



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/PAWS/2016/2/3
22 December 2016

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT OF THE CAPACITY-BUILDING WORKSHOP FOR CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE ON ACHIEVING AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS 11 AND 12

MINSK, 14-17 JUNE 2016

INTRODUCTION

1. At its tenth meeting, in Nagoya, Japan, in October 2010, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, which contains 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets under five strategic goals (see decision X/2). Strategic Goal C on improving the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity includes also Target 11 on protected areas and Target 12 on threatened species. Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 states that “by 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas, 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, integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes”. Aichi Biodiversity Target 12, states that “by 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained”.
2. In its decision XI/24, the Conference of the Parties invited Parties to undertake major efforts to achieve all elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. Accordingly, the Executive Secretary organized a series of subregional workshops in collaboration with partner organizations, including the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the other members of the PoWPA Friends Consortium (UNEP-WCMC, Birdlife International and WWF), and with the generous financial contribution of the Governments of Germany, Japan, and the Republic of Korea. The fifth in the series of workshops was for Central and Eastern Europe and was organized with the support of the Government of Belarus and the Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). It was held in Minsk from 14 to 17 June 2016.
3. Background information for the workshop and the presentations, along with other workshop documents, can be found on the Convention’s web portal at <https://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=PAWS-2016-02>. The workshop was held in English with simultaneous Russian interpretation. The list of participants is contained in annex I and the organization of work in annex II. The following is a summary of the proceedings of the workshop.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

4. Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, along with Mr. Igor Kachanovsky, Deputy Minister of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of Belarus, delivered opening statements, and the workshop was officially opened at 9:05 a.m. on Tuesday, 14 June 2016.
5. Ms. Natalya Minchenko, Head of the Department of Biological and Landscape Diversity from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of Belarus, based on proposals from the

floor, was elected Chair of the meeting. Subsequently, all participants introduced themselves briefly. The plenary then adopted the provisional agenda prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/PAWS/2016/2/1) without amendment. Participants considered the proposed organization of work, as contained in annex II, and adopted it without amendment.

6. In the first presentation of the day, Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda introduced the participants to the processes that led up to the workshop as well as the main objectives and outputs. In the process leading up to the workshop, he had mentioned the development of the programme of work on protected areas (PoWPA); the elements of PoWPA; the outcomes of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties; PoWPA successes; and the outcomes of the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties regarding protected areas. Mr. Gidda had also discussed the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and summarized the findings of the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* on the mid-term status of these two targets. Mr. Gidda reminded the participants of all these details and, then, presented the Strategy of the Convention to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 by 2020. He stated the workshop objectives and outcomes, including the four main elements: identifying status, gaps and opportunities of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12; developing national priority actions; exploring support through national budgets, bilateral sources and the sixth replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility, and the next decision on protected areas for the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, as well as exploring tools and mechanisms for implementation of transboundary conservation areas. He concluded by presenting the organization of work of the meeting and describing the content of the USB keys that were given to each participant. Following the opening session presentation, a press conference was also held and a group photo taken.

7. In the second presentation, Mr. Trevor Sandwith of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) presented the outcomes of the last IUCN World Parks Congress, which had been held in Sydney, Australia, in November 2014. The aim of the World Parks Congress had been to identify how protected areas could contribute solutions to global challenges while also accelerating progress to achieve the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and goals for sustainability. He discussed four elements that had arisen from the Congress as the [“Promise of Sydney”](#): first, in the vision, the high-level aspirations for the change needed in the coming decade; second, in innovative approaches, the identification of successful approaches that could be scaled up and replicated; third, the collation of case studies and evidence of successful practice on a shared Panorama website of solutions for peer-to-peer learning and capacity development; and fourth, commitments as part of the Promise of Sydney, that signal the intention of Governments and other organizations to accelerate implementation. He stated that the Congress had emphasized the need to progress and not regress, and outlined the development of the new [IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas](#) standard as a means to measure performance against Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 qualitative parameters, to inspire a new generation of citizens who understand and support the conservation of nature, and to emphasize the solutions that nature and protected areas provide which are the foundation of sustainable development, including meeting such challenges as climate change. Mr. Sandwith concluded his presentation by summarizing the eight streams of innovative approaches and cross-cutting themes discussed at the Congress.

8. In the third presentation, Mr. Brian MacSharry of the United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Center (UNEP-WCMC) presented on the [World Database on Protected Areas](#) (WDPA) under the Protected Planet. He gave a general review of what UNEP-WCMC, Protected Planet, and WDPA. He stated that the WDPA was the only global authoritative database on terrestrial and marine protected areas compiled and managed by UNEP-WCMC in collaboration with Governments and non-governmental organizations. WDPA collects data about sites designated at the national, regional (e.g. Natura 2000), and international levels (e.g. World Heritage Site). He then presented a brief history of WDPA and the evolution of the terrestrial and marine protected area network since the first World Park Congress in 1962. As of June 2016, the WDPA included 229,593 records from over 244 countries and territories and over 18 300 records had a marine component. Mr. MacSharry then presented the proportion of sites and the proportion of area covered by protected areas in every region, showing that the 65.6 per cent of sites were found in Europe, which represented 12.9 per cent of protected areas globally.

9. Mr. MacSharry then explained that, in Europe, 91,288 sites had been identified at the national level, 29,274 at the regional level and 1,129 at the international level. He then presented the number of sources of data for national, regional and international designations in Europe. He also mentioned the three main challenges faced by WDPA, namely lack of updating for data, lack of capacity to deliver data, and lack of capacity to have data centrally located. He then presented briefly the tool protectedplanet.net, the data it used, its content and how that tool could be useful for consultation and publication by different organizations, and support in decision-making. Mr. MacSharry said that his organization was working closely with countries to collect data about protected areas designated at the national level. He stated that the purpose of his presence at the workshop was to discuss with participants the means to update the WDPA with their national information.

10. Following this presentation, Mr. MacSharry invited participants to discuss for a few minutes on WDPA. Ms. Natalya Minchenko of Belarus stated that the classification of protected areas might be different from one country to another and that numbers in the WDPA did not necessarily correspond to the official national statistics. She asked Mr. MacSharry to explain how he and his colleagues addressed those discrepancies. In response, he stated that the WDPA used data from national authority but also included multiple sources sometimes, which might explain these discrepancies. He also stated that the information in the WDPA was sometimes outdated and he and his colleagues would be happy to update it with the help of national authorities. The WDPA team also shared experience and engaged dialogue with countries to address these issues of difference in the numbers because sometimes these discrepancies were a result of countries applying their own understanding of the concept of the different management categories due to the lack of a standard.

11. Following this discussion, Mr. Wouter Langhout of BirdLife International delivered a presentation entitled “Key Biodiversity Areas and Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas: a support tool to implement Aichi Targets 11”. He presented a brief history of the IBA Programme, the IBA global criteria and the way data was gathered using global science and local expertise. Data was gathered at the local level, analysed at the national level, assessed at the regional level, and standardized at the global level. More than 12,000 IBAs had been identified globally and terrestrial IBAs covered approximately 7 per cent of the land surface of the world. He then stated that, for marine IBAs, BirdLife International had created the marine e-atlas and identified 3,000 sites in 150 countries and high seas and covering 6.5 per cent of the oceans as marine IBAs. He also presented a relatively new tool: the Alliance for Zero Extinction sites, which were vital sites for threatened species. To date, 587 sites covering 920 species had been identified as AZEs. Mr. Langhout explained further that KBAs were sites contributing significantly to the global continuance of biodiversity. A new global KBA standard had been approved in April 2016 and now provided the framework for KBA identification and revision by using 11 criteria grouped under five categories: threatened biodiversity; geographically restricted biodiversity; ecological integrity; biological processes; and irreplaceability.

12. Mr. Langhout then explained that, within the five regions systematically assessed to date, IBAs constituted 68 per cent of all KBAs while AZEs constituted 3 per cent of all KBAs. He reminded participants that KBAs needed better protection as only 28 per cent of all IBAs were completely covered by protected areas and 49 per cent had no protection at all. Approximately 60 per cent of AZEs identified so far were protected, but countries should aim to have 100 per cent of their AZEs protected by 2020 to facilitate the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 and other Aichi Targets.

13. Mr. Langhout indicated that there was progress in the protection of KBAs as the mean percentage of IBAs and AZEs covered by protected areas had increased over several decades, but the actual proportion of protected areas covering KBAs was decreasing, as opposed to protected areas established outside of KBAs. He then stated that the protection of KBAs was important as it had been proven that extinction risk of birds was significantly lower in better protected IBAs. He concluded by presenting the many other applications of KBAs, including informing the description of EBAs, supporting the designation of Ramsar sites, mainstreaming biodiversity, promoting local engagement with conservation and helping in decision-making.

14. Following this presentation, participants were engaged in a discussion about KBAs. Participants from the delegation of Belarus raised the issue that designation of KBAs can be made by NGOs and that there was, sometimes, a lack of communication and cooperation between these NGOs and the local government. For example, an NGO could designate an area as a KBA while the Government was unaware of this designation, so decision makers did not make any plan to protect that area. Organizations needed to make sure to consult the Government when designating a site so that the Government can fulfill its commitments. Participants stated that a mechanism including the Government during the process of designating a KBA should exist.

ITEM 2. COLLECTING AND SHARING INFORMATION AND DATA ON STATUS, GAPS AND OPPORTUNITIES REGARDING THE ELEMENTS OF AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS 11 AND 12

15. Under this item, Ms. Natasha Ali of IUCN delivered a presentation on the [RedList of Threatened Species](#), the status of Aichi Biodiversity Target 12 in Central and Eastern Europe and a new tool developed by IUCN and other partner organizations entitled “Assisting progress towards Aichi Target 12”. She first discussed the key components of Aichi Target 12, namely known threatened species, preventing extinction and improvement in conservation status. Ms. Ali then presented the status of the target at the global level as presented in the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* as well as the status of an element of the target for Central and Eastern Europe, namely the number of critically endangered and endemic critically endangered species in each country present at the workshop. She then presented the RedList of Threatened Species, its history, its objectives, its processes and its goal, which was to provide information and analyses on the status, trends and threats to species to inform and catalyse action for biodiversity conservation.

16. Ms. Ali presented the different categories and criteria used by this tool as well as the assessment process and the mechanisms used by IUCN to assure governance and quality control. She then presented the training and capacity-building done by IUCN through assessors’ training workshops and online training courses. She presented briefly on the national red lists compiled by countries to provide them with key information about species status within their borders. She finished by presenting a new decision-support tool, the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT) Country Profiles. These profiles would include peer-reviewed and robust information managed by expert and integrated data on species, protected areas and key biodiversity areas. She presented the objectives of the profiles and the audience they aim for, and she presented an example of a profile. Ms. Ali then asked participants to give her feedback on the use, the presentation, and the content of this tool. Ms. Elvana Ramaj from Albania stated that this tool would indeed be useful and would ease the process and the burden of reporting.

17. Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda of the Secretariat of the Convention delivered a presentation entitled “Subregional analysis of the status of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11”. He first provided an explanation of each of the elements of Aichi Target 11, which were: quantitative elements, areas important for biodiversity, effective management, equitable management, ecological representativeness, connectivity and integration into wider land- and seascapes, and other effective area-based conservation measures. He also presented global, subregional and national data, as available, for each of these elements. To describe the status of the above elements was very lengthy, therefore, for illustrative purposes, one element was provided. For the quantitative aspects of Aichi Target 11, Mr. Gidda stated the global objective of securing 17 per cent of terrestrial areas and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas as protected was close to being reached as in 2015, globally, 14.7 per cent of land and 10.2 per cent of coastal and marine areas up to 200 nautical miles were protected. However, he also noted that simply achieving the coverage aspect of Aichi Target 11 would not result in achieving the target overall as all of the different elements of the target had to be simultaneously achieved. He further noted that obtaining quantitative information on many of these other elements was difficult due to different interpretations by Parties and a lack of available data. Regarding protected area coverage in Central and Eastern Europe, at the subregional level, Central Europe had 21.3 per cent terrestrial and 0.1 per cent marine areas protected, and Eastern Europe had 12.0 per cent terrestrial and 1.1 per cent marine areas protected. Nationally, Slovenia had the most

terrestrial areas protected in 2014 with 53.6 per cent, followed by Bulgaria with 40.5 per cent. For coastal and marine areas, nationally in 2014, Slovenia had the most area protected with 100 per cent, followed by Bosnia and Herzegovina with 16.5 per cent.

18. Mr. Gidda then introduced the participants to the group exercise on national assessment of the status, gaps, and opportunities for each element of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12. Participants were invited to work on the country exercise taking into account the information that was previously gathered through the questionnaire sent out to participants prior to the workshop. Participants were asked to complete the assignment and submit it on the last day of the workshop. The outcomes of the exercise are presented in annex III.

ITEM 3. CAPACITY-BUILDING, AWARENESS-RAISING AND INTEGRATION OF RELEVANT ISSUES ON PROTECTED AREAS

A. Governance and equity

19. Under this item, Ms. Jelena Perunicic of the Open Regional Fund for South-East Europe Biodiversity (ORF BD) delivered a presentation on her organization and how it could help Central and Eastern European countries in implementing biodiversity-related projects. The fund had been commissioned by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development and covered six countries: Albania; Bosnia and Herzegovina; the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Montenegro; and Serbia. Ms. Perunicic then presented the regional challenges related to biodiversity and the objective of ORF BD, which was that biodiversity institutions in South-East Europe increasingly used regional cooperation for the implementation of the European Union Biodiversity Strategy 2020. She then stated that the expected results included improving knowledge of actors in the region regarding the economic values of biodiversity, improving competences of regional network partners regarding reporting on biodiversity conservation, and initiating transboundary ecosystem management measures. Ms. Perunicic then presented an example of a sub-project related to a regional network on biodiversity information management and reporting, and presented its three components. Ms. Perunicic finished by asking a few questions to the audience and sharing her contact information to receive their feedback. Ms. Elvana Ramaj from Albania asked Ms. Perunicic how she foresaw cooperation between countries that might have similar projects to avoid overlaps and create synergies. Ms. Perunicic responded that she herself and her colleagues worked to make sure that the ORF BF projects were tuned in to the countries' needs.

20. Following this presentation, Mrs. Barbara Lang of the [Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit](#) (GIZ) delivered an introduction to governance of protected areas. She first explained that the reason for discussing governance at the workshop was the expression “effectively and equitably managed” contained in the text of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. She then presented a general definition of the term, emphasizing the key questions one should ask oneself when trying to assess the governance type of a protected area: Who has influence? Who decides? Who is accountable? She then presented a definition of “governance of protected areas” more specifically, and asked participants to try to view their protected areas through the lens of governance. She presented the many differences between governance and management, and stated that countries should aim not only to have effectively managed protected areas but also protected areas with “good governance”.

21. Mrs. Lang then presented how the instauration of protected areas had changed throughout history, from isolated protected areas, to conservation areas with buffer zones around them, to linear connections between protected areas, and finally, to protected areas embedded in the landscape with different types and intensities of resource use. She linked those changes with changes in governance of protected areas, from protected areas as “blank spots” in the regional context, to protected areas as providers of services, to protected areas expected to generate income via payment for ecosystem services, to integration into regional development and protected areas “claimed” by local and regional stakeholders as part of their development rights. She presented the history of international policy responses on governance of protected areas, from the IUCN World Parks Congress in 2003, to the creation of PoWPA in 2004, to the

IUCN World Parks Congress in 2014. She summarized PoWPA's Programme Element 2 related to governance, participation, equity and benefits-sharing. However, even if much had been done about governance of protected areas, PoWPA implementation was particularly lagging on governance issues. She then presented two key concepts related to governance of protected areas — namely diversity and quality — and the different possible governance types of protected areas: governance by government; shared governance; governance by private actors; and governance by indigenous peoples and local communities. She concluded her presentation by discussing the different IUCN protected areas management categories used to prepare the matrix participants were asked to complete during the following exercise.

22. Following this, Mrs. Lang introduced the participants to the group exercise on governance. Participants were split into four groups for information sharing and peer-to-peer exchange on information about protected areas governance and were asked to complete the IUCN Protected Areas Governance matrix.

23. After the group exercise, Mr. Trevor Sandwith of IUCN delivered a presentation on going from understanding to action with protected areas governance entitled "Governance quality for protected areas". He first stated that conservation around the world was changing in many ways, that it was a movement that had been building up for years among different stakeholders and it had been enshrined in international policy decisions. He then presented the needs for achieving conservation objectives, namely the need to take into account the capacities, concerns and engagement of society as a whole, the need to pay more attention to the crucial ties between biological and cultural diversity, the need to allow indigenous peoples and local communities to be empowered, the need for a fair sharing of the costs and benefits of conserving biodiversity and managing natural resources in a sustainable way, and the need to respect human rights and indigenous peoples' rights. Mr. Sandwith then described the different principles of "good governance", namely legitimacy and voice, direction, performance, accountability, and fairness and rights. He also presented the reasons to promote quality of governance of protected areas, namely to improve management effectiveness, to involve more stakeholders, to improve social acceptance, and to improve equity. Mr. Sandwith additionally described the differences between governance assessment, evaluation, and the action process, and presented the four phases for realizing them. He then explained those phases, in detail, and provided tools for realizing a spatial analysis, a quality assessment, and an evaluation of governance. He concluded his presentation by describing the possible results of an assessment at the system level and the possible outcomes of a governance evaluation.

24. Following that presentation, Mr. Sandwith engaged participants in a discussion on governance of protected areas by inviting them to share their experiences, and asking them the following questions: Have you conducted an assessment of the governance of the whole system of protected areas in your country? Are the provisions for good governance sufficient in your overall protected areas' system? Have you instituted legal reforms to address issues of governance? What are the opportunities to address issues where there may be room to enhance the quality of governance? The delegation from Belarus raised the issue that local communities usually started asking questions too late during the process of establishing a protected area, and that communication between them and the government was usually not good. Ms. Sandwith stated that it was important for people know, before the start of a project, what they would benefit from the project. Mr. Elshan Majidov from Azerbaijan mentioned that there had been an improvement in the management of protected areas in his country only when the laws had changed. Mr. Boris Suliandziga from a Russian indigenous community presented an example of a protected area in Russia that had representatives of indigenous communities on its board to facilitate sharing the responsibilities related to governance. The delegation from Montenegro raised the issue that guidance was sometimes only on paper and that governance of a protected area was often neglected, leading to protected areas no longer being protected. In those cases, the State was usually accountable and only public pressure on decision makers helped resolve the issue. Ms. Jelena Perunicic from Montenegro stated that governments should make sure that the price of admission to a protected area was not too high in order to make protected areas more popular.

25. Mrs. Elmira Kachibekova from Kyrgyzstan then explained that, as the establishment of a protected area usually meant taking something away from people, the government needed to offer some sort of compensation to local communities in return. For example, in Kyrgyzstan, there was little poaching or harvesting in protected areas where the Government offered local communities training in local entrepreneurship, craft workshops and exhibitions, and small grants so that people could create products and sell them to tourists. Mr. Khalilulla Sherimbetov from Uzbekistan also said that Governments needed to offer alternatives to local communities and explain to them why a protected area would be established. For example, in Uzbekistan, the Government had established a biosphere reserve but had made sure first to provide an answer for every question the local communities might have in order to be able to clearly explain to them the objectives of the project. Ms. Natasa Pjevic from Bosnia and Herzegovina stated that, in her country, local communities that did not agree with a protected area project were involved in the creation of park management plans. They did not completely change their mind about the project, but progress was made and the Government was focusing on a long-term relationship as a means to assure the success of this project.

26. Following this discussion, Mr. Sandwith continued his presentation by stating that there were many similarities between the different interventions from countries, mainly about the importance of the participation of local communities in the decision-making processes and the importance of sharing benefits with those communities. He also stated that it was quite easy to improve the governance of a protected area in theory, but it was quite difficult in reality to put in place principles of good governance. He finished his presentation by presenting briefly the difference between inclusion, equity, justice and fairness, which included the first three terms. Equity was the term widely used by the Convention on Biological Diversity and in the Sustainable Development Goals. Equity had three dimensions, namely recognition, procedure and distribution, and a governance assessment would help in assessing the dimension of recognition and procedure, while a social assessment would help in assessing the dimension of distribution.

B. Transboundary protected areas

27. Under this item, Ms. Tatsiana Trafimovich of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of Belarus delivered a presentation entitled “Transboundary protected areas of the Republic of Belarus”. Belarus had three agreements related to transboundary protected areas with Latvia, Ukraine and Poland. Setting transboundary protected areas was a priority of the strategy of Belarus related to protected areas. Ms. Trafimovich then presented briefly the content of those three agreements, mostly joint management plans of transboundary protected areas and transboundary Ramsar sites. She stated that, in Belarus, most of the areas that could be covered by a joint management plan had already been included in bilateral and multilateral agreements. Ms. Trafimovich concluded by stating that the participants were most welcome to ask questions of the delegation of Belarus because the members had good experience in that matter.

C. Global Environment Facility funding, including the development of project identification forms

28. Under this item, Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda engaged the audience in a presentation on the Global Environment Facility (GEF). He began by discussing the history of GEF and what its individual or national entitlements were. He discussed the structure of the GEF allocations, explaining that 32 per cent or US\$ 1.2 billion was allocated for biodiversity. He reviewed the information presented in the Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 country dossiers regarding GEF funding allocation per country, and the categories under which they could access funding. For the biodiversity allocation, he gave the breakdown of entitlements for the System of Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR), sustainable forest management, and other allocations. A total of 6 out of 10 programmes for funding under GEF were related to elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. He discussed the amount to which each country was entitled, what the funds could be used for, and how the funds could be accessed. He informed participants that, in order to access funding, countries needed (a) to take into consideration national priorities through a prioritization workshop, (b) to decide which funding allocations should be used and which

implementing agency was best to approach, and (c) to develop the project identification form (PIF). He stated some key take-home messages, including involvement in the revision of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), ensuring that actions related to Aichi Targets 11 and 12 were included in the revised strategies, contacting CBD and GEF operational focal points and the GEF implementing agencies as per the decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its eleventh meeting, becoming involved in prioritization workshops, submit projects under STAR, and visit the GEF website.

ITEM 4. INPUTS TO THE THIRTEENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION

A. Identifying focused actions towards the achievement of priority elements of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12

29. Under this item, Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda delivered a presentation entitled “Priority actions”, in which he recapitulated national commitments as per decision XI/24 of the Conference of the Parties and summarized the process of formulating actions for the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12. He stated that, in that process, country experts would look at existing national commitments for Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 to be achieved by 2020, as per their revised NBSAP, PoWPA action plan or other national protected area planning documents; they would also assess, through a matrix, the status of commitments for current projects, such as bilaterally funded and GEF-5 projects, as they related to the nine elements of the two targets. Then, country experts would determine if there was a gap between what they committed to achieve by 2020 and what they had currently done in projects; and, lastly, given a gap, they would evaluate opportunities and develop national priority actions to ensure the full implementation of national commitments. These national priority actions should be undertaken in the next four years and their implementation should improve the existing status of the elements of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 by 2020 at the national, regional or global levels.

30. Further, Mr. Gidda discussed the current situation in terms of the quantitative elements and ecological regions coverage. Given the current status, he mentioned that what was needed to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 was already known. There was a need to explore what could be achieved given the timeline and based on a clear understanding of the goal. He then emphasized the importance of not repeating the past error of setting unrealistic targets, but, instead, setting clear goals and actions given priorities and the time period for implementation. There was a tendency to seek quantitative objectives, but, without quality, quantity had no meaning. Thus, both kinds of actions were needed. He concluded by stating that once goals were set, a very sincere and focused attempt to reach them had to be made.

31. Subsequently, participants were invited to complete their priority actions list, with the support of their colleagues through peer-to-peer exchange of information. On the last day of the workshop, in a session moderated by Mr. Trevor Sandwith of IUCN and Mrs. Barbara Lang of GIZ, each country presented briefly one or two of their priority actions. The outcomes of this exercise are presented in annex III.

B. Discussion on needs for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12

32. Under this item, Mr. Trevor Sandwith of IUCN facilitated a group exercise and discussion on formulating practical elements for a decision of the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting that would help in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12. The outcome of that exercise is presented in annex IV.

ITEM 5. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

Under this item, Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda delivered closing remarks. Ms. Natalya Minchenko, Chair of the workshop, gave a summary of the workshop. Lastly, a workshop evaluation was carried out. The workshop was closed at 12:20 p.m. on Thursday, 16 June 2016, and a field trip took place on 17 June 2016.

*Annex I***LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****Albania**

1. Ms. Elvana Ramaj
Head of Biodiversity Unit
Biodiversity and Protected Areas Directorate
Ministry of Environment
E-mail: elvana.ramaj@moe.gov.al
2. Mr. Spartak Koci
Protected Area Manager
Protection and Preservation of Natural Environment in Albania
E-mail: s.koci@ppnea.org
3. Mrs. Ermira Kocu
Project Manager ORF BD Transboundary Ecosystems
E-mail: ermira.kocu@giz.de
4. Mr. Luan Dervishej
National Coordinator
CABRA Project
E-mail: luan.dervishej@giz.de
5. Mrs. Adriana Petri
Director
Management Department
National Agency of Protected Areas
E-mail: adriana.petri@akzm.gov.al

Azerbaijan

6. Mr. Elshan Majidov
Head Advisor
Department of Protection of Biodiversity
Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources
E-mail: allahverdiyev.r@yandex.ru

Belarus

7. Mr. Igor Kachanovsky
Deputy Minister of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of Belarus
8. Ms. Natalya Minchenko
Head, Department of Biological and Landscape Diversity
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of Belarus
E-mail: n_minchenko@tut.by

9. Ms. Tatsiana Trafimovich
Head of Land and Landscapes Division
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of Belarus
E-mail: tmatsur@tut.by
10. Ms. Elena Shushkova
State Scientific and Production Amalgamation
Scientific and Practical Center for Bioresources
11. Mr. Oleg Borodin
Director General
State Scientific and Production Amalgamation
Scientific and Practical Center for Bioresources
E-mail: borodinoi_zoo@mail.ru
12. Mr. Mikhail Maksimenkov
State Scientific and Production Amalgamation
Scientific and Practical Center for Bioresources
E-mail: maksimenkovm@gmail.com

Bosnia and Herzegovina

13. Ms. Natasa Pjevic
Head, Department for Planning and Analysis
National Park Kozara
E-mail: pjevic.natasa@npkozara.com
14. Mr. Haris Hadžihajdarević
National Park Una
E-mail: jp.np.una@gmail.com
15. Mr. Dejan Radošević
Republic Institute for Protection of Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage (Banja Luka)
E-mail: D.Radosevic@kipn.vladars.net

Georgia

16. Ms. Teona Karchava
Chief Specialist
Biodiversity Protection Service
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection
E-mail: t.karchava@moe.gov.ge; teonakarchava@yahoo.com

Kyrgyzstan

17. Mrs. Elmira Kachibekova
Chief Specialist
Department of Forest Ecosystems and Protected Areas
State Environmental Protection Agency and Forestry
E-mail: kachibekova-ela@mail.ru

Malta

18. Mr. Matthew Grima Connell
Environment Protection Officer
Biodiversity Unit, Environment and Resources Authority
E-mail: matthew.grima-connell@era.org.mt

Montenegro

19. Ms. Gordana Kasom
Senior Advisor
Department for Nature Protection, Analysis, Monitoring and Reporting
Environmental Protection Agency
E-mail: gordana.kasom@epa.org.me
20. Mr. Mirko Jovicevic
Montenegrin Ecological Society
E-mail: mirko.jovicevic@icloud.com
21. Ms. Jelena Perunicic
Senior Country Coordinator
Deputy-Project Manager ORF BD
Biodiversity Information Management Reporting and CSBL Country Coordinator/Component
Manager
E-mail: jelena.perunicic@giz.de

Poland

22. Mr. Lukasz Rejt
Head of Unit
Nature Management Department
General Directorate for Environmental Protection
E-mail: lukasz.rejt@gdos.gov.pl

Republic of Moldova

23. Mrs. Lilia Eladii
Advisory Officer
Natural Resources and Biodiversity Department
Ministry of Environment
E-mail: eladii@mediu.gov.md; liliaeladii@yahoo.com

Russian Federation

24. Mr. Vladimir Krever
National Coordinator
World Wildlife Fund
E-mail: vkrever@wwf.ru

Serbia

25. Ms. Snezana Prokic
Head, Ecological Network and Appropriate Assessment Division
Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection
E-mail: snezana.prokic@eko.minpolj.gov.rs
26. Ms. Milka Gvozdenovic
Young Researchers of Serbia
E-mail: milka@mis.org.rs

Slovakia

27. Ms. Tereza Thompson
Head, International Cooperation Unit
Department of Environmental Education and International Cooperation
State Nature Conservancy
E-mail: tereza.thompson@sopsr.sk
28. Ms. Natália Kubicová
International Treaties Coordinator
Department of Environmental Education and International Cooperation
State Nature Conservancy
E-mail: natalia.kubicova@sopsr.sk

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

29. Ms. Robertina Brajanoska
Member of Macedonian Ecological Society
E-mail: brajanoska@mes.org.mk

Ukraine

30. Dr. Volodymyr Domashlinets
Head of Fauna Protection Division
Directorate of Natural Resources Protection
Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources
E-mail: vdomashlinets@yahoo.com; domashlinets@menr.gov.ua

Uzbekistan

31. Mr. Khalilulla Sherimbetov
Head, Department of the Protected Nature Areas
Republican Inspection on Rational Use of Fauna and Flore
State Committee for Nature Protection
E-mail: x.sherimbetov@uznature.uz; kh.sherimbetov@gmail.com

International Law Commission

32. Ms. Milana Sapelnikova, ILC representative – Russian Federation
Representative of Saami Indigenous Peoples
Center for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North
E-mail: milanochka2483@mail.ru
33. Mr. Boris Suliandziga, ILC representative – Russian Federation
Representative of Udege Indigenous Peoples
Center for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North
E-mail: sulyandziga.boris@yandex.ru

International Union for Conservation of Nature

34. Mr. Trevor Sandwith
Director
Global Protected Areas
E-mail: trevor.sandwith@iucn.org
35. Ms. Natasha Ali
Programme Officer
Knowledge Product and Policy Support
E-mail: natasha.ali@iucn.org

United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre

36. Mr. Brian MacSharry
Senior Programme Officer
Protected Areas Programme
E-mail: brian.macsharry@unep-wcmc-org

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit

37. Mrs. Barbara Lang
Programme Implementing the Biodiversity Convention
Division G300 Climate Change, Environment and Infrastructure
E-mail: barbara.lang@giz.de

BirdLife International

38. Mr. Wouter Langhout
European Union Nature Policy Officer
E-mail: wouter.langhout@birdlife.org

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

39. Ms. Alice-Anne Simard
Individual Contractor
Conservation and Sustainable Use Unit
Scientific and Policy Support Division
E-mail: alice-anne.simard@cbd.int

40. Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda
Programme Officer
Conservation and Sustainable Use Unit
Scientific and Policy Support Division
E-mail: sarat.gidda@cbd.int

Annex II

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Time	Tuesday, 14 June	Wednesday, 15 June	Thursday, 16 June	Friday, 17 June
9– 10:30 a.m.	OPENING OF THE MEETING <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome remarks Election of chair Adoption of the agenda and organization of work Introduction to the workshop, SCBD Press conference 	<i>Recap of previous day</i> ----- GOVERNANCE AND EQUITY Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional overview – GIZ ILC perspectives Group work	<i>Recap of previous day</i> ----- FOCUSED ACTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION Group work Identification of actions	<i>Field trip</i>
10:30 – 10:45 a.m.	<i>Break</i>	<i>Break</i>	<i>Break</i>	
10:45 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promise of Sydney, IUCN WDPa and Protected Planet, UNEP-WCMC BirdLife International 	GOVERNANCE AND EQUITY Group work continued Report back Report for each subregional group	Report back Each country will present one action	
12:30 – 1:30 p.m.	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	
1:30 – 3 p.m.	STATUS OF TARGETS Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-regional analysis of Target 11, SCBD Red List of Threatened Species and Sub-regional analysis of Target 12, IUCN 	PEACE AND BIODIVERSITY INITIATIVE Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional and global overview 	INPUTS TO COP 13 Group work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion on needs for achieving Targets 11 and 12 	
3 – 3:15 p.m.	<i>Break</i>	<i>Break</i>	<i>Break</i>	
3:15 – 5 p.m.	STATUS OF TARGETS Group work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status, gaps and opportunities for Targets 11 and 12 Report back Report for each subregional group	FOCUSED ACTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NBSAPs and the Post-2015 development agenda GEF-6 funding Closing the gap for commitments: Actions 	CLOSURE OF THE MEETING <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final remarks Adoption of the workshop report Workshop evaluation	

Annex III

DRAFT COUNTRY TABLES OF THE STATUS, GAPS AND OPPORTUNITIES AND IDENTIFIED DRAFT NATIONAL PRIORITY ACTIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ELEMENTS OF AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS 11 AND 12 IN THE NEXT FOUR YEARS

1. Albania

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine	Terrestrial 16,61 % Marine 2,5 %	MPAs coverage low	PoWPA action plan included in the updated and revised NBSAP	Designation of new MPAs
Ecological representativeness	Results of the report prepared in the framework of the NBSAP updated are included in this strategic document for the country	System not completed at the country level	Use research data and data coming from PAs administration to draw up the national network	Coordination of the work in the context of nature projects in Albania, in order be able to have a full picture for the whole territory of the country
Areas important for biodiversity Areas important for ecosystem services	IBAs identified and designated in 2011 Selected National Parks identified for ecosystem services provided	The study of 10 years ago needs to be updated A comprehensive study for the country to be carried out	Natura 2000 process, just started in the country, can be used Implementation of Management Plans	KBA list to be compiled for the country
Management effectiveness assessment(s) Improvement(s)	First assessment using RAPPAM in 2014-2015 A complete assessment using METT tool in late 2015 and early 2016 (56 PAs assessed)	Not all PAs included in the first round As the first complete assessment PA managers may be biased in their evaluation	IPA Natura 2000 in the country will continue to support the process for the next 3 years Yearly assessment to be carried out under the auspices of the national Agency of Protected Areas (NAPA)	Ensuring management effectiveness of Protected Areas through the implementation of Management Plans (already elaborated and approved) that will contribute to the conservation of species and habitats, by piloting governance and equity actions, and with the involvement of local governments and communities

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Governance and equity	At early stages	Introduction of the concept as a large scale	New law 'On protected areas' currently being drafted, to be used	Awareness raising of the local governments and communities on this issue
Connectivity and corridors	Preliminary study compiled	Study does not contain details for the whole country	IPA project to support the process	Elaboration of the National Ecological Network
Integration into wider land and seascapes	Revised NBSAP to 2020, approved by Government in January 2016, includes the concept and objectives at the national level	Lack of experience in the implementation of the idea especially for the seascapes	GEF UNDP project on MPA has planned to support the implementation of measures on pilot basis	Training workshops to built capacities on the topic and implementation of pilot actions in practice to showcase the benefit
Other effective area based conservation measures	Pilot actions implemented mainly in the course of several donors' projects running in the country	Relatively new topic in terms of concrete measures in the ground	GEF UNDP new project on financial mechanisms of PAs expected to start in late 2016, to contribute for this kind of initiative	Pilot actions to be carried out and later replicated in other areas
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	No extinction notified in the last 15 years	Need to update the information by revising the status of red listed fauna and flora species of Albania	GEF UNDP EIMS project 2015-2019 planned to support this process	Comprehensive revised data on fauna and flora species through new research and data collection in the field to be carried out
Conservation status of species in declined is improved	First Red List of Albanian fauna and flora, compiled in 2007, updated and revised in 2013	Data on some species still not complete	Research projects carried out by the Universities and specialized NGOs	New research and field work on specific species need to be revised

2. Azerbaijan

Элемент целевых задач 11 и 12	Положение дел	Пробелы	Возможности
Количественные элементы: наземные и морские	В настоящее время для поддержания биоразнообразия в республике Азербайджан образованы и функционирует сеть особо охраняемых природных территорий (ООПТ) общей площадью 892 546,49 га или 10,3 % от площади республики.	3,7 % Планируется создать 1. Загаталский трансграничный биосферный резерват; 2. Гызыл- агаджский Прибрежный Национальный Парк	14%
Экологическая репрезентативность	100 %	0	100%
Районы, имеющие важное значение для биоразнообразия Районы, имеющие важное значение для экосистемных услуг	В настоящее время существует 2 Рамсарские угодий: 1 национальный парк, 1 заповедник Важные 5 охраняемых орнитологических территорий	Не охвачены все орнитологические территории и отсутствуют данные по ним	Создание нового водно-болотного национального парка побережья Каспия
Оценка эффективности управления Улучшения	Оценка эффективности управления примерно 60% Не для всех ООПТ нету эффективные Планы Управление	20 % 40%	80 % 60 %
Руководство и справедливость		Необходимо внести изменение в Закон об ООПТ; Необходимо разработать документ о порядке предоставления земель национальных парков в пользование в соответствии с законом ООПТ	30%
Связность и коридоры	Разрабатывается национальная экологическая сеть	Не утверждена сеть	Планируется к утверждению в 2018 г
Включение в более широкие наземные и морские ландшафты	Планируется создать при базе Гызыл-агаджского заповедника Прибрежный Национальный Парк на территории более 100 000 гектара	Пока не утверждена	Планируется к утверждению в 2018

Элемент целевых задач 11 и 12	Положение дел	Пробелы	Возможности
Другие эффективные природоохранные меры на порайонной основе	Создать План Действие по востановление исчезающих видов флоры и фауны и реализовать проекты по реинтродукции		В данный момент проект начился и работает
Предотвращение исчезновения известных угрожаемых видов	Ко-во видов 2	Планы управления видами не разработаны для 2	Будут разработаны ПУ для 4 видов
Улучшение статуса сохранности видов с сокращающейся численностью	1	4	5

3. Belarus

№ п/п	Мероприятия	Сроки исполнения	Ответственные
1.	Обеспечение реализации схемы рационального размещения особо охраняемых природных территорий республиканского значения до 1 января 2025 г., утвержденной постановлением Совета Министров Республики Беларусь от 2 июля 2014 г. № 649, и региональных схемам рационального размещения особо охраняемых природных территорий местного значения	2016-2020	МИНПРИРОДЫ, УПРАВЛЕНИЕ ДЕЛАМИ ПРЕЗИДЕНТА РЕСПУБЛИКИ БЕЛАРУСЬ, ОБЛИСПОЛКОМЫ
2.	Разработка и реализация планов управления заказниками республиканского значения «Лунинский», «Козьянский», «Синьша», «Долгое», «Корытенский Мох», «Ричи», «Липичанская пуца», «Озеры», «Сорочанские озера», «Выдрица», «Днепро-Сожский», «Смычок», «Селява»	2016-2020	Минлесхоз, облисполкомы, Минприроды
3.	Разработка и утверждение национальной экологической сети	2016-2017	Минприроды
4.	Объявление биосферного резервата «Припятское Полесье»	2016	Гомельский и Брестский облисполкомы
5.	Создание трансграничных природоохранных территорий «Ольманские болота - Переброды» (Беларусь - Украина) и «Адутишкис - Вилейть» (Беларусь - Литва)	2016-2017	Минприроды
6.	Проведение работ по включению природных территорий Республики Беларусь в Изумрудную сеть, создаваемую в рамках реализации	2016-2020	Минприроды

№ п/п	Мероприятия	Сроки исполнения	Ответственные
	Конвенции об охране дикой фауны и флоры и природных сред обитания в Европе		
7.	Ведение реестра особо охраняемых природных территорий Республики Беларусь	2016-2020	Минприроды
8.	Повышение квалификации руководителей и работников ГПУ, осуществляющих управление ООПТ, работников территориальных органов Минприроды	2016, 2018, 2020	Минприроды
9.	Создание на ООПТ визит-центров, разработка и обустройство «зеленых маршрутов», в том числе экологических троп, а также сопутствующей инфраструктуры	2016-2020	Управление делами Президента Республики Беларусь, облисполкомы
10.	Подготовка, издание и распространение путеводителей, карт, памяток, буклетов и других рекламно-информационных материалов об ООПТ	2016-2020	Управление делами Президента Республики Беларусь, облисполкомы
11.	Проведение конференций, семинаров, круглых столов, фестивалей по вопросу сохранения биологического и ландшафтного разнообразия	2016-2020	Минприроды, НАН Беларуси, Управление делами Президента Республики Беларусь, облисполкомы
12.	Создание и обеспечение функционирования экологических центров на ООПТ	2016-2020	Управление делами Президента Республики Беларусь, облисполкомы
13.	Проведение на ООПТ мероприятий по расчистке от древесно-кустарниковой растительности и тростника участков экологических систем (лугов, низинных болот, островов) в соответствии с планами управления ООПТ	2016-2020	Управление делами Президента Республики Беларусь, облисполкомы
14.	Изготовление и установка искусственных гнездовий для птиц, относящихся к видам диких животных, включенным в Красную книгу Республики Беларусь, на особо охраняемых природных территориях	2016-2020	Управление делами Президента Республики Беларусь, облисполкомы
15.	Выявление редких биотопов и передача их под охрану пользователям земельных участков и (или) водных объектов на площади не менее 100 тыс. га	2016-2020	НАН Беларуси, территориальные органы Минприроды
16.	Выявление мест обитания диких животных и произрастания дикорастущих растений, относящихся к видам, включенным в Красную книгу Республики Беларусь, и и передача их под охрану пользователям земельных участков и (или) водных объектов	2016-2020	НАН Беларуси, облисполкомы, территориальные органы Минприроды
17.	Разработка и реализация мероприятий по стабилизации и увеличению численности видов птиц, находящихся под угрозой глобального исчезновения (большой подорлик, вертячая камышевка, дупель, большой веретейник)	2016-2020	НАН Беларуси, Минприроды, облисполкомы
18.	Реализация не менее 20 планов действий по сохранению диких животных и дикорастущих растений, относящихся к видам, включенным	2016-2020	Облисполкомы, государственные природоохранные учреждения,

№ п/п	Мероприятия	Сроки исполнения	Ответственные
	в Красную книгу Республики Беларусь		осуществляющие управление ООПТ, НАН Беларуси
19.	Восстановление не менее 2 популяций видов диких животных и дикорастущих растений, относящихся к видам, включенным в Красную книгу Республики Беларусь, численность которых имеет тенденцию к снижению	2016-2020	НАН Беларуси, Минприроды, облисполкомы
20.	Осуществление мониторинга животного и растительного мира, комплексного мониторинга экологических систем на ООПТ	2016-2020	НАН Беларуси, государственные природоохранные учреждения, осуществляющие управление ООПТ, НАН Беларуси

Начальник отдела земель и ландшафтов

Т.Ф.Трафимович

4. Bosnia and Herzegovina

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine	27 officially protected areas or 2 % of the country (101,315 ha). Inventory of species diversity in B&H not completed (Research on flora and fauna has not been conducted fully).	Planned areas are not officially protected. Reason: lack of financial and capacity resources. There are no categories of vulnerability in the Red List of RS (Red List has not been finalized).	To place under protection planned areas according to the Spatial Plans and strategies of the entities. Complete the inventory of flora, fauna and fungi in BiH.	Legal enactments for establishment of planned protected areas. Completion of inventory of flora, fauna and fungi and creation of a database. Completion of the Red List of the RS.
Ecological representation	2 ecological regions (Dinaric Mountains mixed forests, Pannonian mixed forests) are priority candidate sites for further protection as they cover more than 30% of Bosnia and Herzegovina	Their protection in Bosnia and Herzegovina is less than 10%. There are no protected areas within marine ecological region.	A number of projects related to biodiversity protection have been implemented. The implementation of these projects has enhanced ecosystems and habitats.	Conduct the inventory of ecosystems and types of habitats in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is needed to ensure financial resources in order to implement strategy and action plans for biodiversity protection.

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
Governance and equity	All protected areas are under the government supervision according to the legal acts related to nature protection.	Local communities are partially involved in decision making process.	Local communities to be more involved in decision making process and to give them an opportunity to suggest and establish new protected areas according to legal acts.	Ministries in charge need to encourage and initiate local communities to develop nature conservation plans according to the laws on nature protection, and to establish new protected areas.
Connectivity and corridors	Ecological networks are not designated.		The Natura 2000 Regulation was passed. 122 potential Natura 2000 sites have been proposed.	Adapt proposed Natura 2000 sites and establish the ecological network in accordance with the laws on nature protection.
Integration into wider land and seascapes	4 areas designated as IBA (two of them are Ramsar sites). 5 cross-border cooperation areas were identified.	The concept and initiatives are not adequately practised due to the limited resources.	The National Environmental Action Plan, the Spatial Plan of BIH and the Medium-term Development Strategy all recommend the enlargement of the territories of protected areas.	Identified cross-border areas need to be established. Also, planned protected areas in BIH need to be designated.
Other effective area-based conservation measures	Certification of forests in BIH is in progress.			
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	The Red List in FBIH exists, but the Red List in RS does not exist. Action plans for species protection do not exist. Monitoring and inventory of flora, fauna and fungi has not been conducted.	Red List in FBIH needs to be updated. The Red List in RS needs to be defined as well as categories according to IUCN criteria. Action plans for particular threatened species need to be developed.	Forest and Mountain Protected Areas Project, funded by GEF, was implemented and within this project the taxonomic and geographic evaluation of flora and fauna species was conducted in order to create the Red Lists. There is a need to continue with these activities using the obtained data.	Updating and completion of the existing red lists, conducting research according to the parameters for assessment of vulnerability and eventually providing the measures for the conservation of endangered species. Based on the results of identification of endangered species and their localities and measures to protect these species the expert team should prescribe the action plans for protection and develop red lists.
Conservation status of species in decline is improved	There is no monitoring programme for conservation status of species and there is no data of population trends.			There is a need to conduct flora and fauna research and to develop a monitoring programme and indicators to be used for monitoring of population trends in order to propose adequate conservation measures.

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
ecosystem services		Not all the ecosystems have not been studied from the point of view of ecosystem services.	making process.	
Management effectiveness assessment(s) Improvement(s)	Management effectiveness assessments with METT (Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool) 2011-2013 covered 52% of protected areas territory. According to the EU Habitat and Bird Directives report (2013) 53% of the habitat types of the EU importance are in a favourable status. This is well above the EU average.	Management effectiveness was higher in national parks. Planning component has higher scores than implementation component.	Repeated assessments will be needed in coming years to monitor progress made in management effectiveness. More resources are needed for implementation of management plans.	Implementation of management plans. Improve processes, prioritization of management activities.
Governance and equity	All protected areas are governed either by state or local municipality. According to our legislation, before the adoption, all the protection rules and management plans are discussed in public meetings. Stakeholders have also right to contest the decisions in court. Compensation measures for restrictions largely in place (e.g. Natura 2000 subsidies in forest and agricultural lands, land-tax remissions, state buying lands with restrictions).	No private owned protected areas. Compensation system doesn't cover all the loss in revenue base for the private landowners due to the restrictions.	More protected areas could be established by local municipalities and also private land owners. Enhance the compensation system and develop alternative measures (supporting systems) for landowners.	Update legislation and enlarge the compensation and supporting possibilities.
Connectivity and corridors	Green network (GN) has been approved at state level as a part pf planning process. It is obligatory to follow in comprehensive plans of the local municipality.	With detailed plan the local municipality can change the green network and thus the continuity can	Update green network in order to consider the needs for species population connectivity.	Awareness-raising for local governments, developers and communities on functioning and importance of GN.

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
	Studies in 2015 showed that vast forest areas, including protected areas, are functionally suitable for movement of the country's great carnivores, the bear and the wolf.	get under pressure. GN is not fully taking into account species needs.		
Integration into wider land and seascapes	Legislation sets the obligation to carry out environmental impact assessment (EIA) when carrying out projects in nature. There is a special EIA for the activities that can influence Natura 2000 areas.	Low awareness about the importance of biodiversity outside the protected areas.	Show the benefits of biodiversity outside the protected areas.	Awareness raising for business sector; good guidelines for environmentally friendly planning and management; campaigns to raise the awareness of public as well as decision makers.
Other effective area based conservation measures	Nature Conservation Development Plan up to 2020 has been accepted on governmental level. Targets have been set to measure the progress. Natura 2000 support schemes in agricultural and forest land, for management of semi-natural habitats. Private forest owners' scheme for valuable forest patches (key habitats)	Lack of sufficient financial and human capacities in conservation management.	Better cooperation with stakeholders e.g. land-owners.	Restoration of habitats (mires, spawning grounds of fish). For example, management and restoration of semi-natural habitats is one of the priority actions.
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	Reports of the EU Habitat and Bird Directives in 2013 showed that the status of 52% species of the EU importance in Estonia is favourable. This is well above the EU average. Decline of <i>Coracias garrulus</i> notified in last 5 years.	Situation of <i>Pteromys volans</i> is worsened. Negative trend of farmland bird index, decline of some waterbird species and forest grouses. Unknown reasons for decline.	Several projects have been carried out and new have been prepared to enhance the protection of threatened species.	Preparation and implementation of species action plans, restoration of habitats taking into account habitat needs for umbrella and focal species. Conservation management effectiveness needs to be improved.

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Conservation status of species in decline is improved	Updating of Red List of Estonian fauna and flora is going on (previous revision was done in 2008). State of forest birds (woodpeckers, raptors, owls) has improved, state of eagles (etc. golden eagle, sea eagle) has improved as well.	Data on some species is inadequate or missing.	Research projects, systematic inventories and monitoring on state level.	Same as described in the line above. Elaboration and improvement of monitoring programme and inventories for not well-known species.

6. Georgia

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priorities
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine	Terrestrial – 8.41% Marine – 1.9%	NBSAP Target – Terrestrial 12%, Marine 2% Gap to achieve target 11: Terrestrial - 8.59%, Marine – 8.1%	Agency of Protected Areas has initiated establishment of four new Protected Areas, unfortunately area is not known yet, because feasibility study is just being undertaken, however anyway these territories will contribute to the target achieving. Territories which are currently designated as a candidate Emerald Sites cover more than 10% of the terrestrial area of the country and totally proposed sites are approximately covering 20%. At the same time currently identified IBAs cover approximately 20% of the country. At the moment there is no legal basis to provide official status for these territories, however new draft law on Biodiversity, to be adopted next year, gives opportunity to designate new types of protected areas, such as IBAs and Emerald Sites. Therefore it will be possible to give national status to these territories.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adoption of corresponding legislation by 2017, to create legislative basis for new categories of the protected areas, such as IBAs, Emerald Network; 2. Establishment of new protected areas (Svaneti, Racha, Erusheti, Rioni Delta), according to the feasibility studies; 3. Full adoption of the Candidate Emerald Sites; 4. Establish new protected areas on the territories identified as IBAs; 5. Establishment of the new Protected area at Chorokhi Delta, which involves marine area as well;

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priorities
			<p>Of course all these territories have big overlaps; however considering that IBA sites cover largest territory with approximately 20%, it means that terrestrial target should be reached by 2020.</p> <p>As of marine protected areas, there are discussions to initiate one more coastal protected area, with the marine part. The decision has not been made. However, even if this site will be established, we won't be able to reach 10% target, considering that half of the marine area is in occupied territory. Even we formally establish a protected area; it will not be possible to manage properly. Rest of the area consists of two operational and one planned ports. Therefore at the same time considering navigation ways, most probably it won't be possible to reach 10% target.</p>	
Ecological representation	Limited information is available on this topic	The information available up to date is only regarding the species protected by the Bern Convention on Conservation of European Wildlife and Wild Habitats. However for rest of the habitats new survey should be undertaken	Generally, existing Protected Areas are quite well distributed geographically. At the same time in further years Emerald sites will be adopted. It means that there will be a better ecological representation. However it is sensible to research this topic more deeply. In case of any insufficiencies establishment of new protected areas should be discussed.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initiate research on distribution of protected areas considering ecological representation 2. In case of necessity establishment of new protected areas should be initiated

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priorities
<p>Areas important for biodiversity</p> <p>Areas important for ecosystem services</p>	<p>Currently, there are 31 IBAs identified by the Birdlife International. At the same time, scientists are working on identification of the Important Plant Areas.</p>	<p>The problem is that identified IBAs do not have any legal status, unless they are not inside of the existing protected areas, which are created according to the IUCN categories. Moreover, current legislation does not recognize those categories of the protected areas.</p> <p>Another challenge is to identify territories valuable for ecosystem services, such an inventory has not been undertaken. Therefore we do not have information how much of the territories of this type are under current protection.</p>	<p>We have elaborated new law on Biodiversity, to be adopted in 2017. The law covers most of the topics of nature conservation, such as red list, habitat and species protection, international trade in wildlife, Emerald Network. This law recognizes new types of protected area, such as IBAs and Emerald Network. Therefore we intend to recognize legal status of the identified IBAs and Emerald Network sites.</p> <p>Unfortunately there is much work to be done in terms of inventory of the territories valuable for ecosystem services. We should try to cover this direction with donor support.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adoption of corresponding legislation by 2017, to create legislative basis for new categories of the protected areas, such as IBAs, Emerald Network; Establish new protected areas on the territories identified as IBAs; 2. Finalization of the study on Important Plant Areas and establishment of Protected Areas if necessary; 3. Initiate inventory of ecosystem services, it's distribution and initiate establishment of new protected areas if necessary;
<p>Management effectiveness assessment(s)</p> <p>Improvement(s)</p>	<p>Management effectiveness was assessed in 2012-2013 in process of NBSAP updating.</p> <p>Since the last assessment of PA system management effectiveness number of projects were implemented and are being implemented, which should definitely lead to the improvement of management effectiveness</p>	<p>Mid-term review of the management effectiveness should be done, in order to generalize the success already achieved and identify gaps still exist.</p>	<p>This review should be undertaken under the planned GEF project</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessment of PA management effectiveness; 2. Identification of actions necessary for improving of management effectiveness;

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priorities
Governance and equity	All Protected Areas are state owned. Most of them are governed by the Protected Areas Agency (APA), which is under the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection of Georgia. Two of them, Protected Landscapes, are managed by the municipalities, even though they are established by the APA.	So far Georgian legislation does not allow governance types other than state governed.	The new draft Law on Biodiversity recognizes privately owned territories as Emerald sites. However, designation of privately owned territory as a emerald site, should be a voluntary action. Therefore awareness rising activities should be undertaken. At the same time, some incentives may also be offered to those land owners who decide to designate their territories as protected areas.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adoption of corresponding legislation by 2017, to create legislative basis for establishment of privately or community managed protected areas; 2. Enhance transboundary cooperation;
Connectivity and corridors	Some steps have been taken out to establish new protected areas in order to establish connectivity between the existing protected areas	Previous efforts were mostly attached to the specific regions, therefore national survey is necessary to identify all connectivity areas	New project has started in order to identify all areas necessary for connectivity of the protected areas. By next year, all areas will be identified	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explore possibilities for establishment of protected areas at the territories required for connectivity;
Integration into wider land and seascapes	Some activities have already undertaken. Buffer zone is set for a 500 m, Protected Areas are integrated in some strategic documents, some protected areas are established for restoration purposes	At this stage it should be considered that even more attempts are necessary for more integration	Negotiations, including high-level, should be undertaken with the different stakeholder ministries, for instance, the Ministry of Agriculture.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishment of buffer zones according to the needs of specific protected areas; 2. Explore possibilities for effective management of buffer zones; 3. Explore opportunities for integration into wider land and seascapes;

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priorities
Other effective area-based conservation measures	According to the Georgian legislation, number of licenses for hunting farms is issued. Some of them are inside of managed nature reserve, while majority are inside of state forest fund. License owners are obliged to carry out annual monitoring of species. At the same time, they are obliged to implement conservation activities.	Possibility of establishment of other area-based conservation measures should be explored. While gaps in the management of hunting farms should be improved.	Awareness-raising and capacity-building activities should be undertaken for hunters and other stakeholders. It should be mentioned that Center for Environmental Information and Education with the support of GIZ, is implementing number of capacity building activities, including biodiversity issues. However it is more desirable to focus on these issues. While Biodiversity Protection Service and Protected Areas Agency should also explore more possibilities.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification of the actions for improvement of management of hunting farms and increasing of their contribution towards conservation goals; 2. Explore opportunities for other effective-area based conservation measures;
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	Last assessment of the conservation statuses for most species, except of the non-timber species, was undertaken 10 years ago	At the moment new assessment should be undertaken. Assessment of some species (i.e birds, some mammals) has already been started, but it is necessary to carry out assessments for more species. At the same time, it is necessary to start implementation of the conservation plans already elaborated. However, these activities require high financial resources	It is obvious that there is necessity to improve status of implementation of conservation plans. At the same time the more species should be assessed. Some of the plans may be implemented with the small donor projects. However more effective way would be implementation of the plans via GEF 7 project.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elaboration and adoption of the conservation plans for the key species, such as Turs, Sturgeon, Salamander, etc; 2. Implementation of the existing conservation plans; 3. Assessment of conservation status for as many species as possible;
Conservation status of species in decline is improved	See above	See above	See above	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elaboration and implementation of the conservation plans for the endangered species; 2. Establishment of nurseries and facilities for captive breeding of the endangered species, aiming reintroduction of those species into the wild;

7. Kyrgyzstan

Elements of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gap	Opportunities
Quantitative elements: land and sea	<p>Currently, in order to maintain biodiversity network of specially protected natural territories are formed and functioning in the republic (PA) with a total area of 1 583,481.5 hectares or 7.9% of the area of the republic.</p> <p>According to the classification adopted by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the PA of the Republic falls into 4 categories. So, today in the Kyrgyz Republic are organized and operate 10 state nature reserves (category 1) (559,650.2 hectares), 13 state parks (category 2) (724,404.6 ha), 10 forest, 23 botanical, geological 19 2 complex and 14 hunting (zoological) reserves (category 4) with a total area of 296,426.7 hectares.</p> <p>Planned organization of state natural park “Alai” in the Osh region in the territory of about 36,800 hectares.</p>	<p>Not covered by a network of special protected natural areas of the republic semi-arid savannahs and south of the area of distribution of gray Varan country (IUCN).</p> <p>Reserves formed during the Soviet Union in 1975. So far, inventory of state reserves are not conducted.</p> <p>Methods of management of specially protected areas, contributing to the protection of biodiversity and providing ecosystem services are not implemented.</p>	<p>Inventory of ecosystem services provided by the forest ecosystems in the framework of the World Bank project “Integrated management of forest ecosystems.”</p> <p>The development of integrated management plans.</p>
Ecologically representative	<p>Environmental Network of Central Asia “Econet”, which was approved by the Interstate Commission for Sustainable Development (ICSD) 16. 11. 2007. The “Econet” Kyrgyzstan, approved by order of SAEPP from 06.07.2006 number 156.</p> <p>All state reserves and natural parks have land surveying materials made of the national forest inventory service.</p>	<p>Until now, formal assessment of the representativeness of the special protected areas of the Kyrgyz Republic was not carried out. All assessment management system parameters of protected areas based either on the characteristics of the most protected areas (area, perimeter, number of cordons), or by comparing the proportion of occupied space in the protected areas of the country-wide.</p>	<p>It is proposed to expand the network of protected areas including reserves within the semidesert, steppe landscapes.</p>
Areas of importance for biodiversity Areas of importance for ecosystem	<p>Developed and approved by Decree of the Government on October 11, 2010 № 238 programme studying the state of populations of mountain sheep and mountain goats and their conservation for 2010-2014 on the territory of the Kyrgyz Republic.</p> <p>The project of the Priorities of the Kyrgyz Republic for the conservation</p>	<p>There is no agreement network of protected areas and ecological corridors ensuring sustainable management of protected areas.</p> <p>There are no isolated areas, which</p>	<p>As part of the reform of the forest sector of the Kyrgyz Republic is aimed to develop strategies on conservation of forest species.</p> <p>Conduct an inventory of ecosystem</p>

Elements of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gap	Opportunities
services	<p>of wetlands by 2023 and action plans for their implementation for 2013-2017.</p> <p>In 2008 it issued a Presidential Decree on measures to preserve and increase fish stocks in the lake Issyk-Kul, Son-Kul lake and other water bodies. Adopted by the National Forest Programme for 2005-2015, approved by the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic from November 25, 2004 № 858. Resolution of the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic of September 23, 2011 № 599 approved the complex to ensure environmental security in the Kyrgyz Republic for 2011-2015.</p> <p>Currently, we realized and implemented a number of international projects aimed at addressing biodiversity, such as the draft GEF-UNDP project “Strengthening policy and regulatory legal framework for addressing biodiversity into fishery sector” GEF-UNDP project “Demonstrating Sustainable Management mountain pastures in Susamyr Kyrgyzstan UNDP project”, “Recovery of riparian forests of Kyrgyzstan in the floodplain. Chu KokMoynokskom JSC”; project KOICA “Strengthening the capacity of conservation of forests in Kyrgyzstan and others.”</p> <p>The GEF-5 launched the FAO / GEF project “Sustainable management of mountain forests and land of Kyrgyzstan in the context of climate change” and the UNDP / GEF project “Improving coverage and effective management of protected areas system in the Central Tien Shan”. Launched a regional project of the European Union “Management of forests and biodiversity, including the monitoring of the environment” (FLERMONECA).</p>	<p>is playing an important role in the provision of ecosystem services, especially in the Biosphere territory of Issik-Kul and Sary-Chelek state reserve.</p> <p>Strategy for conservation of natural forests in Kyrgyzstan is not developed; it has a significant impact on the ecological status, such as the walnut-fruit forests of the south, north relic spruce forests juniper forests. Not taken into account mountain lakes (over 3,000), in the context of the conservation of aquatic biodiversity. Not evaluated important waterways of the country, as an object of Ramsar sites.</p>	<p>services in biosphere territory of Issyk-Kul. Study of water bodies (rivers, mountain lakes) for inclusion in the list of Ramsar sites.</p>
<p>Evaluation of management effectiveness</p> <p>Improvements</p>	<p>Evaluation of the effectiveness of protected areas management in the Kyrgyz Republic have not been conducted</p>	<p>The lack of national standards for evaluating the effectiveness of protected area management and biodiversity.</p> <p>Lack of funds for evaluation</p>	<p>Within the framework of UNDP / GEF project “Improving the Coverage and Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas in the Central Tien-Shan” is aimed to develop management effectiveness evaluation methodology of Especially Protected Natural Areas.</p>

Elements of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gap	Opportunities
Guide and justice	<p>Developed in cooperation with the Ministry of Economy of the Kyrgyz Republic and transferred to officialization documents “green growth”:</p> <p>I. Road map of the monitoring and evaluation of “green” growth indicators;</p> <p>II. Guidelines on national indicators of indicators for monitoring and evaluation of “green” growth in the Kyrgyz Republic;</p> <p>III. Monitoring indicators matrix evaluation of “green” growth in the Kyrgyz Republic “indicators” Indicators guide.</p> <p>2. Developed indicators of “green growth” are included in a separate section of the annual statistical list “Environment statistics in the Kyrgyz Republic”.</p>	<p>No country policy to “green growth” for Especially Protected Natural Areas.</p> <p>The lack of green growth indicators for protected areas</p> <p>The lack of specialists in this field.</p>	<p>Train professionals to develop green growth policy.</p> <p>Implementation of large-scale educational programs for a green economy.</p>
Connectivity and Corridors	<p>Active work is underway to establish the "ecological corridors", to ensure favorable conditions for the species diversity of flora and fauna, and the stability of migration routes of large mammals, are under special state protection. One such activity is the installation of camera traps between protected areas.</p> <p>Organization of ecological corridors in Kyrgyzstan initiated in the framework of UNDP / GEF project “Improving the effectiveness of the coverage and management of protected areas in the Central Tien Shan”.</p>	<p>Not covered by the other key areas for the main indicator species.</p> <p>No collaboration between the countries on organization of ecological corridors.</p> <p>The lack of cross-border protected areas, in order to improve the management of protected areas and the effectiveness of the coverage</p>	<p>Strengthening work with the neighboring countries on the organization of cross-border protected areas.</p>
Inclusion into broader land- and seascapes	<p>Work is implementing on the organization of cross-border nature park Alai on 36,800 ga area on the border and Tadjikistan and Uzbekistan.</p>	<p>The lack of cooperation between the two countries</p>	<p>Establishment of a Central Asian Forum on conservation of Biodiversity.</p>

Elements of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gap	Opportunities
Other effective conservation measures on the basis of regional level	<p>Developed and approved PPKR priorities of the Kyrgyz Republic for the conservation of wetlands by 2023 and the Action Plan for their implementation in 2013-2017.</p> <p>In order to preserve the rare crops realized by the development of nut crops Program in the Kyrgyz Republic until 2025 approved PPKR on June 2, 2014 № 293.</p> <p>In order to preserve and restore the population of the snow leopard is developed and approved by the Decree of the Government dated 19 October 2012 National Strategy for conservation of the snow leopard in the Kyrgyz Republic for 2013-2023 years. Developed and approved by order of the Prime Minister of the Kyrgyz Republic from 5 August 2013 Plan to implement the Strategy.</p> <p>Order of the Government KR from 11.07.2014g. № 258-p approved by the Secretariat of the Global Programme on snow leopard conservation of ecosystems. Work on the implementation of the Global Programme for the conservation of the snow leopard and its ecosystems to 2020, adopted at the World Forum on the Protection of the snow leopard (Bishkek, 2013.). Resolution of the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic from October 23, 2014 № 613 on October 23 is set annually celebrated the Day of the snow leopard. More details on the Secretariat website - www.globalsnowleopard.org</p>	<p>Lack of funds for implementation of environmental strategies character.</p> <p>The low level of preparation of strategic documents for the conservation of biodiversity.</p>	<p>Raising funds from donors and international funds for environmental conservation activities of the country.</p> <p>Training and capacity building management authorities of Especially Protected Natural Areas.</p>
Preventing the extinction of known threatened species	<p>KR Government Resolution dated April 11, 2016 № 189 On Approval of the Red Book of the Kyrgyz Republic</p> <p>Issued Inventory of flora and fauna of Kyrgyzstan</p>	<p>There is no developed strategy for the conservation of species listed in the Red Book of the Kyrgyz Republic.</p> <p>Current state of the main types of indicators are not studied</p>	<p>To examine of major species of flora and fauna of Kyrgyzstan in order to develop preservation strategies</p>
Improving the conservation status of species with decreasing population	<p>Annals of nature in especially protected areas were listed, to indicate the status of species with decreasing population.</p>	<p>Lack of funds for activities on improving the status of species with decreasing population.</p>	<p>Raising funds from donors.</p>

8. Malta

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Action
Ecological representation	Noting the extent of protected areas, under various designations, within the Maltese Islands, it is believed that ecological representation is extensive.	The ongoing Life BaHAR project (http://lifebahar.org.mt/) will aid in selecting sites for marine habitats which might not be represented as yet.	Efforts will be made to designate relevant sites; however Malta is on track.	Should the ecological representation of sand banks, reefs and submerged or partially submerged caves prove to be outside areas which are already designated, new sites may be designated accordingly.

Elements of Targets 11 and 12	Benefits accrued from the implementation of project: EU Life Bahar – ongoing
Quantitative aspects	The aim is to select further marine sites to form part of the Natura 2000 network to move further towards sufficiency when considering the marine environment vis-a-vis the EC Habitats Directive.
Improving ecological representation	The aim is to select and designate sites to allow for the protection of reefs, and submerged or partially submerged caves, and sandbanks, where relevant.
Areas Important for Biodiversity	Relevant sites may be identified; surveys are ongoing.

Management effectiveness and equity	<p>The LIFE BaHAR for N2K project is currently mid-way through its implementation. The second set of marine surveys, led by Fundacion Oceana, is currently underway. In addition, the contract for a bathymetric survey in selected areas has been awarded, and the surveys are expected to be carried out in the coming weeks. These surveys build on the first expedition that took place in summer 2015.</p> <p>The project is due to conclude in June 2018, with the following actions being carried out in the meantime:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Marine habitat surveys and preliminary analysis of raw data (ongoing - 2016);• Data analysis and interpretation, including recommendation of priority habitats for protection (2016/2017);• Identification of proposed Sites of Community Importance (2017);• Designation process for pSCIs (2017/2018);• Identification of conservation objectives for each designated site (2017/2018);• Identification of diversification of tasks for stakeholders being impacted by the designated sites (2017/2018). <p>Development of management actions would be the next step to be considered in the six years after site designation.</p>
-------------------------------------	---

9. Montenegro

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused actions
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine	11.57% Terrestrial protected areas (1599,2536 km ²) 0% Marine (0 km ²)	Without protected marine areas; Insufficient percentage of terrestrial protected areas; For some Terrestrial protected areas no studies of protection as well as the spatial data, as well as the border of these areas.	We have finished two Feasibility studies and agreed plans to establish marine protected areas Platamuni and Katici. Now we are waiting for opinion of our Ministry for tourism and sustainable development In the procedure of protection there are three new terrestrial Regional park Dragisnica and Komarnica Sinjajevina and Orjen, then Nature Parks such as Cijevna river canyon, Ulcinjska salina... In May 2016 we started project on establishment of Nature 2000 network -IPA funded. Through this project will receive numerous data that will be in the future to provide better protection	Establishment of marine protected areas, make and adopt management plans for them. Developing capacity for governance and equity for marine protected areas, Capacity-building, Give technical support and determine the governing body. Increase of terrestrial protected areas to 17% according to the targets of NBSAP through revision of some protected areas and design new protected areas; Digitalization of important information of protected areas and establish an information system; Conservation measures in all areas; In the coming period, intensive activities will have to be carried to increase PAs and to improve the pace of PAs designation and to ensure their full adequacy in covering important habitats and species, including those that are of interest to the European Community (Natura 2000).
Areas important for biodiversity Areas important for ecosystem services	Identified 13 IBA sites 32 Emerald sites 22 Important Plant Areas (IPA) NP Skadar lake drinking water for people, traditional used of land	Some IBAs that have no protection or having partial protection under protected areas. Only 3 IBA is fully protected as national parks. Luck of information	Montenegro has 5 IBAs. More IBAs are waiting for official approval from Birdlife International.	Bringing unprotected IBA PAs under protection either by expanding existing PAs or establishing new PAs and improving management effectiveness through addressing threats are potential further actions. Mapping and assessment of ecosystems service in protected areas NP Skadar lake

Management effectiveness assessment(s) Improvement(s)	5 National Parks: Durmitor, Skadar Lake, Biogradska Gora, Lovćen and Prokletije have management plans as well as two Natural Monuments: Lipska Cave and City Park Tivat. For Regional Park Piva (proclaimed in 2015) management plan is in procedure of adoptions. The rest of protected areas still missing management plans. This means 7 management plans there are in operations.	Implementation of adopted management plans have not yet done	Implementation of adopted management plans.	Assessing management effectiveness of protected areas and protected area systems Improvements education on biological diversity and public participation in decision making processes. For other protected areas should make management plans and adopted them and implemented Developing a strategy for the consultation and participation of different stakeholder groups in the establishment process. Developing a strategy to optimize benefits for local communities from the establishment and management of protected areas. Improvement of Rural Livelihoods in protected areas.
Governance and equity	Some protected areas or some categories of protection do not have appointed governance and equity	Lack of capacities and technical support	Cooperation with NGO and municipalities, indigenous peoples and local communities, private sector	Developing capacity for governance and equity for protected areas, Capacity building, Technical support
Connectivity and corridors	Without connectivity and corridors	Lack of information	Project establishment of Nature 2000 network will give certain data for corridors and connectivity	Realization of project Nature 2000
Integration into wider land and seascapes	Guidelines are in place	No gap at the moment	To be followed effectiveness of implementation	Implementation of guidelines

Other effective area-based conservation measures	city parks forests with protective function (protection of erosion and protection of water sources) according to the Law on forests - forest management mountain peaks	No gap at the moment		
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	Red lists are not developed so there is no systematic information on it	Lack of information	Project support	Project support
Conservation status of species in decline is improved	Conservation status of some species are improved			

10. Poland

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine	Terrestrial: 32% Marine: 58%	-	-	-
Ecological representativeness	23 national parks 987 Natura 2000 sites 1487 nature reserves 122 landscape parks 396 landscape protection sites	Need for national parks representative for lake region and Carpathian mountain region; Enlargement of at least 4 national parks territory; Lack of nature reserve's ecological evaluation (database).	Cooperation with local communities (they agreement is necessary for establishing the national park and enlargement as well); Removing the valueless reserves and establishing new ones if needed; Establishing the governmental system of financial support for communities impacted by being covered by national park.	Educational efforts and negotiations with local communities in at least one region; Ecological evaluation of all nature reserves (database).

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Areas important for biodiversity Areas important for ecosystem services				
Management effectiveness assessment(s) Improvement(s)	3 national parks with protection plans (13%) 461 of Natura 2000 sites with management/protection plans (46.7%) 881 nature reserves with protection plans (59.2%)	20 national parks without plans; 526 sites without plans; 606 nature reserves without plans;	Increase in knowledge concerning the biodiversity, species and habitat status	Establishing 370 plans for Natura 2000 sites; Establishing 200 plans for reserves; Finance the field studies and monitorings of Natura 2000 sites according to existing management plans assumptions
Governance and equity	Act from 13 October 2008 of citizen access to information (i.e. all management plans for Natura 2000 sites and protection plans for national parks have to be consulted by local communities, stakeholders and all people interested in the process of establishing the plan)	Lack of the similar opportunity in the case of nature reserves' protection plans		
Connectivity and corridors	7 main ecological corridors of international importance; 987 Natura 2000 sites	Lack of data concerning the effectiveness of existing corridors	Creation of integrated and coherent system of ecological corridors	Analysis of 240 green corridors effectiveness, "hot-spots" identification and preparation of the "road map" for subsequent actions
Integration into wider land and seascapes				
Other effective area based conservation measures				
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	Unstable population of ground squirrel <i>Spermophilus citellus</i> , the species known only for two sites	Unclear current population status and trends		Consecutive and continuous monitoring of the population

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Conservation status of species in declined is improved	Peregrine Falcon <i>Falco peregrinus</i> population of about 20 pairs; Greater Spotted Eagle <i>Clanga clanga</i> population of 12-20 pairs; Aquatic Warbler <i>Acrocephalus paludicola</i> population of about 3000 males;		Increase of Peregrine Falcon <i>Falco peregrinus</i> population; Increase of Greater Spotted Eagle <i>Clanga clanga</i> population; Stability of the Aquatic Warbler <i>Acrocephalus paludicola</i> population;	Natura 2000 management plans realisation at sites where species occur; Continuous monitoring of the population trends;

11. Republic of Moldova

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine	5,76 % of terrestrial PAs from the territory of the Republic of Moldova The flora of the Republic of Moldova includes 5,568 species of plants, 1,357 species of fungi and about 15,000 species of animals In the recently published Red Book 208 – plants and fungi 219 – animals	In some of the state protected natural areas the situation worsens because of the breaking of the protection regime, the gaps in the legal and institutional framework in this respect, as well as because of insufficient enforcement of the laws on developing the management plans and cadastres of natural state protected areas, plant and animal kingdoms, as well as on the creation of the national ecologic network. The main reason is the lack of administrations and financial resources, especially of the natural state protected areas, which are administered by the local public authorities.	Ensuring the extension of state protected natural areas to up to 8% of the surface area of the country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish a wetland area of international importance (Ramsar) “Domneasca” in the Middle Prut area - Establish the tri-party Biosphere Reservation “Danube Delta – Lower Prut” (Romania-Republic of Moldova-Ukraine) - Establish the National Park “Lower Nistru” - Create the “Emerald” network as a component part of the Pan-European Ecological Network
Ecological representation	Total surface area of the country is 33846 km ² =3384600 ha (Wikipedia) According the national Law on State Protected Natural Areas, the total surface of protected areas is – 189385,9 ha (5.6 % from the territory of the Republic of Moldova) From which ≈ 45,19% are located in National Forest Fund, including 26,18% in the forests administrated by the Forest Agency “Moldsilva”	The Law on State Protected Natural Areas is already old (1998), as it is far from the real situation and a plenty of protected areas are located in the unrecognised territory (Transnistria) of the country. Illegal and irrational biodiversity exploitation : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Illegal felling; - Poaching and irrational use of the hunting resources; - Illegal fishing and irrational use of 	Ensuring the extension of state protected natural areas to up to 8% of the surface area of the country	-/-

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions																																							
	<p>Ramsar Sites (3), Scientific Reserves (5) and the recent created first National Park “Orhei” (33 792,09 ha) are the biggest protected areas in the Republic of Moldova</p> <p>National Park Orhei - 1 Scientific reserve - 5 Nature monument - 130 Natural reserve - 63 Landscape reserve - 41 Resources reserve - 13 Area with multifunctional management 32 Dendrological garden - 2 Zoological garden - 1 Landscape architecture monument - 21 Wetland of international importance - 3</p>	<p>fishery resources; - Illegal grazing; - Illegal wildlife trade.</p>																																									
<p>Areas important for biodiversity</p>	<p>Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Site Number</th> <th>Site Name</th> <th>Area (km²)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>837</td> <td>Codrii</td> <td>-180.26 km2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>838</td> <td>Bazinul Cuciurgan-</td> <td>14.51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>839</td> <td>Manta flood-plain-Beleu-</td> <td>83.53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>840</td> <td>Balatina</td> <td>- 64.12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>841</td> <td>Plaiul fagului</td> <td>- 58.37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>842</td> <td>Golf Goeni</td> <td>- 3.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>843</td> <td>Copanca-Talmaz</td> <td>- 4.31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>844</td> <td>Bazinul Costesti-Stfinca</td> <td>-26.91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>845</td> <td>Bazinul Ghidighici</td> <td>- 11.55</td> </tr> <tr> <td>846</td> <td>Otaci-Golosnita (bazinul Dubasari)</td> <td>- 155.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>847</td> <td>Bazinul Taraclia</td> <td>- 14.36</td> </tr> <tr> <td>848</td> <td>Lacul Salas</td> <td>- 4.05</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/country/moldova/species</p>	Site Number	Site Name	Area (km ²)	837	Codrii	-180.26 km2	838	Bazinul Cuciurgan-	14.51	839	Manta flood-plain-Beleu-	83.53	840	Balatina	- 64.12	841	Plaiul fagului	- 58.37	842	Golf Goeni	- 3.75	843	Copanca-Talmaz	- 4.31	844	Bazinul Costesti-Stfinca	-26.91	845	Bazinul Ghidighici	- 11.55	846	Otaci-Golosnita (bazinul Dubasari)	- 155.80	847	Bazinul Taraclia	- 14.36	848	Lacul Salas	- 4.05	<p>Lack of interaction between MoE and the IBA contact in Moldova, Mr. Vitalie Ajder, PhD Student: “Al. I. Cuza” University www.bio.uaic.ro</p>	<p>The information is going to be updated. According to Mr. Vitalie Ajder, IBA contact in Moldova, who is at the same time the Chairman of the <i>Society for the Protection of Birds and Nature</i>, the updated information was sent one year ago, but it was not published on the official website of BirdLife. Even so, according to BirdLife staff, that information must pass a final validation phase before it could be made public. As long as Mr Ajder has no confirmation from BirdLife, he refuses to make it public.</p> <p><u>The expansion of the areas with forest vegetation</u></p>	
Site Number	Site Name	Area (km ²)																																									
837	Codrii	-180.26 km2																																									
838	Bazinul Cuciurgan-	14.51																																									
839	Manta flood-plain-Beleu-	83.53																																									
840	Balatina	- 64.12																																									
841	Plaiul fagului	- 58.37																																									
842	Golf Goeni	- 3.75																																									
843	Copanca-Talmaz	- 4.31																																									
844	Bazinul Costesti-Stfinca	-26.91																																									
845	Bazinul Ghidighici	- 11.55																																									
846	Otaci-Golosnita (bazinul Dubasari)	- 155.80																																									
847	Bazinul Taraclia	- 14.36																																									
848	Lacul Salas	- 4.05																																									
<p>Areas important for ecosystem services</p>	<p>A significant part of the population still lives in rural areas and the everyday life of these people depends directly or indirectly on the ecosystem products and services.</p>	<p>It is necessary to increase the areas with forest vegetation in order to rehabilitate the areas affected by erosion and landslides, to ensure ecological stability, to reduce the impacts of droughts and scorching heats,</p>	<p>will have a positive impact on: 1) ensuring ecological balance on the territory of the Republic of Moldova;</p>	<p>In order to extend and create areas with forest vegetation and to create the ecological network, documents and policies have been</p>																																							

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
	<p>The biodiversity conservation interests cannot be limited to the state borders, being approached in an international context in which the European Union has taken a leading role for the conservation of wild life and natural habitats of interest for society. Biodiversity is also important for the country because the poor population is the most exposed to risks related to biodiversity loss since it is directly dependent on ecosystem goods and services. Conservation of ecosystems is an ethical duty and a practical necessity, both for our generation and For future generations. The forest and agricultural ecosystems can serve as an example of the contribution of biodiversity at the well-being of the population.</p> <p>According to the <i>Report on the State of the Forest Fund of the Republic of Moldova for 2006-2010</i>, a considerable number of people find services in forestry activities: exploitation and harvesting of timber, industries on wood processing, furniture, cellulose and paper.</p>	<p>floods, to create the ecological network etc.</p>	<p>2) enriching biodiversity and ensuring a sustainable use of natural resources; 3) rehabilitation of degraded lands; 4) restoring the protection strips of rivers and water basins; 5) restoring the protection strips of agricultural lands; 6) diminishing the effect of climate changes; 7) increasing the productivity of agricultural lands adjacent to the national ecological network; 8) increasing the soil fertility; 9) ensuring a more effective coordination between the central and local public administration in the domains of environmental protection and forestry; 10) developing the National Ecological Network and the Pan-European Ecological Network; 11) reducing the fragmentation of natural ecosystems.</p>	<p>elaborated, the main of which are: -the National Programme for the Creation of the National Ecological Network for 2011-2018, - the National Plan on Extending of Forest Vegetation Areas for 2013- 2018.</p>
<p>Management effectiveness assessment(s)</p>	<p>In Moldova the main entities entitled to manage protected areas are as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Central Authority for the Environment/State Body Responsible for Natural Resources and Environment Protection’ is the ‘default’ manager of Scientific Reserves. • Central Public Administration Authorities. With respect to Monuments of nature; Natural reservations; Landscape reservations and Monuments of landscape architecture. 	<p>There are serious impediments to the sustainable management of protected areas system, which stood out during the last years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The insufficient institutional capacity to ensure the management and the protection of natural protected areas and biodiversity. - The poor implementation of the environmental legislation, including in the field referred to. - The lack of financial support for the proper management of natural protected 	<p>In the recent years, in the Republic of Moldova, some changes have occurred in the environmental policy and management at national and local level, respectively. However, some of the environmental problems and especially those concerning the protection of the natural ecosystems and the natural resource management remain</p>	<p>According to the RM NBSAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthen management capacities of the National Park “Orhei”; - Develop 44 management plans for protected areas; - Develop management plans for ecosystems and plant and animal species of community interest; - Develop plans for the management of Nistru and

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Improvement(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forestry Central Authority. This function is fulfilled by Moldsilva which may be appointed as management authority for protected areas within the forest estate and for Scientific Reservations (subject to agreement with the Central Authority). Local Public Administration Authorities. May be appointed as managers of Natural reservations; Landscape reservations and Monuments of landscape architecture. <p>Several state institutions (e.g. the MoE, the Agency “Moldsilva”, the Academy of Sciences) and non-governmental organizations (e.g. the Environmental Movement of Moldova, the ES “Biotica”, the NGO “EcoSpectru”, etc.) actively participated in the expansion of the surface of the areas protected by the state.</p> <p>In order to solve the problems on the management of protected natural areas and preparing the legislative and institutional framework in the field, the Republic of Moldova received essential support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF, UNDP Moldova) by implementing the Project “Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of the Protected Areas System in Moldova”, which was conducted during 2009-2013. Within the project, were proposed a set of recommendations regarding the elaboration of statutes and objectives of management of natural protected areas according to the IUCN practices.</p> <p>There is only one report (http://www.enpi-fleg.org/site/assets/files/1875/fleg_moldova_legal_analysis_report_en.pdf) that was prepared within the regional program ENPI FLEG II (www.enpifleg.org) and under the financial</p>	<p>areas and biodiversity conservation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lack of database, of records and of cadaster of natural areas protected by the state, of plant and animal kingdoms. The insufficient and inefficient collaboration of the central and local authorities on the creation and effective management of the natural areas protected by the state. The regime of the protected areas is partially respected; the protected areas do not have management and monitoring plans. <p>In the sense of IUCN only 2 Management plans were approved by the minister order in December 2014, for wetland sites “Nistru de Jos” and “Unguri-Holosnita”</p>	<p>unsolved, and the effectiveness of the management is poor.</p> <p>This situation leads to delaying the promotion of reforms concerning the ecosystem services.</p> <p>Establishing effective, efficient and consistent management of</p>	<p>Danube-Prut hydrographic basins and the Black Sea;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop 2 projects for local communities based on sustainable management of plant resources (energy, medicinal, feed, essential and oleaginous oils etc.); Develop programs and continuous professional development courses in the public and private sectors on matters related to biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of state protected natural areas;

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
	support from the European Union. It contains only the study on efficient management of forest resources.		individual protected areas	
Governance and equity	<p>According to national legislation the National Authority is the '<i>Central Authority for the Environment/State Body Responsible for Natural Resources and Environment Protection</i>'. At present the Central Authority is MoE, acting mainly through the Department of Policy Analysis, Monitoring and Assessment, the Department of Natural Resources and Biodiversity and the State Ecological Inspectorate.</p> <p>At the same time, the bodies subordinated to the central environmental authority have representatives at district level that directly engage in the management of local natural resources, fulfilling thus the decentralization to the lower level authorities.</p> <p>The Republic of Moldova has established a legal basis thorough the following main legal instruments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Law on State Protected Areas Fund 1998 - Regulations on National Parks, Monuments of Nature, Resource Reservations and Biosphere Reserves 2000 - Regulation regarding the procedure for establishing the protected natural area regime. 2002 - Law on Ecological Network 	<p>The Legal Framework is generally quite adequate, but does include some elements that are unclear or that are subject to dispute or different interpretations (particularly with respect to management of the 4 existing Scientific Reserves).</p> <p>There is a lack of secondary legislation to determine the exact means of implementing the law.</p>	Improving the Governance Quality for Protected Areas Republic of Moldova is now in the process of revising/updating the Law on State Protected Natural Areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop and promote new language for the Law on state protected natural areas adjusted to the provisions of international treaties - Develop and promote the draft Law on habitats (by harmonizing it with the Council Directive 92/43/CEE of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora) - Establish administrative units for some categories of state protected natural areas - Establish a Biodiversity, Biosafety and Protected Areas Department as part of the central environmental protection authority
Connectivity and corridors	The second phase of the Project related to creation of the "Emerald" network as a component part of the Pan-European Ecological Network is now in process.	So far it is still a lack of connectivity between biodiversity components with those of the social landscape and structures which have the natural protected areas as central components which establish liaison ecological corridors.	Creation of the "Emerald" network as a component part of the Pan-European Ecological Network	The ecologic network "Emerald" (a European ecologic network launched in 1998 by the Council of Europe), which is in the process of establishment, shall include 18 sites that will cover state protected natural areas and other land with valuable habitats, with an approximate area of about 10% of the territory of the country.

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Integration into wider land and seascapes	Quite good legal framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of an analysis of existing system of planning given cadaster data on land- and PAs-systems. - Old cadastral data 	Sectorial integration: Creation of a mechanism for economic stimulation using environmental-friendly approaches to strengthen climate resilience through mainstreaming into protected areas activity.	<p>Step 1: Analysis of existing system of incentives and restrictions.</p> <p>Step 2: Development of a mechanism for economic stimulation given a need to involve a spatial planning mechanism into sectorial planning.</p> <p>Step 3: Public hearings (also to increase public awareness).</p> <p>Step 4: Development of relevant recommendations for legislation.</p> <p>Step 5: Infrastructure development given above mentioned.</p>
Other effective area-based conservation measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The first national workshop in the frame of the JP Emerald Network phase II for the Republic of Moldova took place in Chisinau, on 13-14 May 2013. - 2013 has been a busy year for the national Emerald team in Moldova. Aside from working hard on the finalisation of the country database and identifying and gathering ecological information on a new potential Emerald site in the country (1 additional site to the 17 identified already in 2012 and are officially nominated as candidate Emerald sites by the Standing Committee to the Bern Convention), the team engaged in various dissemination and visibility activities. http://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1461016/3828642/Moldova_Emerald_Narrative_Report_2013.pdf/7eb210f3-2c47-4496-b08e-f9e8abf16f50 - The revised and finalized database and GIS maps (total Five categories of information from Moldova Emerald Network) were uploaded and available at the EUNIS European information system (http://eunis.eea.europa.eu/gistool.jsp) and the EIONET European database (http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/) 	<p>Some encountered difficulties to identify possible presence of certain species or habitats were face:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient published data on species and its population and biogeographical distribution, boundaries, mapping - Limited resources to organize field trips and monitoring of status of some Emerald species and habitats - No classification of natural habitats done yet 	Integration of Emerald and Ecological Networks in the national environmental policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation of species and habitats proposed to be included in Emerald Network; - Creation of the database on species and habitats, according to the Bern Convention; - Improving the legal framework by harmonizing it to the international practice (especially to the neighbouring European Union countries – Habitat and Birds Directives) according to the Association agreement between the Republic of Moldova and the European Union.

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	82 species of plants were recently included in the last Red Book. Number of species increased from 126 (2001) to 208 (2015) 103 species of animals were recently included in the last Red Book. Number of species increased from 116 (2001) to 219 (2015)	Lack of interconnection between Researches Institutes (who deals with rarity status establishment) and the Ministry of Environment	Develop plans for the conservation of certain species included in the Red Book of Republic of Moldova and international conventions	By 2018, at least 10 plans for the conservation of species approved; measures implemented
Conservation status of species in decline is improved	The conservation status of 25 species* of animals and plants has been improved in the las 14 years. N.B. One of this 25 was Critically Endangered	Lack of interconnection between Researches Institutes (who deals with rarity status establishment) and the Ministry of Environment	Develop plans for the conservation of certain species included in the Red Book of Republic of Moldova and international conventions	<p>In order to implement the RM NBSAP, MoE approved already a list of species of plants and animals listed in the 3rd Red Book, which requires the development of a plan of conservation, that are supposed to be issued in 2016-2017 years:</p> <p>Plants</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Colchicum arenarium</i> Waldst et Kit (Melanthiaceae) 2. <i>Trapa natans</i> (Trapaceae) 3. <i>Genista tetragona</i> Bess (Fabaceae) 4. <i>Salvinia natans</i> (L) All. (Salvinaceae) <p>Animals</p> <p>Mammals</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Mustela lutreola</i> (Linnaeus, 1761) <p>Birds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Falco cherrurg</i> (J.E. Gray, 1834) 2. <i>Haliaeetus albicilla</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) <p>Fishes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <i>Acipenser ruthenus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) <p>Insects</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. <i>Cerambyx cerdo</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) 5. <i>Saga pedo</i> (Pallas, 1771) 6. <i>Bombus fragrans</i> (Pallas, 1771)

Abbreviations:

RM NBSAP – Republic of Moldova Action Plan of the Strategy on Biodiversity of the Republic of Moldova for 2015-2020, approved by Government Decision No. 274 of 18.05.2015.

MoE – Ministry of Environment.

12. Serbia

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine	6,53 % of terrestrial Protected Areas (PAs); approx. 20% of protection under the ecological network; Marine—Not applicable	Low capacities of managers; Insufficient financing and data gathering and updating IUCN categories have not been fully harmonized	Gap analysis of the management system of PAs to be done including affective management of the ecological important sites national and international importance (Natura 2000)	(Draft revised NBSAP - Action Plan) To conduct financial analyses and establish a system for tracking the financing of PAs and Action Plan on PoWPA/CBD IUCN categorization will be implemented
Ecological representation	Key habitats and species represented in Pas. The diversity of the ecosystems in Serbia is reflected in the diversity and specific character of vegetation: 1,339 associations and 59 vegetation classes have been registered in Serbia. The most important centers of ecosystem diversity with a large number of endemic, relict and endemic-relict communities are: high mountain regions (Kopaonik, Tara, Šarplanina, Prokletije, Stara planina and Suva planina), sand and steppe habitats (Deliblato and Subotica-Horgoš sands) and refugial areas (the Đerdap gorge, the canyon of the Drina River, the Sićevačka gorge, the valley of the Pčinja River).	Data on some priority habitats and species and landscapes are not fully in place	To improve ecological network and establish Natura 2000 as its part and identification of the Key biodiversity areas	(Draft revised NBSAP - Action Plan) To improve ecological network in the Republic of Serbia (Serbia's PowPA Action Plan) 4.4: To ensure that scientific knowledge contributes to the establishment and effectiveness of protected areas and protected area systems

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
<p>Areas important for biodiversity</p> <p>Areas important for ecosystem services</p>	<p>Ecologically important areas of national importance (certain PAs) and ecologically important areas of international importance (IPA, IBA,PBA, Ramsar, Emerald) - Ecological network</p> <p>Studies done for certain PAs (Koviljsko-Petrovaradinski Rit, NP Djerdap)</p>	<p>Some degraded habitats and vulnerable ecosystems are not yet identified</p> <p>Mapping and assessment of ESS on national bases is lacking</p>	<p>To integrate areas for restoration as a part of ecological important areas</p> <p>ESS valuation and including in national planning documents and processes of the relevant sectors; promote research in this field</p>	<p>(Draft revised NBSAP - Action Plan)</p> <p>To improve criteria for establishing the ecological network; To collect distribution data on habitats and species; To evaluate ecologically important areas of national and international importance</p> <p>(Serbia's PowPA Action Plan)</p> <p>3.1: Progress in assessing the contribution of protected areas to local and national economies</p> <p>(Draft revised NBSAP - Action Plan)</p> <p>ESS valuation and including in national planning documents and processes of the relevant sectors</p>
<p>Management effectiveness assessment(s)</p> <p>Improvement(s)</p>	<p>RAPPAM, UNDP - Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool</p>	<p>New assessment have to be preformed</p>	<p>Good platform for improving governance of PA's and Ecological Networks</p>	<p>(Serbia's PowPA Action Plan)</p> <p>3.2: To build capacity for the planning, establishment and management of protected areas</p> <p>3.4: To ensure financial sustainability of protected areas and national and regional systems of protected areas</p> <p>4.2: To evaluate and improve the effectiveness of protected areas management</p>
<p>Governance and equity</p>	<p>Different types of governance : Public enterprises, private enterprises, NGOs; Regimes of protection; EQUITY - Public hearing procedures during establishing new Pas as well as validation process is the way to include all and local stakeholders; PAs work to promote inclusion of local communities and benefits of PAs mainly in tourism or agriculture sector but - further improvement needed</p>	<p>Governance has not been yet recognized in each PA.</p>	<p>To promote more equitable management; To promote equity and benefit-sharing; local participation in decision-making</p>	<p>(Serbia's PowPA Action Plan)</p> <p>2.1: To promote equity and benefit-sharing</p> <p>3.1: Progress in assessing protected area governance</p> <p>3.2: To build capacity for the planning, establishment and management of protected areas</p> <p>Development Guide or Criteria for effective governance</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
Connectivity and corridors	Ecological network of the Republic of Serbia established (2010) determines the manner of protection, management and financing of ecological network, i.e. areas of ecological importance and ecological corridors of national and international importance	Ecological corridor have not been yet identified at all country	Better collaboration with spatial planners	(Draft revised NBSAP - Action Plan) To improve criteria for establishing the ecological network; To collect distribution data on habitats and species; To evaluate ecologically important areas of national and international importance
Integration into wider land and seascapes	Ecological network and ecological corridor	Collaboration with other sectors within the spatial planning process	Implementation of the ecosystem approach and ESS	(Serbia's PowPA Action Plan) 1.2: To integrate protected areas into broader land- and seascapes and sectors so as to maintain ecological structure and function
Other effective area-based conservation measures	Ecological network and Appropriate Assessment;	Adopt the Decree on AA	To complete identification of ecologically representative areas	Legislative and institutional framework is established
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	Some protection measures were implemented for threatened species and their habitats	Not all red lists exist in Serbia; the status of all species not known Including partially IUCN categories implementation	To establish all red lists; <i>Ex situ</i> and <i>in situ</i> protection; re-introduction of species	(Draft revised NBSAP - Action Plan) To improve monitoring system for protected species and habitats; to develop and implements action plans for certain species; To establish all red lists; To plan and implement protection measures ; To coordinate activities for implementation of Tunis Action Plan 2013-2020 (Bern Conv.); To develop system for monitoring of migratory species
Conservation status of species in decline is improved	Several projects are ongoing on protection species and monitoring of birds	Monitoring system is not established	To establish monitoring system of species in decline	(Draft revised NBSAP Action Plan) To improve monitoring system for protected species and habitats; to develop and implements action plans for certain species; To establish all red lists; To plan and implement protection measures ; To coordinate activities for implementation of Tunis Action Plan 2013-2020 (Bern Conv.); To develop system for monitoring of migratory species

13. Slovakia

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine	Target 11: T - 36,76 % M - 0 %	Target 11: For 97 small scale sites (covering 0.36%) there is a need to elaborate projects	Target 11,12: ERDF funds and state budget Designation of new Natura 2000	Target 11: Designation of the 97 areas. Increase of protected area coverage by 0.36 % Prepare for designation xxx areas

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
	<p>Target 12: <u>Assessment of Natura 2000 habitats and species resulted in following status of species:</u></p> <p>63 with favourable status (19.9%)</p> <p>130 with unfavourable status (41.14%)</p> <p>63 with bad status (19.93%)</p> <p>60 data unknown (18.98%)</p>	<p>of protection based on which they will be designated as PAs belonging to the national network. These sites are currently designated as Natura 2000 only (designation phase A, B)</p> <p>177.6193 km²</p> <p>Target 12:</p> <p>Insufficient management of species and their habitats</p>	<p>sites planned. Designation of new Ramsar site.</p>	<p>Target 12: Take measures to: Increase of species in favourable status to 65 species (20.57%).</p> <p>Increase of species assessed as in unfavourable status from lower categories - 188 species (59.5%).</p> <p>Decrease of number of species with bad status to 53 species (16.78%).</p> <p>Decrease the number of species in data unknown category to 10 species (3.16%).</p> <p>Target 12: Elaboration of Rescue projects and management plans for selected species and their implementation.</p>
Ecological representation	Good and improving with designation of new Natura 2000 sites in accordance with EC requirements.	Habitats not sufficiently covered by Natura 2000 network yet.	ERDF funds and state budget New phase of designation of Natura 2000 sites	The procedure leading to designation of Natura 2000 sites.
Areas important for biodiversity Areas important for ecosystem services	Special Protection Areas (SPAs) as well as Special areas of Conservation (SACs) within Natura 2000 network (41 sites covering 28 % of area) Ramsar Sites network (14 sites) and Critical Sites Network for waterbirds Map of Ecosystems of Slovakia created	Some management plans need more time to be finalized Assessment of ecosystems		Finalizing the management plans for all SPAs. Carry out the assessment of ecosystem services and creation of ES catalogue.
Management effectiveness assessment(s) Improvement(s)	Not carried out regularly.	Lack of motivation to use the tool.	CCPAMETT	Encourage the use of the CCPAMETT.

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
Governance and equity	Majority of protected areas with governmental governance. Two private PAs and several community protected areas.	Should be more balanced and diversified.	Act on Nature and Landscape Protection	Communication of PA managers with the stakeholders, better involvement of local people, raising responsibility of stakeholders for the protection of the areas (support of participatory management.) BfN and Propark study on Governance in EE.
Connectivity and corridors	Good due to Spatial System of Ecological Stability (SSES), however greater awareness of the concept of ecological connectivity needed among stakeholders and decision making bodies.	Decision making body is not obliged to take SSES into consideration.	Communication. Projects within the Danube Transnational Programme	Implementation of two Danube Transnational Programme projects aimed to support the concept of ecological connectivity (Transgreen, Connectgreen)
Integration into wider land and seascapes	As above,+ communication with stakeholders still weak.	Communication abilities. Spatial System of Ecological Stability has only recommendatory status and need to have more enforcement.	Update of Spatial System of Ecological Stability documents at different levels. Learn from existing positive examples (BR Polana, NGOs, examples from abroad), training courses for PA practitioners in stakeholders involvement and communication.	Finding resources for trainings. Learning from countries abroad and sharing the information with PA practitioners at various occasions.
Other effective area-based conservation measures	Data missing, but still might be happening on local level.	Collection of information on this topic.	Practitioners on local level, better information exchange with NGOs.	Collection of data.
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	Information from Natura 2000 reporting on status of habitats and species (see quantitative elements of Target 12) Red Lists of species Management / Rescue plans for certain threatened species	Certain habitats and species in bad and unfavourable status. Species Red lists incomplete and mostly outdated	ERDF projects, bilateral crossborder projects Monitoring system	Elaboration and/or update and implementation of management plans for habitats and species. Update and elaboration of Red Lists
Conservation status of species in decline is improved	As above	As above	As above	As above

14. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine	Current national PAs 230083 ha or about 9% of country territory (overlapping of several PAs are not considered, real % is lower)	-National Spatial Plan target is 12% of PAs (gap about 3%) -Draft revised NBSAP target is 15% of PAs (gap about 6%)	Proclamation of new PAs form 8-12% (included in approved GEF 5 project)	-Finalize revision of existing PAs -Proclamation of new protected areas
Ecological representativeness	Current PAs network is inefficient; there is a big disparity of distribution of PAS in Eastern and western part of the country and coverage of different ecoregions.	Not only Balkan mixed forest but also other habitats (e.g. wetlands, grasslands) are not enough covered by PAS	Representative PAs network was developed in 2010-2011 (UNDP/GEF project on PAS) however not approved by the Government. It can be used for prioritization in the process of proclamation of PAs	Prioritization of proclamation of PAs
Areas important for biodiversity	Identified IBAs, IPAs, PBAs, KBAs.	24 IBAs are covering about 27% of country territory but only 10% of these areas are protected.	IBA and IPA core areas to be used in prioritization and proclamation of new PAs (included in the GEF 5 project).	Identification of areas important for ecosystem services.
Areas important for ecosystem services	Areas important for ecosystem services are not identified yet.	Areas important for ecosystem services need to be identified	GIZ biodiversity project component for ecosystem services?	
Management effectiveness assessment(s) Improvement(s)	Some initial steps started in 2010 (as part of the UNDP/GEF project on protected areas). Several PAs were assessed using METT tool.	Most of the PAs have no management body. For PAs with management authorities METT assessment was not repeated. Capacities of existing PAs (even for national parks) are very low)	Strengthening the capacities of management bodies (included in GEF 5 project)	Conduct assessment of management effectiveness of all PAs in the country. Strengthening the capacities of existing PAs

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Governance and equity	National parks (3) and several other protected areas have operational management bodies. (details in 5 th National report)	Management bodies of all PAs should be appointed. Law on nature protection gives only general framework about management of each PA category. Details should be prescribed in secondary legislation.		Preparation of secondary legislation and adoption. Appointment of management bodies for at least 10 existing PAs.
Connectivity and corridors	Developed national ecological network (MAK-NEN) based on requirements of large carnivores in particular brown bear.	MAK-NEN is not approved by the Government; core areas are not protected; proposed management measures for corridors are not implemented.	Testing of management measures in at least 2 corridors (included in the GEF 5 project).	Approval of MAK-NEN by the Government.
Integration into wider land and seascapes				
Other effective area-based conservation measures	Trilateral Prespa Park designated in 2010.	The Park is not functional because the Declaration is not ratified by Greece.	Established platform 'Prespa Net' by NGOs from the 3 countries (MES, PPNEA and SPP) and draft Strategy developed to be used for joint trans-boundary activities. PONT trust fund to be opened soon.	
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	Threatened species are not well known in the country. Balkan Lynx was assessed as critically endangered; conservation action plan was prepared.	National red lists are not prepared yet. Red list index is not developed. CAP for Balkan lynx is not implemented.	Development of Red list index for several species groups (included in GEF 5 project). The on-going transboundary Balkan Lynx Recovery Programme (Macedonia and Albania) is in the planning phase for the next 3-5 years period, financed by MAVA foundation.	Preparation of national red lists. Implementation of conservation measures for Balkan lynx to prevent extinction.
Conservation status of species in declined is improved				

15. Ukraine

Элемент целевых задач 11 и 12	Положение дел	Пробелы	Возможности	Приоритетные действия
Количественные элементы: наземные и морские	<p>Степень заповедности наземных экосистем – 6,84%,</p> <p>морских экосистем – 2,98 (по состоянию на 01.01.2016)</p>	Не достигнута цель по наземным территориям (17%) и морским территориям (10%)	Согласно утвержденной национальной экологической стратегии запланировано достичь к 2020 году заповедности в 15%	Достичь к 2020 году степени заповедности 15%
Экологическая репрезентативность	<p>Доля природоохранных территорий по физико-географическим территориям :</p> <p>1. Зона хвойно-широколиственных лесов – 7,4%;</p> <p>2. Зона широколиственных лесов – 9%;</p> <p>3. Лесостепная зона – 2,9%;</p> <p>4. Степная зона – 3,5%;</p> <p>5. Крымские горы – 11,1%;</p> <p>6. Карпаты – 12,2%</p> <p>7. Морская территория (Черное море) – 2,98%.</p>	Степень заповедности недостаточна. Необходимо продолжить работу по идентификации и созданию территорий и объектов природно-заповедного фонда	Согласно утвержденной правительством экологической стратегии запланировано увеличить на период до 2020 года количество территорий и объектов природно-заповедного фонда до 15%, в том числе увеличить экологическую репрезентативность физико-географических (экологических) регионов.	Провести анализ экологической репрезентативности природоохранных территорий и обеспечить их адекватное увеличение при планировании работ по расширению площади территорий и объектов природно-заповедного фонда-
<p>Районы, имеющие важное значение для биоразнообразия</p> <p>Районы, имеющие важное значение для экосистемных услуг</p>	<p>Идентифицировано 123 территории, важные для птиц (ИВА территории). Определено 53 водно-болотных угодья, имеющие международное значение для водоплавающих птиц (Рамсарские угодья).</p> <p>Анализ районов, важных для экосистемных районов системно не проводился</p>	<p>Данные по ИВА территориям в базе данных BirdLife International сильно устарели.</p> <p>Не все предложенные Рамсарские угодья прошли верификацию в Секретариате Рамсарской конвенции</p> <p>Недостаточно данных по</p>	В рамках Бернской конвенции идет работа по идентификации объектов Изумрудной сети (Emerald Network), которая является расширением сети Natura 2000 за пределы ЕС. Критерии, используемые для идентификации элементов Изумрудной сети, можно рассматривать, как критерии важности того или иного объекта с точки зрения	<p>Обеспечить продолжение работ по идентификации потенциальных объектов Изумрудной сети.</p> <p>Пересмотреть ревизию ИВА территорий.</p> <p>Продолжить работы по выявлению Рамсарских угодий</p> <p>Провести системный анализ по территориям и объектам, имеющих важное значение для</p>

Элемент целевых задач 11 и 12	Положение дел	Пробелы	Возможности	Приоритетные действия
		районам, имеющим значение для экосистемных услуг	биоразнообразия. На сегодня в качестве кандидатов Изумрудной сети предложено уже около 200 объектов. В рамках имплементации Директивы ЕС по охране диких птиц запланировано проведение оценки мест, важных для этой группы животных. Продолжается работа по идентификации и верификации Рамсарских мест.	экосистемных услуг
Оценка эффективности управления Улучшения	Оценка эффективности управления проведена частично	Расширить охват соответствующих оценок	В предложенном Украиной Плане действий по выполнению PoWPA запланированы работы вплоть до 2020 года по оценке эффективности управления	Разработка и внедрение критериев и стандартов эффективности управления природоохранными территориями Выполнить запланированные в PoWPA работы по оценке эффективности управления
Руководство и справедливость	По Закону Украины «О природно-заповедном фонде Украины» для ряда территорий и объектов природно-заповедного фонда предусмотрено создание специальных администраций (природные заповедники, биосферные заповедники, национальные природные парки, региональные ландшафтные парки, ботанические, дендрологические и зоологические парки общегосударственного	Руководство отдельными территориями и объектами природно-заповедного фонда осуществляется недостаточно эффективно. В некоторых объектах отсутствует специальная администрация. Недостаток участия местных общин в управлении заповедными территориями и в принятии решений	Создание специальных администраций, где это необходимо по законодательству. Вовлечение местных общин в руководство заповедными территориями и в процесс принятия решений.	Совершенствование структуры администрации территорий и объектов природно-заповедного фонда. Разработать и выполнить пилотные проекты по вовлечению местных общин в управлении заповедными территориями.

Элемент целевых задач 11 и 12	Положение дел	Пробелы	Возможности	Приоритетные действия
	<p>значения. Такие администрации могут быть созданы для ботанических, дендрологических и зоологических парков местного значения по решению органов власти, которые их опекают. Руководство объектов природно-заповедного фонда, для которых не предусмотрено создание специальных администраций, осуществляется организациями и предприятиями, которые опекают соответствующие территории. Участие местных общин в процессах принятия решения недостаточно</p>			
Связность и коридоры	В Украине принят Закон Украине «Об экологической сети». Во исполнение этого закона идет работа по созданию экологической сети.	Работа по созданию региональных экосетей завершены не по всем областям	Запланированы дальнейшие работы по созданию экосети и трансграничных территорий в соответствии с утвержденной экологической стратегией.	К 2020 году завершить работы по созданию региональных экосетей
Включение в более широкие наземные и морские ландшафты	Процесс создания или расширения охраняемых территорий не всегда включен в наземные и морские ландшафты	Оценка степени включения в более широкие наземные и морские ландшафты проведена недостаточно	Провести анализ по областям относительно включения в более широкие наземные и морские ландшафты и на основе полученных результатов разработать соответствующий план действий	Провести региональный анализ относительно включения в более широкие наземные и морские ландшафты

Элемент целевых задач 11 и 12	Положение дел	Пробелы	Возможности	Приоритетные действия
Другие эффективные природоохранные меры на порайонной основе	Создана сеть охраняемых территорий местного значения	Отсутствует анализ степени экологической репрезентативности территорий и объектов природно-заповедного фонда местного значения	Провести соответствующую оценку и подготовить рекомендации местным органам власти относительно направлений работы по созданию территорий и объектов природно-заповедного фонда местного значения	Разработка рекомендаций для местных властей по обеспечению экологической репрезентативности во время проведения работ по созданию сети заповедных территорий местного значения
Предотвращение исчезновения известных угрожаемых видов	В Красную книгу Украины внесено 542 вида животных и 826 видов растений и грибов. По ряду видов в рамках Бернской конвенции, Соглашения по охране афро-евразийских мигрирующих водно-болотных птиц (AEWA), Соглашения по охране китообразных Черного моря, Средиземного моря и прилегающей атлантической акватории (ACCOBAMS) разработаны планы действий. На национальном уровне утверждено только два плана действий (по зубру и медведю).	Планы действий по видам, входящим в фауну и флору Украины, утвержденные в рамках международных договоров не выполняются на национальном уровне	Провести анализ потребности в планах действий по сохранению видов. Составить список приоритетных видов. Разработать национальные планы действий по приоритетным видам.	Составить список приоритетных видов животных и растений, для которых необходимо разработать планы действий как на национальном, так и на региональном уровне Выполнить проекты по выполнению элементов международных планов действий для видов животных и растений, утвержденных в рамках международных договоров
Улучшение статуса сохранности видов с сокращающейся численностью	Сохраняется тенденция к уменьшению численности популяций ряда видов	Недостаточно вовлечение местных органов власти в деятельность по восстановлению видов. Недостаток методических рекомендаций по данной тематике	Составить перечень международных руководств по восстановлению видов, перевести их на украинский язык и распространить среди заинтересованных учреждений и организаций. Выполнить планы действий по приоритетным видам.	Обеспечить внедрение на местном уровне международно признанных руководств и практик, направленных на сохранение и восстановление редких и исчезающих видов животных и растений, уменьшение действия на них негативных факторов

Элемент целевых задач 11 и 12	Положение дел	Пробелы	Возможности	Приоритетные действия
Контроль инвазивных видов	Проведен обзор состояния проблемы в Украине	Отсутствует национальная стратегия контроля за чужеродными инвазивными видами	Разработать стратегию контроля за инвазивными чужеродными видами и начать выполнение ее элементов	Составить список наиболее опасных инвазивных чужеродных видов животных и растений. Разработать основы стратегии контроля за инвазивными чужеродными видами
Другие меры			Выполнить план действий по охраняемым территориям, поданный Украиной в Секретариат КБР (Action Plan for Implementing the Programme of Work on Protected Areas of the CBD).	Обеспечить выполнение плана действий по охраняемым территориям

16. Uzbekistan

Элемент целевых задач 11 и 12	Положение дел	Пробелы	Возможности
Количественные элементы: наземные и морские	<p>В настоящее время для поддержания биоразнообразия в республике образованы и функционирует сеть охраняемых природных территорий (ОПТ) общей площадью 2461709,8га (1-5 категории) или 5.5 % от площади республики. В нашей стране нет морских ОПТ, имеются только наземные.</p> <p>В соответствии с законом Республики Узбекистан «Об охраняемых природных территориях» ОПТ в зависимости от их целевого назначения и режима подразделяются на следующие категории:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> государственные заповедники; комплексные (ландшафтные) заказники; природные парки; государственные памятники природы; территории для сохранения, воспроизводства и восстановления отдельных природных объектов и комплексов; охраняемые ландшафты; территории для управления отдельными природными ресурсами. <p>Кроме того, к ОПТ включен биосферные резерваты.</p> <p>Так, на сегодняшний день в Республике организованы и функционируют: 8 государственных заповедников (1 категория) (201705,3га), 3 государственных природных парков (3 категория) (598732,4га), 10 памятники природы (4 категории) (3680,6 га), 13 заказников и 3 питомника по разведению редких и исчезающих видов животных (5 категория) (1588874 га) и один государственный биосферный резерват (вне категории) (68717,8 га).</p> <p>К охраняемым ландшафтам (6 категория) относятся водоохранные зоны, прибрежные полосы водных объектов, зоны формирования поверхностных и подземных вод. На сегодняшний день их территория составляет более 200 тыс. га.</p> <p>Лесхозы и лесохозяйственные хозяйства включены как седьмая категория ОПТ. Их территория составляет 8896983,1га</p> <p>Территории всех категорий ОПТ составляет более 28% территорий Узбекистана.</p>	11,5%	<p>Постановлением Кабинета Министров Республики Узбекистан №255 от 29 августа 2015 года «О комплексной программе мер по смягчению последствий Аральской катастрофы, восстановлению и социально- экономическому развитию региона Приаралья на 2015-2018годы» предусмотрено создание 10 новых ОПТ с общей площадью 3.7 млн. га.</p> <p>Необходимо привлечь финансирование со стороны ГЭФ или других международных финансовых институтов для реализации имеющихся проектных предложений.</p>

Экологическая репрезентативность	Заповедники расположены преимущественно в горных районах, на равнинах же заповедники организованы преимущественно вдоль рек на участках тугаев.	Анализ существующих ОПТ показывает, что объем и репрезентативность природных территорий недостаточны для сохранения ландшафтов и биологических объектов, представленных на этих территориях. Отсутствие строго охраняемых заповедных зон в пустынных районах порождает проблемы в сохранении многих видов крупных млекопитающих (джейран, сайгак, манул, каракал и др.) и птиц (сокол балабан, дрофа красотка (джек), чернобрюхий и белобрюхий рябки и др.), а также некоторых уникальных местных видов и подвидов рептилий.	Для решения данной проблемы в пустынных зонах Постановлением Кабинета Министров Республики Узбекистан №255 от 29 августа 2015 года «О комплексной программе мер по смягчению последствий Аральской катастрофы, восстановлению и социально- экономическому развитию региона Приаралья на 2015-2018годы» предусмотрены создания 10 новых ОПТ с общей площадью 3.7 млн. га. Необходимо привлечь финансирование со стороны ГЭФ или других международных финансовых институтов для реализации имеющихся проектных предложений.
Районы, имеющие важное значение для биоразнообразия Районы, имеющие важное значение для экосистемных услуг	В настоящее время озера «Денгизкуль» и Айдар-Арнасайская система озер включены в Рамсарский список, как водно-болотные угодья, имеющие важное значение для перелетных птиц. Работы в области оценки экосистемных услуг находятся в начальной стадии. Проведена частичная оценка сервиса экосистемных услуг одной ОПТ страны (Угам – Чаткальском национальном Парке, Flermonica 2015 GIZ). Определены и включены в международный список 51 важнейших орнитологических территории (IBA).	Отсутствие национальной методики оценки экосистемных услуг	Разработано проектное предложение «Устойчивое управление природными и лесными ресурсами в ключевых горных регионах, важные для глобально значимых видов биоразнообразия» для финансирования со стороны ПРООН-ГЭФ. Подготовлены предложения для включения в Рамсарский список 2 водных объектов и направлены в секретариат Конвенции.
Оценка эффективности управления	Оценка эффективности управления ОПТ в Республике Узбекистан проводился в рамках реализованных международных проектов ПРООН-ГЭФ (по методике METT, UNDP Scorecard assessment на двух уровнях: национальном и на уровне отдельных ОПТ). Проведена оценка заповедников и биосферного резервата -	Отсутствие национальных стандартов оценки эффективности управления ОПТ.	

	<p>средняя оценка колебалась 40-60 баллов.</p> <p>Все заповедники и биосферный резерват имеют Планы Управления (ПУ). Структура и процедура согласования ПУ утверждены на государственном уровне.</p> <p>Национальным законодательством определены виды контроля над управлением ОПТ. Действует более 40 законов и подзаконных актов.</p>		
Руководство и справедливость	<p>Имеется соответствующая нормативно-правовая база для участия местных органов власти в вопросах контроля сохранением биоразнообразия и деятельности ОПТ.</p>	<p>На практике участие органов самоуправления граждан, негосударственных некоммерческих организаций и граждан в организации, охране и использовании охраняемых природных территорий в начальной стадии.</p>	<p>Закон «Об экологическом контроле» предусматривает создание института инспекторов общественного экологического контроля</p>
Связность и коридоры	<p>Ведется работа по обеспечению благоприятных условий для видовой разнообразия флоры и фауны и устойчивости миграционных путей крупных млекопитающих (хищных и копытных), однако в недостаточной степени. Имеется Сурханский заповедник на границе между Узбекистаном и Туркменистаном (граничащий с Кугитангским заповедником в Туркменистане), обеспечивающий трансграничные переходы копытных (винторогий козел, бухарский баран). Создается комплексный (ландшафтный) заказник на границе с Казахстаном для обеспечения территориальной охраны на миграционном пути сайгака. На территории Казахстана также создается ОПТ. Это облегчает миграцию сайгаков.</p> <p>Существует охрана на путях сезонного перемещения бухарского оленя (Кызылкумский заповедник со стороны Узбекистана и Амударьинский заповедник со стороны Туркменистана). Расположение Угам-Чаткальского Национального Парка также имеет трансграничный характер призванный сохранять во время сезонных миграций такие виды как снежный барс, сибирский горный козел, тьяншанский архар, перемещающихся через границы Узбекистана, Казахстана и Киргизстана. Однако в связи со слабостью режима территориальной охраны и недостаточностью финансовых и человеческих ресурсов данная функция выполняется не в полной мере.</p>	<p>В законодательстве отсутствует такая форма территориальной охраны как экологический коридор.</p> <p>Не охвачены коридорами заповедники, которые имеют 2 и более участков (например Чаткальский биосферный заповедник).</p> <p>Не охвачены территориальной охраной важные с точки зрения неразрывности ландшафта и обеспечения строгой охраной во время миграции в Западном Тянь-Шане (например, бассейн р. Акбулак, верховья р. Пскем), Памиро-Алае (например верховья р. Тупаланг), Южном Устюрте.</p>	<p>Разработаны предложения в рамках планируемого крупномасштабного проекта ПРООН-ГЭФ по расширению Чаткальского заповедника:</p> <p>за счет присоединения бассейна р. Акбулак на границе с Киргизстаном,</p> <p>создания коридора между Башкызылсайским и Майданталским участками Чаткальского заповедника</p> <p>создания строго охраняемой зоны в верховья р. Пскем на территории Угам_Чаткальского Национального Парка на границе с Казахстаном,</p> <p>расширение территории Гиссарского заповедника в верховья р. Тупаланг на границе с Таджикистаном. Подготовлен проект Программа по расширению ОПТ, в рамках которой, в том числе, планируется создание</p>

			Национального парка на Южном Устюрте на границе между Узбекистаном, Туркменистаном и Казахстаном.
Включение в более широкие наземные и морские ландшафты	Подготовлен и согласован с заинтересованными министерствами и ведомствам проект Постановления Президента Республики Узбекистан для утверждения новой Национальной Стратегии и Плана действий по сохранению биоразнообразия на 2016-2025 годы, который внесен в Кабинет Министров Республики Узбекистан. В нем предусмотрена разработка проекта постановления Кабинета Министров «Об утверждении Программы развития сети ОПТ на 2016-2025 годы». Разработанные национальные стратегические цели соответствуют решению Конференции Сторон Конвенции 2010 года. Определены четыре стратегические цели, актуальные для Узбекистана.		Довести площадь территорий наземных ОПТ до 2020 года до 12% от территории страны.
Другие эффективные природоохранные меры на порайонной основе	В настоящее время озера «Денгизкуль» и Айдар-Арнасайская система озер включены в Рамсарский список, как водно-болотные угодья, имеющие важное значения для перелетных птиц.	Имеется ряд водных объектов в стране соответствующих критериям для включения в Рамсарский список.	По двум водохранилищам подготовлены все необходимые документы и направлены для рассмотрения в Секретариат Рамсарский Конвенции.
Предотвращение исчезновения известных угрожаемых видов	Каждые 5 лет издается Красная Книга Республики Узбекистан. Подготовлено и согласовано новое Положение о Красной Книге. Ведется Кадастр редких, исчезающих видов флоры и фауны Узбекистана.	Создание условий в местах обитания этих животных и произрастания этих растений, вне территорий действующих ОПТ.	Для сохранения популяции снежного барса разработано проектное предложение «Устойчивое управление природными и лесными ресурсами в ключевых горных регионах, важные для глобально значимых видов биоразнообразия» для финансирования со стороны ПРООН-ГЭФ.

<p>Улучшение статуса сохранности видов с сокращающейся численностью</p>	<p>Для сохранения сокращающейся численности устюртской популяции Сайгака, существующий местный заказник (без образования юридического лица), реорганизуется в комплексный (ландшафтный) заказник с образованием юридического лица, со штатами управления и охраны, а также передачей земли в постоянное пользование (МСОП категория Ib).</p> <p>Разработано проектное предложение «Устойчивое управление природными и лесными ресурсами в ключевых горных регионах, важные для глобально значимых видов биоразнообразия» для финансирования со стороны ПРООН-ГЭФ.</p>	<p>Необходимо улучшение статуса сохранности видов с сокращающейся численностью.</p>	<p>Создание комплексного(ландшафтного) заказника «Сайгачий».</p> <p>Реализации проекта ПРООН-ГЭФ «Устойчивое управление природными и лесными ресурсами в ключевых горных регионах, важные для глобально значимых видов биоразнообразия» (для сохранения снежного барса и других обитателей высокогорий Западного Тянь-Шаня и Памиро-Алая)</p>
---	---	---	---

Annex IV

NEEDS FOR ACHIEVING AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS 11 AND 12

Equity Governance	Research	Regional Cooperation	Technical Guidance	Legislation/ Policy	Financial Resources	Effectiveness (management/ performance)	Capacity Development (professional/ skills/ competency)	Communication and awareness
Develop pilot projects for good governance and drive technical guidance	Complete the inventory of flora, fauna, fungi, and ecosystems and types of habitats in BiH, and update Red Lists	Align national PAs according to IUCN categories – including trans-boundary context	Encourage usage of Standard for the identification of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), develop relevant guidelines		Management Funding (Stable and Long-term)	Develop projects for effective management of PAs and share best practices	Capacity building for data management and use in decision making	Environmental Education for Primary School Children (with an outdoor component) → in PAs → on topics of PAs and species (overlap with other targets)
Maximum interaction with the local population	Explore opportunities for improving information exchange between countries on species status and measures taken for the conservation of threatened species	Transboundary cooperation	Establish a global register of species action plans, developed under various treaties or by individual countries		Good practice of ecosystem services market	To conduct management effectiveness assessments (developing the methodologies) (BiH)	To establish a team for project applications towards IPA and other international funds (BiH)	Increase public awareness level related to biodiversity protection securing financial resources for projects in BiH
Develop mechanisms to integrate environmental responsibility of stakeholders	Facilitate updating of data on IBAs, implementing relevant projects or action plans		Guidance needed for testing use of the IUCN Green List of Protected Areas					
Urge countries to explore variety of governance types	To develop an ecological network (BiH)		Guidance developed for the use of the Standard for identifying KBAs					
	Drivers of population decline							