



## WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT

<b>Event co-leaders:</b>	Maurizio Ferrari, Phil Franks, Barbara Lang and Dilys Roe
<b>Time and date:</b>	14 November 2014, 13:30-15.00
<b>Rapporteurs:</b>	Dilys Roe
<b>Presenters/discussants:</b>	Nathan Bennett, Dominique Duval-Diop, Michael Winer, Michele Andrianarisata, Maurizio Ferrari and Phil Franks

This session was intended to enhance understanding of the concept of equity given the focus of Aichi Target 11 on protected areas being effectively *and equitably* managed. An overview of concepts and definitions was followed by three case studies of governance and equity in practice – covering Cape York Peninsula in Australia, Madagascar and the regional association of Marine Protected Areas (RAMPAO) in West Africa. The case studies were followed by presentations on two approaches to measuring and/or addressing protected area impacts – the Whakatane Mechanism and SAPA (Social Assessment of Protected Areas) - to explore the extent to which these can provide insights into the achievement of equitable outcomes.

This workshop has helped to start a process of thinking about what equity means in the context of PA management/governance and how to measure it. Further action is needed on how to improve the Aichi indicators and measure progress towards them if we are not to get to 2020 and find that Target 11 has not been achieved because we forgot about the equity component.

### **Key emerging lessons:**

1. Perceptions of equity are as important – if not more so – than actual measurable equity in terms of social and conservation outcomes
2. Different treatment of equity is needed at different scales
3. Equitable governance (recognition of knowledge and rights and procedural equity) is a key dimension of equity, is critical to reduce conflict, and is a key determinant of equity in the distribution of social outcomes (benefits, costs and risks) of PA conservation.
4. BUT the assumption that more equitable governance will lead to more equitable social outcomes can be problematic in a number of cases, for example:

---

\* Originally “Governance and equity – how to achieve equitable management in Aichi target 11”, the title has been here rephrased to be in line with the previous and the following workshop.

\* Following current IUCN practice we distinguish between national, regional, and local governments and indigenous peoples’ and local communities’ customary or legally recognized governments. This also

- a) if people have different understandings of equity: – a governance set-up may respond to one perception of equity, people’s expectations of benefits may reflect another perception
  - b) if high transaction costs of participation in conservation undermine the value of benefits
  - c) If the governance in practice is not what it appears to be on paper, e.g. if there is elite capture, poor representation of women and other marginalised groups etc.
5. The current set of Aichi target indicators are insufficient to measure progress towards equitable management of PAs, and even the meaning of the equity in the target is unclear.

**Key recommendations:**

- 1. Indicators for equitable management including the procedural and the distributive dimension to be developed and integrated into the Aichi Targets assessment process
- 2. Governance assessment needs to be complemented by social assessment to understand different perceptions of equity - in terms of distribution of costs and benefits as well as process
- 3. Attention needs to be paid to governance quality and vitality not just type

This event has been instrumental in shaping recommendation #11 of the Stream final document: *The CBD Secretariat and relevant partners highlight and develop guidance on: assessing the “equitable management” dimension of Aichi Target 11.*

Rec#	Title
11	CBD Guidance

*Original presentations and report are available in the event’s folder (see link in annexed “Repository of original Powerpoint presentations and Rapporteur reports”).*