A Report for the CEESP on the Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) Delineation Workshop organized by the IUCN during 10 -15 March 2013, Front Royal, Virginia, USA.

The joint task force of the World Commission of protected Areas (WCPA) and the Species Survival Commission initiated the process of delineation of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) which are the areas of global persistence of biodiversity. The initiative is not meant to duplicate but build upon some of the existing delineations like the global biodiversity hotspots, global eco regions, important plant, fungal and bird areas. The framing workshop at Cambridge UK in June 2012 prepared a preliminary road map to the delineation which was further fine tuned during the workshop held during 11 to 15 March 2013 at Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute, at Virginia, USA. The working papers prepared for the workshop delved on data deficiency situations and availability of newer information like the phylogenetic diversity and information at the sub-specific levels.

The workshop was organised with a major objective to develop criterion for delineation and began with a very strong mindset to identify KBAs only on the biological values, The CEESP representation in the workshop with some participants expressed an aspiration that it will be possible to reconsider by the workshop organizers, inclusion of social and ecological values and traditional knowledge systems in the delineations. It was hoped that KBAs identified through the process would not lead to people and KBA conflicts.

Different working groups *viz*.,the criteria, the delineation.,the threshold, the documentation and the end users.: worked simultaneously to contribute to the process,

The Criterion Work Group

Five Criteria were developed by the Criterion Group to identify sites contributing significantly to the global persistence of biodiversity. All sites should be assessed against all the criteria, but meeting any one of the criteria is enough to qualify a site as a Key Biodiversity Area. These are:

A. Sites contributing significantly to the global persistence of threatened biodiversity
B. Sites contributing significantly to the global persistence of geographically restricted biodiversity
C. Sites contributing significantly to the global persistence of biodiversity through their ecological integrity
D. Sites contributing significantly to the global persistence of outstanding biological processes
E. Sites contributing significantly to the global persistence of biodiversity as determined by quantitative analysis

The Thresholds working Group.

The aforementioned Fifth (Criteria E), based on formal calculations of Irreplaceability will be developed later, based on the results of the discussions of the Thresholds Working Group. There are sub-criterions to each of the aforesaid criteria.

The Delineation Working Group

The delineation working group proposed ten points of agreement have been reached during the workshop, even though their wording requires further refinement. These are as under:

1. Delineation is a process that requires guidance, rather than rigid prescription. There is not one model.
2. There is considerable experience and documentation to build on for global guidance (e.g. IBA, EBSA).
3. Delineation should occur in collaboration with all relevant stakeholders. Stakeholder selection is contextual to scale and region. Where site delineation overlaps with areas owned, occupied, managed or claimed by indigenous peoples, the principle of free prior and informed consent (FPIC) should be observed when implying or recommending that those sites be managed for biodiversity. (Stakeholders definition will be included in a glossary under development).
4. Biodiversity that is triggered by the criteria should be mapped using the best available information, including traditional knowledge. Step 1 is always biological mapping. This mapping should be retained for reference. Step 2 will try to develop boundaries that best support the likelihood of persistence of biodiversity for which the site is important. In Step 2, the biological map will always be considered as an option for the KBA boundary.
5. Biological/Ecological information is necessary, but not always sufficient, to map useful KBA boundaries. We need to recognize both biological and management complexity in defining useful, practical boundaries for KBAs. For example, areas of high biodiversity with multiple overlapping polygons, species with large home ranges, and areas of continuous habitat, are not easily mapped biologically and need practical solutions.
6. Boundaries should be informed by management considerations, land tenure and customary rights where demanded by site-based realities and practicalities (e.g, political boundaries, linguistic boundaries, other land uses.). The reason for this is that the aim for KBA delineation is beyond “mere” identification. It aims to delineate areas that have the best chance to support the likelihood of persistence of biodiversity for which the site is important.
7. KBA boundaries should aim to minimize the amount of additional land added that is not relevant to the persistence of biodiversity features. KBA delineation should aim to identify sites that have the potential to be effectively managed. Where data deficiency precludes the identification of biological units, then the precautionary principle should be applied to ensure sufficient area is considered.
8. The KBA delineation Guidance document will include illustrative case studies for each criterion.
9. Each KBA should contain a regional context statement, e.g. whole area is high conservation value.
10. Delineation of KBAs should always be considered as iterative and there is a requirement for adaptive learning. Delineation may change over time for the same feature (due to climate change impacts, improved data, changes in species status, etc.). The cartography and documentation around delineation decisions should highlight the level of confidence around KBA boundaries.

The documentation group proposed a following outline to the KBA nomination sheet. (* indicate optional information)

- KBA Name
- Geographic Locality Information (e.g., country, coordinates)
- KBA category
- Bio-geographical realm*
- Site type/s (e.g., terrestrial, marine, freshwater, subterranean)*?
- Concise Site Summary Description (stand-alone, for general audience, with word limit)
- "Trigger" biodiversity features
- KBA criteria that are met (all relevant criteria)
  - Justification on how criteria are met (based on available data)
- KBA criteria not met*?
  - Brief explanation on why criteria are not met/relevant*?
    Rationale: End user needs information on the criteria that are met and not met
- Administrative jurisdiction
- Customary jurisdiction
- Land tenure and use regimes
- Relevant stakeholders (decision makers, conservation agencies, land owners, local people)
- Spatial data layers
  - elevation/bathymetry
  - habitat
  - "trigger" biodiversity features
  - other biodiversity features (optional)
  - land/sea cover or use over time (when known)
  - administrative and land tenure
  - proposed delineation of KBA boundaries
- Explanation of delineation of proposed KBA boundaries
- Photographs and Videos (with captions) of KBA and its features (guidelines to be given)
- Site status and designation history (e.g., protected area status)
- Ecosystem services*
- Socio-economic values (e.g., including degree of dependence of local communities for livelihood)*?
- Cultural values (where applicable and known)*
- Major site-related threats and pressures
- Conservation actions in-place (including impact where known)*?
- Recommended conservation actions at the site*?
- Important information gaps*
- Relative viability
- Assessors, Contributors, Evaluators (following IUCN terminology)
- Data Sources
- Engagement of stakeholders in KBA assessment

Submission should be accepted in any IUCN language (English, French, Spanish)

The group felt that Communication to Groups doing KBA Assessment (= assessors) or the end users should be engaged throughout the process. The target groups identified are as follows:

Target Groups

- General conservation community - e.g., NGOs
- Scientific community
- Academic institutions (in KBA country, outside KBA country)
- Governments

- Local communities near potential KBAs

Communication Packages to be developed

- Manual/s
- Guidelines (e.g., little red booklet)
- Training package/s (e.g., online, workshops)
- Case studies ("perfect" assessment)

Target Groups for Information in KBA Documentation (=end-users)

- General conservation community - e.g., NGOs
- Scientific community
- Academic institutions (in KBA country, outside KBA country)
- Educational Sector
- Governments
- EU
- Multilateral environmental agreements (CBD, CMS)
- Private sector - banking, extractive industries
- Press and Media
- Local communities
- Local government
- Indigenous communities
- Development agencies (international, national)
- Health sectors
- UN organizations (UN,FAO, UNDP)
- Agricultural sector
- Fisheries
- Forestry
- General public
- Other

Communication Packages to be developed

- Website/s
- Data entry tools
- Scientific publications
- Audio-visual presentations for general public
- Presentations at key meetings (e.g., COPs)
- Fact sheets for key target groups
- Workshops with end users

These communication packages need to relate to the perspective and use the "language" of each audience

Some of the issues that were highlighted for the End-users/Application working group were:

- Clear outcomes useful to end-users.
- When we define our criteria, are we thinking about this just from a scientific perspective, or do we need to think about it in terms of broader end-users who must take ownership of KBAs?
- Mechanisms for the process that would help avoid KBA-people conflicts.
- Some discussions on the desired uses of the new KBAs (or whatever they shall be termed) as this will help us devise criteria and delineation process.

- Simply to find a way to reduce human pressure on all ecosystems and species.
- Discussion concerning the final aim: how can governments be influenced to use the KBA approach for conservation measures; Legal implementation with IPBES; “Ranking” between existing systems.
- Final product is applicable by policy makers.
- Application of KBAs to broader issues (e.g. CC) and engagement with end users.
- How do we integrate the many different types of local/regional issues with a global standard?

The KBA delineation process is likely to culminate with the World Park Congress, in Australia in 2014. The CEESP representation requested for an overview of the process against timelines, milestones and success indicators. A strong follow up will be required by the CEESP throughout.

> While delineation of KBAs would be on the basis of delineation of geographical ranges of distribution of species , it was proposed that the nomination sheets of the proposed KBA documentation sheets would provide adequate information on cultural, social and economic values of the sites.

For further information, please contact:

"Sudipto Chatterjee" <sudipto.chatterjee@ymail.com *(ymail, not gmail)*
Dr. Sudipto Chatterjee
Biodiversity and Protected Area Management Specialist
Sikkim Biodiversity Conservation Project
CEESP TGER & TILCEPA