Group work

1] Summary of regional priorities based on discussions -

- **Pacific - mostly marine focus, community-based management is predominant model – OECM decision of COP welcomed PAME assessments and increased terrestrial coverage, KBAs, ecological representation**
- Malaysia - states have more power hence focus on OECMs, PAs defined as all areas under national jurisdiction
- India – work with OECMs and implementation of 4-step process [identify, map, analyse, report]
- OECM – can't be protected areas and cannot lie within protected areas [one condition of these]

2] Gaps

- Pacific – need more PAME assessments carried out across countries, and more attention on terrestrial PA coverage, incorporating KBAs and AZEs in protected areas and OECMs, need guidance and experience on application of OECM criteria/requirements
- Malaysia – many areas managed by private entities need to be recognised as OECMs
- India - Private sector work and initiatives related to protected areas go largely unnoticed [eg – mangrove protection by some private entities]
- Guidance needed on reporting to the WDPA

3] Opportunities

- Replication of India's experience in resource mobilisation in other areas is possible - proposals to donors for additional resources around October/November, NBSAPs supported through BIOFIN, support to four states as needed, workshops on OECMs nationwide [4-step process]
- India biodiversity Awards – every two years, assessment committee, 800 cases captured so far, internships for mapping OECMs, alignment with national biodiversity act, Target awards around PAME assessments?
- IUCN has developed the greenlist and associated criteria, candidate sites for greenlisting in the ASIA-PACIFIC region, voluntary standard, 3-4 years to do the assessments. Both for PAs and OECMs
- No greenlist sites in India, pacific islands and Malaysia so far
- Greenlisting for Pacific – needs more promotion. IUCN ORO can/should take a greater role in promoting this.
- Regional and national projects – GEF6
- OECM guidance under CBD COP is being updated, screening tool exists but needs to be tested [FAO training on OECMs in fisheries management], interpret and operationalise the guidance, testing on an informal basis would be helpful, [OECMs have to be areas effective for conservation, for OECMs quality prevails above quantity]
- WDPA training for the Pacific sub-region

Monitoring and reporting;

- Reporting to whom and how – WDPA

- Not everything needs to be reported against AT11 – traditional closures wouldn't qualify as an OECM, would fall under Aichi target 6 [sustainable use] so as sustainable fisheries measures. OECMs are important to be counted as part of achieving AT11 – traditional focus on how many protected areas established, shifting focus
- Many countries reported that they want to focus on effective management rather than establishing more protected areas
- Variations on what is reported on by countries – eg-Ramsar sites are reported on and sometimes not, not - formal protected areas in some case
- **Focal points might not necessarily be dealing with OECMs – WCMC now recognises reporting from NGOs**
- **ICCA registry** – some ICCAs are located in protected areas and danger of double counting si an issue
- **Temporal version of WDPA** – track changes over time in country data [WDPA ID changes etc,]
- Double counting of ICCAs as OECMs a potential issue ICCAs – self recognised and self-reported, others cannot report on these without their consent
- GD PAME – assessments recorded, what year, methodology
- India – many OECMs and a lot of work done already but has not reported PA information is traditionally from government, what about OECMs? – eg – army areas which are government managed, can be co-managed, government or NGO managed
- Monitoring – review of 6NR – suggest that each region undertake this, NBSAP review and update, other existing national and regional monitoring and reporting mechanisms