



The Beyond 2020 and Global Marine Resolutions Workshop, Washington, DC



**4th – 6th February 2019
The Pew Charitable Trusts, 901 E Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20004 USA**

February, 2019

Please cite this report as: Constant, V., Sullivan, J., Baxter, J.M., & Laffoley, D. 2019. The Beyond 2020 and Global Marine Resolutions Workshop, Washington, February 2019. 21 pp.

Table of Contents

Monday 4th February	4
Introduction to the beyond 2020 work – Harvey Locke	4
Scene setting presentations	5
What would 30% and 50% ocean protection actually look like? - Bethan O’Leary	5
Effectively managed MPAs - what is the real situation, and what might be done about it? & The Green List – Jonas Geldmann & Sue Wells	5
Global ocean conservation priorities – Enric Sala	5
The ‘three conditions idea’ as a basis for post 2020 targets? – Harvey Locke	6
Intervention: Why MPA targets need to be tied to performance targets – Joachim Claudet.....	6
Tuesday 5th & Wednesday 6th February	8
Planning for WCC 2020 Resolutions	8
What makes a good Resolution: The timetable and essential facts to make a Resolution – Carl Lundin	8
Review of previous WCC Resolutions – Stephen Woodley	8
Resolution pitches	8
Resolution on management effectiveness in terrestrial and marine protected areas – Jon Day, Jonas Geldmann & Sue Wells	8
Marine fisheries - Gilly Llewelyn	9
Bringing greater clarity and transparency to marine protected areas - Jane Lubchenco & Kirsten Grorud-Colvert (+ MPA Guide team and feedback in multiple fora).....	10
Protecting and sustainably/effectively managing the whole ocean – Christine Franklin	11
Towards an IMMA Resolution at the next WCC – Tundi Agardi absent, presentation by Jon Day	11
Defining industrial fishing – Angelo Villagomez & Ian Hendy.....	12
Advancing conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction - Lauren Kubiak	13
Proposed Motion on Deep Seabed Mining - John Vermilye	13
Gaps identified	14
Specific volunteers to liaise externally:	14
Wednesday 6 February presentations	15
Report on status of Beyond Aichi Targets: Clarity, Quality, Quantity, Right Places and Connections – Harvey Locke	15
Planning for WWC 2020 – Carl Lundin	16
Planning for IMPAC5 – Sabine Jensen	16
OECM guidance update – Stephen Woodley	16
List of IUCN Member Organizations at this meeting	17
Final Agenda	18
Attendees list and contacts	20

Monday 4th February

Workshops Overview

- The purpose of this invitation only self-funded workshop was to continue discussions on the shape of post 2020 targets and to consider what new Resolutions are needed in time to submit to the World Conservation Congress which will be held in Marseille in 2020.
- It was the fourth in series of meetings held over the last year: IUCN Standards (2018), Meeting 2: MPA Guide (2018), Meeting 3: Paris (2018), Meeting 4: Beyond 2020 and Global Ocean Resolutions
- In particular the post 2020 discussions were another in the series of consultations that are set in the context of continuing discussions the IUCN WCPA Beyond the Aichi Targets Task Force (chaired by Harvey Locke) is having with terrestrial and marine experts. These discussions have a focus on the shape of the targets the world needs when the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity is revisited once the CBD Aichi Target deadline is reached in 2020.
- The Resolutions discussions that naturally follow the Post-2020 target discussion for this workshop were set in the context of previous successful Resolutions that interact with marine protection and management, any issues arising from the post 2020 discussions the day before, as well as new developments such as the MPA Guide that may need resolution support and new ideas from Members. The thinking about Resolutions focused on those with global application at this event. The purpose of the workshop was to facilitate idea sharing between like-minded experts - there was no intent for there to be full agreement on these exploratory motions as an outcome of this meeting.
- Deep appreciation to Pew for their amazing support for the workshop, to Jenna Sullivan and Vanessa Constant for note taking and report preparation, to Jane Lubchenco for supporting Jenna and Vanessa to attend from Oregon State University, to John Baxter for editorial work and help on this workshop report, and to Harvey Locke for his support and assistance in making this workshop happen.

Overarching recommendations & Discussion themes:

- Need greater clarity and uniformity of language
- Use existing IUCN Resolution 50 language
- Build connections between SDGs, Target 5, Target 10 (beyond SDG 14/Aichi 11)
- Anticipate and incorporate changing climate
- Elevate protection issues at interface habitats (without sacrificing deep sea, seamounts, and other habitats)
- Integrate ocean, terrestrial, and freshwater protection in a way that doesn't bury ocean issues and is sensitive to governance challenges
- Highlight linkages/synergies between ocean and climate
- Emphasize both quantity and quality in MPAs and other effectively managed areas
 - Be sensitive to human issues
- Connectivity is important
- MPA effectiveness should be assessed via outcomes that are based on the best indicators
- Embrace holistic approaches without losing sight of the goal(s)

Introduction to the beyond 2020 work – Harvey Locke

- Long standing history of targets and protections in marine and terrestrial settings

- Need nature-based targets (i.e. half-earth)
- How to build global momentum around solutions? Engagement and technical advice
- Use established terminology (i.e. IUCN language)
- Presented survey of expert opinions: large area-based conservation targets are useful
- Paris Meeting (Meeting 3 of 4):
 - Q1: How much marine protection is needed?
 - Q2: How should we think about connectivity in context of global targets?
 - Q3: Should we integrate land and sea targets?
 - Q4: Do the three conditions apply in the ocean (Three Conditions Framework)?

Discussion points:

- Targets assume all MPAs are effective (some are not) - do we need more ambition?
- Target achievement depends on goal - non-extinction, or more?
- Need to consider and plan for future climate conditions
- Indicators of effectiveness: How do we ensure governance and regulations are working? How do we determine how much money needs to be invested to make them effective? How to balance effectiveness with complexity in targets?
 - (1) good governance, (2) effective management, (3) proper ecological design, (4) conservation outcome

Scene setting presentations

What would 30% and 50% ocean protection actually look like? - Bethan O'Leary

- Used Marxan modelling to generate protected area network design options, each of which met conservation targets but had different socio-economic costs (to fishing)
- Setting coverage targets at the level of individual conservation features means the overall coverage of MPA network designs will be larger than targets used
 - 36-42% to achieve 30% coverage targets
 - 52-59% to achieve 50% coverage targets

Effectively managed MPAs - what is the real situation, and what might be done about it? & The Green List – Jonas Geldmann & Sue Wells

- Effectiveness = planning + performance
- Need resources to deliver all benefits - staff capacity + budget (Gill et al., 2017 *Nature*)
- Green List aim: incentivize protected and conserved areas globally and support fair governance and effective management to achieve conservation outcomes

Discussion points:

- There were concerns about whether Green List is able to measure ecological benefits
- This is a fundamental aim of the Green List, but problem comes in ability to actually assess conservation outcome

Global ocean conservation priorities – Enric Sala

- Conservation priorities for ocean - biodiversity, food provision, climate mitigation
- Team is putting together a map with spatially-explicit cost/benefit analysis of priority/optimal areas for protection

Discussion points:

- Important to standardize messages that arise from different tools
- People are motivated by quantitative targets

- Important to focus not only on most degraded or pristine areas, but also middle ground

The 'three conditions idea' as a basis for post 2020 targets? – Harvey Locke

- Three global conditions for biodiversity conservation and restoration (e.g. Halpern, B. S. et al. A global map of human impact on marine ecosystems. Science 319, 948–952 (2008))
 - (1) Crowded, fertile, and developed areas: mainstream sustainable practices. Endangered species, high biodiversity, save all the fragments
 - (2) Open landscape: ecologically representative and connected protected areas
 - (3) Wild places: ecological processes are the priority, protect whole/unfragmented ecosystems and indigenous knowledge; look for things we want to maintain system wide (e.g. peat in ground, rainforest stands, etc.)
- Be strategic about which places we protect, and what role countries can play relative to their situation (i.e. a state may not have, but still can influence, all three conditions)

Discussion points:

- Holistic management (earth perspective not ecosystem specific perspective)
- Maps need to be interpreted with caution (e.g. disproportionate climate impacts in polar regions do not show up on map)
- Consider both full-protection and managed areas as well

A higher per cent target, new designations, management effectiveness, and other options

Intervention: Why MPA targets need to be tied to performance targets – Joachim Claudet

- Many MPAs are not conferring any benefits at all
- Need dynamic targets based on outcomes that can change over space and time
- Need clear performance goal to increase support from business sector

Participant Discussion

- *How should we consider connectivity in post-2020 targets and linkage to Convention on Migratory Species?*
 - Does connectivity matter? Can use “rules of thumb” (size, space, and movement matter), but shouldn’t be a barrier to getting started
 - SLOSS debate: intended outcomes can influence design - both large and small MPAs in a network are useful depending on goal
 - CMS defines four types of connectivity: landscape, ecological, habitat, evolutionary process
 - Three areas of connectivity: within LMEs, between LMEs, between land and sea
 - Include examples to make the term “connectivity” concrete for policymakers
- *How do we consider the terrestrial - marine interface (mangroves, sea grass, estuaries, salt marshes, wetlands) in conservation targets?*
 - Agency/organization silos present barriers to unifying and operationalizing
 - Different agencies are charged with different responsibilities and have different views
 - Separate connectivity targets between major biomes of the earth
 - Extract it from Target 11 and make it at the forefront of CBD
 - Are interface zones (aquatic, terrestrial, marine) disproportionately important? Included as representative habitats or with specific targets?

- Balance interface zones with other important areas (e.g. high seas)
 - Think about processes, not just habitats
 - Draw attention to specific areas to make tracking easier
 - Develop indicator of representativity
 - Don't forget value of no-go category
 - Don't separate out climate from biodiversity - unified conversation
 - Aggregate research showing how global biodiversity looks (30% vs. 50% targets)
- *How do we ensure marine conservation linkage to the UNFCCC?*
 - Improve messaging around bi-directional impacts (oceans and climate) and the key role of oceans in mitigation/adaptation
 - Emphasize connections between SDGs
 - Be more explicit about CBD role in supporting delivery of UNFCCC and SDGs
 - To bring biodiversity to the forefront, emphasize the economic value of nature, "intact" ecosystems on both land and sea
 - Weave into other conversations (e.g. Marseille, IPBES assessment)
- *Can we come to a DC agreement?*
 - Thoughts on Paris consensus statements: remove negative statements (e.g. fisheries exclusion), try to convey sense of urgency, add OECMs
 - Proposed language: "We urgently need healthy, productive, and resilient ecosystems in 100% of the ocean. To achieve this, we need (by 2030) at least 30% in fully and highly protected areas, 20% in OECMs, and sustainable use of rest of ocean plus reduction of land-based sources of pollution including climate change and habitat destruction, for example in coastal areas."
 - Proposed changes: add language "all effectively managed", "delivering biodiversity outcomes", "areas that balance human use with the conservation of nature", "including categories 5 and 6"
 - Note: these percentages are not the cure all - we need more per cent protection to achieve outcomes, but there is no "silver bullet" number
 - No consensus reached - outstanding issues RE: OECM usage, percentages (i.e. if OECMs provide conservation benefits equivalent to MPAs, then we are actually calling for 50% protection here)
 - Consider less ambitious area targets but more ambitious management/resource target?
 - We need to consider both simultaneously (e.g. we can't protect as effectively after degradation)
- *Should we use separate targets for marine and terrestrial systems or one integrated target?*
 - A holistic target requires explicit statements (e.g. 30% protection = 30% of land and 30% of ocean)
 - Incorporating fresh water may be politically challenging
- *Is the three conditions framework applicable to marine realm?*
 - Can allow us to talk about restoration
 - If we lump together, might lose oceans

Tuesday 5th & Wednesday 6th February

Planning for WCC 2020 Resolutions

What makes a good Resolution: The timetable and essential facts to make a Resolution – Carl Lundin

- Motion outcomes - resolutions (to IUCN) or recommendations (to third parties)
- Motion focus - conservation issues and advance environmental policies, linked to IUCN Programme or Commission mandates, address internal governance issues of IUCN
- Motion timeline: Key dates to remember
 - Submit motion: 2 May 2019 - 28 August 2019
 - Publication of motions: ~30 October 2019
 - Online discussion of motion: 11 December 2019 - 11 March 2020
 - Electronic vote on motions: ~29 April 2020 - 13 May 2020
 - Publication of results: ~29 May 2020
 - Submission of new and urgent motions: 4 -16 June 2020
 - Members' assembly: 16 -19 June 2020
- Members also invited to:
 - Comment on IUCN Programme 2021 - 24 (deadline 30 September 2019)
 - Propose candidates for various positions (deadline December 2019)
 - Proposed amendments to statutes (11 December 2019)
- Advice from discussion: need to look at both IUCN and CBD - if ultimate goal is CBD related, need to first know what you want to get from IUCN congress; this is a campaign - ticking off one box isn't sufficient

Review of previous WCC Resolutions – Stephen Woodley

- Need 10 members to support a motion (+ meet timetable, propose new resolution, build on previous resolutions when possible)
- To get to Assembly floor, has to pass both voting houses (Government, NGO/Indigenous)
- Searchable database on IUCN portal: portals.iucn.org/library/resrec/search
- Consider relevant UN Resolutions, clarify/build on existing, e.g. IUCN Resolution 57
- May need more urgency and targeted Resolutions (e.g. restoration)
- Have diversity of representation in co-sponsors (i.e. from global north/south, governments/other members)

Resolution pitches

Resolution on management effectiveness in terrestrial and marine protected areas – Jon Day, Jonas Geldmann & Sue Wells

- **Focus:** Promote/encourage and provide technical support and resources (build capacity for assessing management effectiveness, establish knowledge sharing mechanisms, develop tools to facilitate and improve assessments, increase reporting to UNEP - WCMC/WDPA to track global progress in assessments)

- **Application:** Understand gaps and weaknesses; assessment as part of national reporting ensures quality component is measured and taken seriously; no reporting on assessment outcomes, inadequate knowledge sharing, best practice guidance for assessments
- **Outcome:** Improve management effectiveness of PAs, implementation of assessments, (credible methods, flexible/adaptable), greater reporting of management effectiveness to UNEP/WCMC, measurable element in post-2020 targets

Discussion:

- Put in context of good governance, emphasize need for capacity and resources
- Should have diversity of representation in co-sponsors (i.e. from global north/south, specific governments/other members)
- Mandates are useful for WDPA - UNEP/WCMC accountability

Additional suggestions from Wednesday working groups:

- Coordinate with transparency resolution
- Cut across agency silos
- Call for government and civil society to create MPAs, implement and monitor
- Clear links to MPA guide - complimentary but not duplicative
- Effective management of MPA estate is priority - need capacity and resources
- Value in including an “ask” for money and discussions if it could detract from focus
- Clear links to MPA guide - complimentary but not duplicative
- Effective management of MPA estate is priority
- Need capacity and resources
- Value in including an “ask” for money and discussions if it could detract from focus
- Diversity of representation in co-sponsors

Reflections from feedback:

- Feel endorsed by MPA people, and will go ahead; excited to tie marine and non-marine together at beginning
- Resolution came together because of push of this meeting; because of conversations here, plan to balance complexity of objectives with outcomes to identify indicators; resolution and also working towards measurable new targets; would love more input

Offered to help: Sue L, Naomi

Marine fisheries - Gilly Llewelyn

- **Focus:** spotlight on benefits of MR/MPAs and networks on fish population recovery and contribution to ocean health, motivating criteria for MPA establishment
- “This resolution focuses on ocean health more broadly and explicitly links up fisheries management with area-based equitable and effective management tools, including MPAs. It also paves the way for the development of an associated goal, as part of the post 2020 targets under the 2030 agenda for sustainable development.”
- **Application:** Urges “states, both individually in areas within national jurisdiction, and as members of regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) in areas beyond national jurisdiction, to ensure that area based management tools, including MPAs, are a key and routine component for managing fisheries to being ecologically sustainable, and to ensure their role in securing ocean health and food security, and seen in the context of the ecosystem.”
- **Outcome:** bridge between protected areas and fisheries management

Discussion:

- Consider ABNJ, indigenous communities, incentives to individual fishers, recreational fisheries, high arctic
- Anticipate pushback from fishing communities

Additional suggestions from Wednesday working groups:

- Keep it global, don't lose high seas – “one ocean” narrative
- MPAs working with high seas versus MPAs as a fisheries management tool
- Clarify the purpose of the motion
- Consider non-RFMOS
- Large body of contemporary relevant science should be collated
- Cultural benefits
- Explore cosponsors
- Consider ABNJ, indigenous communities, incentives, etc
- Anticipate pushback from fishing communities and bureaucrats

Reflections from feedback:

- Clarify the intent and that this is not creating a framework for fishery management

Offered to help: Sabine

Bringing greater clarity and transparency to marine protected areas - Jane Lubchenco & Kirsten Grorud-Colvert (+ MPA Guide team and feedback in multiple fora)

- **Focus:** Increase effectiveness of existing PAs; create and support more, effective PAs
- **Application:** Two classification categories in the MPA Guide matrix:
 - Stage of establishment: Committed/Announced, Designated, Implemented, Actively Managed
 - Level of protection: Fully Protected, Highly Protected, Lightly Protected, Minimally Protected
- **Outcome:**
 - Replace confusion and argument about MPAs with clarity and transparency; connect outcomes to protection levels
 - Facilitate tracking, reporting, and evaluation
 - Enable productive post-2020 action, i.e. IUCN Resolution 50

Discussion:

- Challenge is to operationalize; concern that we need agreement on categories, and that agreement will take too long for this resolution timeline; suggested that guide wouldn't be Resolution, it would be concept for Guide, that we need increased clarity
- Concern that there are other important factors influencing effectiveness of MPAs than just level of protection (e.g. design within network, partnerships involved)
- Harmonize with existing systems to avoid disruption/confusion (i.e. regulation-based system, IUCN categories); MPA Guide builds on these systems, doesn't displace them
- Stages of establishment are not linear - can backslide, skip, or stagnate between stages
- Simplicity/agreement with existing systems makes it useful - not new terms, just clarified
- Deal with multi-use zones without averaging an MPA into one category
- Terrestrial and marine applications
- Some confusion on if “Minimally protected” category is an MPA at all
- WDPA/MPAtlas are working to link up, to get MPA Guide operationalized

Additional suggestions from Wednesday working groups:

- For Resolution, focus on framework for tracking - not on the Guide itself
- Keep it separate from the 30% call
- Should link into and be cross referenced by other resolutions
- Valuable for clarity and transparency on various PA numerical reports
- Tool valuable for better alignment of MPAtlas and WDPA

Reflections from feedback:

- Moving ahead based on your feedback
- Resolution will be focused on the framework and concepts, not the Guide itself

- Key outstanding issue: focus on marine or all PAs?
- Intend to continue to collaborate with other resolutions
- Moving ahead with publishing a peer reviewed paper with Guide details
- Guide is a work-in-progress
 - Struck by difference in response to written document vs. post presentation and discussion
 - We need your help to come up with a written document that does a better job of explaining our goal. **Please send edits or high-level comments to Kirsten Grorud-Colvert grorudck@science.oregonstate.edu by 14th February 2019**
- Will continue to work with WDPA and Atlas of Marine Protection toward useful and consistent framing
- We have engaged with global colleagues to receive input on this
- Developing socialization strategy including, but not exclusive to, a Resolution

Offered to help: Dan, John, Jon, Naomi, Jonas, Bethan, Mirella, Marine, Sabine, Jennifer, Lauren W, Emanuel, Deb Castellana, Lauren K, Ian, Beth, Russell, Joachim, Angelo (and Pew Team), Gilly, Gabby, Ginny, Christine S., Sue W, Stephen

Protecting and sustainably/effectively managing the whole ocean – Christine Franklin

- **Focus:** To convey the urgency of protecting the ocean, reinforce IUCN and IUCN member support for increased marine protected area coverage, establish support for the concept of sustainably managing the coastal and marine areas outside of those covered by MPAs and OECMs, and to urge the Parties to the CBD to increase their ambition for the ocean
- **Application:** Goal is to get this passed at the World Conservation Congress, COP; build towards CBD COP15, propose WCC 2020 motion; call on parties to adopt 30x30; operationalize text outlined in WCC_2016_050
- **Outcome:** Provide further guidance to IUCN; complementary efforts include IUCN standards, management effectiveness, fisheries, high seas, MPA guide (“highly” language), 30x30 land and sea

Additional suggestions from Wednesday working groups:

- Sharpen focus and include more about the other 70%
- Reference MPA guide

Reflections from feedback:

- Need further reflection to decide if this is worth a Resolution
- CBD is priority, IUCN is stepping stone; main goal to get target of at least 30% in post-2020 framework; if 30 by land and sea folks put something in, Pew motion will be subsumed by their efforts but still may contribute

Towards an IMMA Resolution at the next WCC – Tundi Agardi absent, presentation by Jon Day

- **Focus:** Promoting a tool for marine mammal habitat identification that has wide implications for marine conservation promoting a tool for marine mammal habitat ID that has wide implications for marine conservation in national waters and on the high seas
- **Application:** marine mammals can help get better conservation planning as a flagship species, build institutional capacity, easier to monitor, can help with CBD portfolio
- Support identification of useful marine spatial measures
- **Outcome:** raise awareness among IUCN members and alert them to how they can contribute to them and benefit from them
 - Have to have follow-up efforts from local community

- Need to get awareness at this stage, could lead to money later
- Map layer with info about where IMMAs are

Discussion:

- Acronym is confusing because of existing “MM” abbreviation for “marine managed”
- Integrate with key biodiversity areas (KBAs)
- Marine mammal-based management and fisheries issues are co-dependent

Additional suggestions from Wednesday working groups:

- Build on Sydney resolution for 2020
- Consider linking IMMAs with KBAs
- Resolution would be more powerful if linked to designing effective MPA networks

Reflections from feedback:

- Resolution is not appropriate, but want to build momentum and awareness

Defining industrial fishing – Angelo Villagomez & Ian Hendy

- Brief survey of “industrial” definitions: huge range of answers, small scale vs. industrial, qualitative vs. quantitative
- **Focus:** The IUCN Standards for Marine Protected Areas identifies industrial fishing and other activities as incompatible with protection, but do not provide guidance on defining industrial; provide better clarity on the difference between industrial fishing and other types of fishing
- **Application:** Apply IUCN standards to area-based management, to clarify the difference between protected areas and fisheries management, and for advocates to better understand the distinction between protection and sustainable management
- **Outcome:** Tell governments that MPAs don’t comply with IUCN categories, mechanism to feedback, and audit effectiveness
 - Possible definition, based on Daniel Pauly’s response: “Large” motorized vessels, expensive to construct and maintain, in operation everywhere, landing a large catch that is overwhelmingly sold commercially, using some gears that are always industrial (e.g. trawlers, pirogues, longlines, purse seines, baby trawlers, capable of long-distance fishing)

Discussion

- Consult with FAO
- May be useful parallels with forestry and artisanal mining
- Is industrial the same as commercial? Consider scale and effect
- MPA conservation community should write to FAO and ask them to clarify their position on the definition of an MPA because information on their website is being misused.

Additional suggestions from Wednesday working groups:

- Follow up on terrestrial classifications look into other targets and country definitions
- Look across definitions, contact FAO representative, white paper?

Reflections from feedback:

- List of actions to do
 - Check in with FAO
 - Seek government sponsors
 - Follow up with terrestrial classifications
 - Search how other countries define industrial
 - With working group, develop white paper to look into artisanal vs industrial

Advancing conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction - Lauren Kubiak

- **Focus:** Effective management of high seas; “Currently, there are no mechanisms for establishing fully protected marine reserves, nor are there uniform requirements for environmental impact assessments. As a result, overfishing, climate change, and shipping are posing increasing threats to marine biodiversity in our shared ocean.”
- **Application & Outcome:** (paraphrased from Resolution pitch) Make treaty legally binding call for ambitious, robust and comprehensive action for the long-term conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in ABNJ; encourage members to support science-based processes that allow for the establishment of an ecologically representative and well-connected system of MPAs; calls on the Director General, the Commissions and Secretariat to provide technical support and to promote and support the actions described above.

Discussion:

- Act like high seas have been part of the biodiversity target all along (party to a convention e.g. Convention on Migratory Species)
- Recognize wider impact and use common language from resolutions: “area-based management tools” and “well managed”
- Get mechanism in place as a Resolution before involving specific MPA plans
- ABNJ/EEZ distinction irrelevant for marine life
- Consensus-based processes can be unproductive and cause delay - majority voting
- Consider voluntary shipping corridors
- EBSA areas don’t have teeth

Suggestions from Wednesday working groups:

- Recommendations for global decision making
- Add well managed to description and use language from MPA Guide
- Incorporate provisions from CBD and CMS
- Consider how this could become a party to CBD
- More urgency
- Emphasize biodiversity link
- More ambition and unity in language across resolutions

Reflections from feedback:

- Importance of institutional arrangement - create global body with decision making/management power
- Convey urgency, get past EBSA process, emphasize need to establish ASAP and not negotiations stall progress

Proposed Motion on Deep Seabed Mining - John Vermilye

- **Focus:** Address the threats of deep seabed mining and reform the ISA. Set limitations - 50% set-asides for protection, study total % of CCZ to exploit, maximum time frame for exploitation
- **Application:** understand effects of deep-sea mining (ecosystem impacts, modelling, plumes, test mining) and resolve the conflict of interest inherent in the ISA mandate (promote mining and at the same time protect these same resources)
- **Outcome:** “Provide guidance to countries, industry and observers at the ISA and instructions to the IUCN Secretariat to build expertise and a body of knowledge to provide specific guidance to countries and members of the ISA to address the key issues of governance. Maximize protection of the seabed but identifying clearly go, no-go areas, and provide a roadmap and timing to ensure that the Precautionary Principles

are followed and that the BBNJ process can be taken into account when forming the ISA Mining Regulations.”

- More info (deep sea mining report, infographics) at www.gallifrey.foundation

Discussion:

- Prioritize certain areas over others or consider process across all potential DSM habitats
- Proposal to call for a moratorium of deep seabed mining rather than regulations
- Economic argument not necessarily valid
- Put burden of proof of doing no harm on industry

Suggestions from Wednesday working groups:

- Moratorium on all DSM has momentum
- Transparency - contractors obliges to share data and reports on impacts from testing during the exploratory state
- Transparency - ISA require transparency in all venues include legal and technical committee

Reflections from feedback:

- Will go forward, but need help
- Need to work to resolve conflict of interest with ISA
- Need help strategizing/scientific input RE: configuration of APEIs, set asides
- 10-year moratorium could allow for scientific exploration, not guarantee exploitation

Offered to help: Ian; Mirella & Lauren W offered to continue discussions around moratorium

Gaps identified in Resolutions

- **Climate**
- **Restoration**
- **Plastics** (specific interest/expertise from Sabina, Jon, Gilly, Ian, Pew)
- Noise
- Resources (i.e. something similar to global climate fund for MPAs)
- Blue carbon
- Reforming high seas treaty
- Aquaculture
- Funding for decade for ocean science - call to fill gaps in knowledge
- Systematic conservation planning that accounts for climate change impacts

Specific volunteers to liaise externally to help with proposed Resolutions:

- Joachim: French government
- Lauren W.: MPA Agency Partnership, Protected area/climate change working group (??)
- Claudio: countries/agencies in Latin America.
- Gilly: Global Mangrove Alliance
- Mirella: help communication using strategic campaign terms (??)
- Sue W.: coral reef community (ICRI) re: their in-progress Resolution
- Ian: Global Mangrove Alliance, coral reef community, land/sea interface, high seas
- Sabine: liaison in Canada and with Canadian government

Wednesday 6 February presentations

Report on status of Beyond Aichi Targets: Clarity, Quality, Quantity, Right Places and Connections – Harvey Locke

- Overview of workshop
 - Concern about clarity of what we mean with protected areas and their designation process
 - Concern that quality and effective management are essential and strong interest in quantity conversation - we need a lot more
 - Objective = life on earth flourishing, not just reducing the bleeding
- Clarity
 - Genuine interest in the MPA Guide and its applicability across PAs not just MPAs
 - Suggest using: “stages of protected area establishment and management effectiveness” heading
- Quality
 - Resounding agreement that this is an important consideration
 - Quantity is not a threat to quality - need to do both
- Quantity
 - “30%” target vs “at least 30%” target wording has consequences -- explore the 70% space beyond
 - Clear consensus that we need to think about goals that relate to the whole ocean
 - Discussion about it being 30% no take, plus more in nature first or OECMs, with some use at the local level (non-industrial)
 - Discussion about high seas and if we can bring strategic plan on CBD into the high seas UNCLOS process so that the high seas are bound by the same goals as the 196 countries of the world
- Right Places and Connections
 - Terrestrial Marine Interface
 - Interest in unifying these things (e.g. coastal mangroves)
 - Concern that momentum on marine side may be lost in general tendency for terrestrial interests to dominate
 - Restoration
 - Interesting conversation on restoration as a theme
 - Terrestrial restoration meeting occurred in January to connect with the larger conservation community
 - Consider restoration and three conditions on marine side - paper in works for terrestrial
 - Continue to explore if we need specific targets for special features (e.g. mangroves, reefs) - already exist to some extent in Aichi Target 9
 - Three Conditions
 - Growing interest in its applicability in marine realm, but clear desire for further development
 - While the Halpern map shown talks about impacts, other ways of considering the three conditions include proximity to coastlines
 - We will develop this idea further for marine realm, but recognize there is no consensus in the room on what the conditions might mean for marine conservation
 - Deep interest in the room but currently, there is not in a place for direct applicability to the marine realm as it stands

- Conclusions
 - Taskforce process: the path forward
 - Stay tuned: Dan and Harvey strategize process to engage community, ensure ongoing interaction
 - Clear consolidation of some points from Paris meeting, but also need to clarify per cent protected, whole ocean conversations to find consensus
 - Starting point: at least 30% and high degrees of protection
 - 30% is not end goal (see Bethan's paper)

Discussion:

- For three conditions, suggested to not define as gradient in impact, but based on proximity to direct impact (as opposed to indirect impact)
- 3-part MPA framework suggested: Coastal - crowded, competition for space, need small MPAs in networks. Far out in EEZ - larger MPAs in a less crowded space. High seas - huge MPA's are possible.
- "One Ocean" / "One *Healthy* Ocean" perspective
- Socialization timeline and essential meetings
 - Canada on high ambition stuff
 - G7 meeting with nature focus in France
 - Trondheim Norway invite-only conference in July
 - 1st open ended working group meeting in early September
 - SBSTTA will follow and be in service of the open-ended working group

Planning for WWC 2020 – Carl Lundin

- Marseille, France, 12-19 June 2020
- See circulated PowerPoint for more details
- Timetable for getting involved:
 - Call for Contributions (May – Jul 2019)
 - Consultation to IUCN Programme 2021-2024 (May – Sep 2019)
 - Nominate candidates for elections (May – Dec 2019)
 - Book a stand in the Exhibit hall (From Sep 2019)
 - Register for Congress (From Sep 2019)
 - Submit proposals to amend Statutes (By 11 Dec 2019)
 - Electronic discussion on motions (11 Dec '19 – 11 March '20)
 - Member accreditation process (Feb – May 2020)
 - Electronic voting on motions (29 Apr – 13 May 2020 –TBC)
 - Become a sponsor (Anytime)

Planning for IMPAC5 – Sabine Jensen

- Vancouver, Canada, 26 - 30 September 2021
- See circulated PowerPoint for details
- Website – www.impac5.ca

OECS guidance update – Stephen Woodley

- KBA's are supposed to apply in land and sea - an umbrella standard that harmonizes existing approaches

- IRMAs are meant to be converted to KBAs
- Five criteria - threatened biodiversity, geographically restricted biodiversity, ecological integrity, biological processes, irreplaceability through quantitative analysis
- OECMS - prefer to be called conserved areas (i.e. protected vs conserved areas)
- Must have:
 - Defined space
 - Legitimate govt authorities
 - Managed (in ways that achieve positive and sustained outcomes for the conservation of biodiversity)
 - Effective
 - Sustained in long term
 - In situ conservation of biological diversity
- Part of the solution of scaling up
- May be a way to mainstream in situ conservation
- www.cbd.int/decisions/cop/?m=cop-14

Discussion

- WDPA has mandate to track OECMS
- OECMs meant to supplement protected areas, not replace. One-way direction OECM to MPA
- there's a Resolution that Countries should focus on achieving target 11 through protected areas (not OECMs)

Accessing the list of IUCN Member Organizations

- To see who is a Member Organization of IUCN please use this search facility <https://portals.iucn.org/union/members-website>

Final Agenda

Monday 4th February

0830 arrivals

0900 Welcome and self-intro of participants

1015 Objectives of the three-workshop, focus, exploratory nature, constraints, opportunities and expected outcomes – Dan Laffoley

1030 Introduction to the beyond 2020 work – Harvey Locke (10 mins)

1045 - 1115. Coffee/tea

1115 - 1230. Scene setting presentations (10 mins max each)

- What would 30% and 50% ocean protection actually look like? - Callum Roberts & Beth O'Leary
- Effectively managed MPAs - what is the real situation, and what might be done about it? Jonas Geldmann and Sue Wells. The Green List – Sue Wells
- Global ocean conservation priorities – Enric Sala
- The 'three conditions idea' as a basis for post 2020 targets? Harvey Locke

Discussion around a higher percent target, new designations, and management effectiveness and other options

- Intervention: Why MPA targets need to be tied to performance targets – Joachim Claudet

1230 - 1330. Lunch

1330 - 1500. Discussion by participants continued

Topics to include:

- How should we consider connectivity in post- 2020 targets and linkage to Convention on Migratory Species?
- How do we consider the terrestrial -marine interface (mangroves, sea grass, estuaries, salt marshes, wetlands in conservation targets?
- How do we ensure marine conservation linkage to the UNFCCC?
- Simple v complex target formulation – helps or hinders take-up by Governments and Agencies?

1500 - 1530 coffee

1530 - 1700 Discussion by participants continued

1700 - 1800 Concluding comments and next steps

1800 close

Evening dinner together – self funded – At Jaleo

Tuesday 5th February

0830. Arrivals

0900 Planning for WCC 2020 Resolutions

- What makes a good Resolution: The timetable and essential facts to make a Resolution – Carl Lundin
- Review of previous WCC Resolutions – Stephen Woodley

1030 - 1100. Coffee/tea

1100 - 1230. Resolution pitches - 10 minute Members slots on ideas for new Resolutions

- Resolution on management effectiveness in terrestrial and marine protected areas – Jonas Gledmann & Sue Wells
- Marine fisheries - Gilly Llewelyn – text to follow
- Bringing greater clarity and transparency to marine protected areas - Jane Lubchenco & Kirsten Grorud-Colvert
- Protecting and sustainably managing the whole ocean – Christine Franklin
- Towards and IMMA Resolution at the next WCC – Tundi Agardi
- Defining industrial fishing – Angelo Villagomez
- Advancing conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction - Lauren Kubiak
- Proposed Motion on Deep Seabed Mining - John Vermilye

1230 - 1330 lunch

1330 - 1530 Slots continued and discussion on growing and gaining government endorsement for Resolutions

1530 - 1600 coffee/tea

1600 - 1700 Working groups to shape Resolution priorities

1700 close

Free evening for networking

Wednesday 6th February

0830. Arrivals

0900 Feedback from working groups and presentation by groups of Resolution ideas

1100 - 1130. Coffee/tea

1130 Beyond 2020 final discussions

1300 Lunch

1400 Quick-fire essential (10-20 minute) briefing sessions on global priority issues and discussions:

- planning for WWC 2020 - Carl Lundin
- Special Issues of Aquatic Conservation – John Baxter
- planning for IMPAC5 - Sabine Jensen
- Progress on MPA Standards - Dan Laffoley
- OECM guidance update - Stephen Woodley
- Green list implementation and management effectiveness forward look – Sue Wells

1600 Close and departures

Attendees list and contacts

Confirmed attendees for all three days

	Name	email
1	Dan Laffoley	danlaffoley@btinternet.com
2	Carl Lundin	Carl.lundin@iucn.org
3	Ingrid Irigoyen	Ingrid.Irigoyen@aspeninstitute.org
4	Claudio Maretti	claudio.maretti.1958@gmail.com
5	Gonzalo Cid	gonzalo.cid@noaa.gov
6	Stephen Woodley	stephen.woodley@iucn.org
7	Matt Rand	mrands@pewtrusts.org
8	Jon Day	jon.day@my.jcu.edu.au
9	Louie Porta	louieporta@oceansnorth.ca
10	Dan Myers	dmyers@ngs.org
11	Lance Morgan	Lance.Morgan@marine-conservation.org
12	Christine Santora	christine.santora@stonybrook.edu
13	Sue Wells	suewells1212@gmail.com
14	Sabine Jessen	sjessen@cpaws.org
15	Lauren Wenzel	lauren.wenzel@noaa.gov
16	Beth O'Learly	bethan.oleary@york.ac.uk
17	John Baxter	j.baxter4@btinternet.com
18	Jonas Geldmann	jg794@cam.ac.uk
19	Harvey Lock	harvey@wild.org
20	Marine Deguignet	Marine.Deguignet@unep-wcmc.org
21	Naomi Kingston	Naomi.Kingston@unep-wcmc.org
22	Emanuel Gonçalves	egoncalves@oceanozulfoundation.org
23	Gabby Ahmadi	Gabby.Ahmadi@wwfus.org
24	John Vermilye	john@gallifrey.foundation
25	Deb Castellana	dcastellana@mission-blue.org
26	Christine Franklin	cchau@pewtrusts.org
27	Angelo Villagomez	avillagomez@pewtrusts.org
28	Winnie Roberts	groberts@pewtrusts.org
29	Seth Horstmeyer	seth@oceans5.org
30	Joachim Claudet	joachim.claudet@gmail.com
31	Mirella von Lindenfels	mirella@communicationsinc.co.uk
32	Ginny Farmer	gfarmer@conservation.org
33	Jane Lubchenco	lubchenco@oregonstate.edu
33	Kirsten Grorud-Colvert	grorudck@science.oregonstate.edu
34	Russell Moffitt	Russell.Moffitt@marine-conservation.org
35	Ian Hendy	ian@bluemarinefoundation.com
36	Gilly Llewelyn	gllewellyn@wwfint.org
37	Beth Pike	Beth.pike@marine-conservation.org
38	Mike Gravitz	Michael.Gravitz@marine-conservation.org
39	Jennifer Sletten	jennifer@anthinst.org
40	Vanessa Constant*	constanv@science.oregonstate.edu
41	Jenna Sullivan*	sullijen@science.oregonstate.edu
42	Lauren Kubiak	lkubiak@nrdc.org

* official workshop 'key points' scribes!

Confirmed attendees for one day or part of a day

43	Enric Sala	esala@ngs.org	For part of the time on 4th
44	Masha Kalinina	mkalinina@pewtrusts.org	4 th only
45	Shannon Rake	srake@mission-blue.org	6 th only
46	Sue Lieberman	slieberman@wcs.org	4 th pm, 5 th all day, 6 th part
47	Tom Dillon	Vice President, Pew	4 th and 5 th around midday

Via audio, video or Skype

48	Phénia Marras – Aït Razouk	phenia.marras@afbiodiversite.fr	4 th and 5 th in the mornings
49	Nathalie Rey	Nathalie.Rey@oceanunite.org	Specific sessions
50	Raphaëlle Flint	Raphaëlle.Flint@iucn.org	Specific sessions