



## WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT

<b>Event co-leaders:</b>	Brent Mitchell and Pedro Solano
<b>Time and date:</b>	15 November 2014, 08:30-12.00 (double session)
<b>Rapporteurs:</b>	Brent Mitchell
<b>Presenters:</b>	Sue Stolton, Mike Innerdale, James Fitzsimons, Peter Torkler, Elisa Corcuera, Angela Pellin, Bruno Monteferri and Naik Faucon

Private protected areas contribute to conservation outcomes directly through site management and connectivity with public and other protected areas (PAs), and indirectly through public engagement. Despite the name, *private*, this group of PAs engage society in ways other governance types often find challenging. For example, nongovernmental owners often have large public membership; local groups and/or families provide direct stewardship; individual and corporate owners contribute different approaches and theories of management; and the tourism economy (e.g., private game reserves) directly links PAs to the biggest business on the planet. Private PAs have received far less attention than other governance types, therefore less is known globally about their conservation outcomes. The two-part workshop explored the opportunities and needs for elevating privately protected areas.

### Key emerging lessons:

Discussion, understanding and implementation of privately protected areas (PPAs) have come a long way since Durban. The IUCN recognizes PPAs as one of the four governance types, yet there are many overlaps and gray areas. Defining and categorizing PPAs has, and continues, to present a challenge. There are many subsets of PPAs and our understanding of each varies. PPAs are under-reported and a key difficulty is how to account for them in tools like the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA). This is particularly important given future challenges associated with marine zones, air rights and climate change, and that capturing aspects like ownership vs governance vs responsibility can be difficult. Terminology has shifted recently to refer to PPAs as “private-LY protected areas” (“private”) as they are result from private initiative for public benefit (not for private gain). What this means in the context of access is also opaque (ie. private land may not allow access but be a PPA, yet consider that IUCN cat 1a also have forms of access restriction). PPAs offer many benefits, including supporting other kinds of PAs to promote connectivity and conserve biodiversity. The complexities, including of diverse legal frameworks and tenure systems, will continue to pose challenges.

PPAs have a role in providing ecosystem services and how they relate to legal systems and other PAs are important. PPAs can range from nature trusts in supportive legal systems (e.g., the United States, Canada) to private arrangements in free market environments that provide no support (e.g. Chile). This diversity means a range of objectives and capacity to achieve them. PPAs can be a buffer against policy change (e.g. non-regression national trust properties) but can also have permanence issues (e.g. trusts fail or non-protected PPAs ended by development or death of owner). Success keys are: good governance; sharing learning; building partnerships with government, indigenous peoples, the public, business. PPAs depend on clear goals, land availability, political will and capacity (of all actors). Challenges include non-conducive legal frameworks, unclear management/financial obligations, communication (especially between types of PAs) and existential threats.

The group discussion on trends/opportunities for decade: including PPA in biodiversity strategies; reporting on national/international level; how to include/respect indigenous rights and build connectivity (inc. communication) between different PA types; need to engage with PPA practitioners; risks of PPA greenwashing; World Bank ecosystem payments difficult for PPAs to access; need for online platforms to communicate PPAs and track effort (to exemplify creative solutions); counting PPAs/WDPA inclusion; engaging PPA owners/managers (not just experts); how do PPAs complement all PAs and build resilience; identifying best legal mechanisms for PAs; need for contributions of volunteer experts; opportunity to leverage existing opportunities and relationships. The near-term vision for PPAs is to: elevate and illuminate PPAs; expand the IUCN specialist working group; realize opportunity; build capacity; bring people to the conversation. PPAs are crucial in the next 30 years as a key part of all PAs in working together to support biodiversity conservation. The 2016 World Conservation Congress will be a key opportunity for advancement of the PPA conversation internationally.

### **Key recommendations:**

1. All governments, conservation agencies and organisations, and the IUCN should use the IUCN protected area definition as the basis for defining and international reporting of privately protected areas.
2. All governments should review national PPA systems to clarify definition, legal standing and importance of PPAs, through their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and national processes. (recommendation 10)
3. All governments, in consultation with PPA organizations and owners, should develop and implement monitoring and management effectiveness systems for privately protected areas. (recommendation 18)
4. PPA organizations and owners should create or strengthen national PPA associations to assess performance, provide training and develop data collection systems.
5. IUCN should improve knowledge sharing and information by development of best practice guidelines and encouraging a focus on company and religious reserves, through

the specialist group, to be launched at the World Conservation Congress (2016, Hawaii). (recommendation 15)

6. Governments and IUCN should better understand what incentives are needed to support and promote PPAs relating to establishment, management and ensuring long-term security, through development of best practice guidelines, as described above. (recommendation 15)
7. Governments and donors should develop incentives to increase the conservation role of PPAs through expanding their size, ensuring connectivity and focusing on threatened species (recommendation 3)
8. IUCN and the World Conservation Monitoring Centre should create structures and incentives to report on PPAs both nationally and to the WDPA. (recommendation 18)

*These points were directly or indirectly instrumental in developing the following final recommendations:*

<b>Rec#</b>	<b>Title</b>
18	Governance data and analyses
10	Implementing policies and agreements
15	Governance capacity
3	Voluntary conservation

**Exemplary case/s and other useful links:**

Case studies are available in the global assessment of privately protected areas launched at the Congress: Sue Stolton, Kent H. Redford and Nigel Dudley, with the assistance of: William (Bill) M. Adams, Elisa Corcuera and Brent A. Mitchell. [\*The Futures of Privately Protected Areas\*](#). A project funded by the Linden Trust for Conservation, published by IUCN WCPA with the CBD and UNEP-WCMC, November 2014. <http://privateconservation.net/index.html>

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