected area governance systems and further adapt them to national and regional contexts”), the 2009 **Regional Working Programme** requests to RAC/SPA, with the support of partners, to assist countries to **improve their national legislation in relation with the protected areas and the financing systems of their marine and coastal protected areas.**

Furthermore, MPA **management effectiveness** requires a national political will, which ensures the establishment of a clear institutional framework, proper planning as well as **adequate human, technical and financial resources**. Thus, good management requires the development of integrated and coordinated policies, the clarification of responsibilities and legal, institutional and administrative frameworks (draft Roadmap Objective 2).

However, the current Mediterranean context shows that **resources**, be them human, financial or equipment related, are often **inadequate**. Mediterranean MPA managers rarely have the necessary basic requirements in terms of qualifications and financial resources to put in place a proper management of the sites they are in charge of.

In this context, the draft **Roadmap** has put emphasis and provided for a separate objective dealing with financial sustainability of the regional MPA system (Objective 4), which is a sine quonon condition for ensuring their long-term viability and stability.

### **3.3.Added value in terms of clear responsibilities for Contracting Parties and international organizations**

The draft **Roadmap** and the **Regional Working Programme** target both the **Contracting Parties** to the Barcelona Convention and also relevant **Regional and International Organizations**. However the draft **Roadmap** specifies **clear activities** addressing the Contracting Parties and others addressing regional and international organizations.

### **3.4.Added value in terms of progress monitoring and timeline extension towards 2020**

The draft **Roadmap** provides for **key milestones aiming to assess the progress made in implementing such roadmap**: (i) a report to COP 20 (December 2017) assessing the progress in implementing the draft Roadmap, and more particularly about the steps the Contracting Parties have done during the biennium 2016-2017 and steps they will undertake during the biennium 2018-2019, and (ii) an evaluation at regional level, by the end of 2019, to assess the progress made (including success and possible failure) by the Mediterranean countries towards achieving the Aichi Target 11.

The **Regional Working Programme** of 2009 doesn't foresee any monitoring and evaluation mechanism.

**Implementation calendars** of both the draft **Roadmap** and the **Regional Working Programme** extend over **five years**.

The **Regional Working Programme**, adopted by the end of 2009, extends though over the period **2010-2014**.

The new **Roadmap** allows extending the Regional Working Programme's lifespan towards the 2020 target, its implementation calendar extends over the period **2016-2020**.

## References:

Montbrison D., Rais C., Romani M., 2012, Roadmap towards a comprehensive, ecologically representative, effectively connected and efficiently managed network of Mediterranean Marine Protected Areas by 2020. MedPAN, RAC/SPA, Turkish General Directorate of Natural Assets Protection, UNDP Turkey/GEF project. 36 pp.

Reporting System for the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols: <http://bcrs.info-rac.org/>

Spalding, M. D., Meliane, I., Milam, A., Fitzgerald, C., and Hale, L. Z., 2013, Protecting Marine Spaces: global targets and changing approaches: Ocean Yearbook, v. 27. pp 213-248.

The Nature Conservancy and UNEP-WCMC, 2012, Aichi Target 11 - Reshaping the global agenda for MPAs, Policy Brief at the UN CBD COP 11, India, October 2012/nature.org, 4 p.

UNEP/MAP-RAC/SPA, Regional Working Programme for the Coastal and Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean Sea including the High Sea, 2009, RAC/SPA Ed., 30 p.

UNEP/MAP-RAC/SPA, Evaluation of the Regional working Programme for the Coastal and Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean Sea including the High Sea, 2015, Twelfth Meeting of Focal Points for Specially Protected Areas, Athens, Greece, 25-29 May 2015, UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.408/Inf.26, 25 p.