

Equitable management of protected areas

Preliminary Discussion Paper Prepared for CCEA Yellowknife Workshop, October 2016

Nathan Deutsch (nathan.a.deutsch@gmail.com)

Executive summary

This paper considers how Canada may equitably reach its area-based targets for protected areas under Aichi Target 11, and how we may track progress on equitable management nationally. The paper focuses on Indigenous and local communities in Canada and develops a set of issues that emerge from international programmes and frameworks relevant to equitable protected areas planning and management. As such, this document does not attempt to create yet another framework for analysis and assessment of equitable management, but rather uses existing frameworks and dimensions to assess relevancy of these in the Canadian context and discuss where gaps may lie.

The CCEA, as a community of practice looking at equitable management of protected areas, may draw on work being carried out by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural resources (IUCN). Frameworks developed by these organisations do not yet provide methodologies or criteria and indicators that can aid assessment of justice and equity in protected areas management, although they eventually intend to do so. The IIED framework is nonetheless found to provide the groundwork for moving forward in the Canadian context. In particular, IIED suggests a well-being approach to equity that reconciles well with the interest of Indigenous communities in re-gaining control over their lives and development needs.

The paper adds elements to the dimensions of equity identified by IIED paper (recognition, procedure, distribution and enabling conditions). These are, (1) enabling recognition of both protected governance types and protected areas categories, reflecting diverse planning and development goals of Indigenous and community territories; (2) equitable distribution of protected areas coverage from south-to-north; and (3) enabling endogenous processes through fuller recognition of ongoing negotiations with government on Indigenous territories. The paper recommends starting with a set of pilot studies to establish a set of measurement and reporting tools on equity, examine best practices and build upon existing frameworks.

Introduction

Aichi 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 (PAs) and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascape.”¹ The purpose of this paper is to provide background to inform development of national guidance on the equitable management component of Target 11 and evaluate how progress on equitable management may be gauged.

While actors, including businesses and organisations may hold expectations about how they may benefit or be impacted by protected areas in the landscapes within which they operate, the focus of this paper is on ensuring equitable management vis-à-vis the poorest communities and segments of the population. In Canada, justice in conservation is inseparable from the presence of Indigenous peoples and historical and ongoing processes to recognise their rights to land, resources and self-determination. The term, *Indigenous peoples and local communities* (IPLCs), is used purposefully in international policy language to acknowledge local communities that may not be recognised as Indigenous, yet may have important rights claims regarding their attachments to land and resources within protected areas.

A commonly used argument is that recognition and respect for the rights of stakeholders are fundamental for effective protected areas management.² Equitable management can be understood to include the sharing of relevant responsibilities, rights, costs and benefits associated with PAs with attention to fairness and distribution of benefits.³ The International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) sees equitable PA governance as central to “a just world that values and conserves nature”.⁴ Protected areas policies may potentially either support or undermine conservation and justice.⁵ While protected areas can play an important role in maintaining a healthy environment on which enjoyment of critical human rights are based – recognition of rights to food, clean water and a healthy environment are enshrined in both international and national legal frameworks worldwide – it is increasingly evident that better awareness of rights and justice can also lead to better conservation while addressing concerns about poverty and human well-being.⁶

The paper begins with a look at conceptual frameworks concerning equity in PA planning and management in order to aggregating existing approaches in Canada and internationally. The paper then

makes specific recommendations on how to address equitable management in the Canadian context, and suggests how existing frameworks may be extended or modified to address their limitations.

Frameworks for understanding equity in PAs

Although diverse frameworks (understood as conceptual packages used to give direction as to what is important and what is not and guide work) supply concepts and tools for assessment of equitable management in protected areas, no single approach has yet seen wide adoption nationally or internationally. As such, we may freely draw upon several existing frameworks to assist us in assessment and measurement of equity in Canadian PAs.

Timko and Satterfield employ three criteria to assess equity issues in both Canadian and South African national parks. These are (1) resolution of land tenure (including unresolved historical loss of rights and those transgressed in genesis of new National Parks), (2) maintenance of livelihood opportunities (or resolution of conflicts stemming from loss or changes in local livelihoods), and (3) decisions making authority in national park governance.⁷

The International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) has a dedicated programme on assessment of social impacts of protected areas (SAPA).⁸ A recent IIED policy briefing provides international guidance on equitable PA management.⁹ IIED identifies three interlinked dimension of equity – recognition, procedure and distribution – embedded within a set of enabling conditions (See table 1). Recognition involves acknowledgement and respect of rights, values, interests, priorities and human dignity; procedural equity involves inclusive and effective participation; distributive equity is related to costs and benefits and how these are shared between different groups. Enabling conditions influence the equity with which PAs are established, governed and managed.

Table 1: Equity framework for protected areas (reproduced from IIED briefing, August 2016)

Recognition

1. Recognition and respect for human rights
2. Recognition and respect for statutory and customary property rights
3. Recognition and respect for the rights of Indigenous Peoples, women and marginalised groups
4. Recognition of different identities, values, knowledge systems and institutions
5. Recognition of all relevant actors and their diverse interests, capacities and powers to influence
6. Non-discrimination by age, ethnic origin, language, gender, class and beliefs

Procedure

7. Full and effective participation of all relevant actors in decision making

8. Clearly defined and agreed responsibilities of actors
9. Accountability for actions and inactions
10. Access to justice, including an effective dispute-resolution process
11. Transparency supported by timely access to relevant information in appropriate forms
12. Free, prior and informed consent for actions that may affect the property rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities

Distribution

13. Identification and assessment of costs, benefits and risks and their distribution and trade-offs
14. Effective mitigation of any costs to Indigenous Peoples and local communities
15. Benefits shared among relevant actors according to one or more of the following criteria:
 1. Equally between relevant actors or
 2. According to contribution to conservation, costs incurred, recognised rights and/or the priorities of the poorest
16. Benefits to present generations do not compromise benefits to future generations

Enabling conditions

17. Legal, political and social recognition of all protected area governance types
18. Relevant actors have awareness and capacity to achieve recognition and participate effectively
19. Alignment of statutory and customary laws and norms
20. An adaptive, learning approach

IUCN has spearheaded various approaches that may inform work on equitable management, including programmes on protected areas governance¹⁰, a rights-based approach to conservation¹¹, and the Whakatane Mechanism¹². IUCN understands a rights-based approach to be key to forming interlinkages between biodiversity conservation through protected areas, improving livelihoods, and ensuring that people's rights, including rights to land, traditional use and a healthy environment, are safeguarded.

The author finds the IIED framework to be a suitable starting point on which to build using the other aforementioned approaches as well as experience in Canada and abroad. We can start by briefly dissecting the conceptual foundations of the IIED framework.

Livelihoods and access to benefits from PAs

IIED holds that as the international community committed to poverty reduction and rights of IPLCs, it was argued that conservation urgently needed to embrace moral and ethical principles, starting with a commitment to "do no harm". This applied in particular to impacts of PAs on IPLCs that depend on natural resources for their livelihoods. PAs constitute spatial institutions that change rights of use and access to land and resources. On the other hand, costs of restricted access may be offset by potential

benefits associated with PAs, such as spill-over effects that provide higher flows of beneficial species, e.g. outside of marine protected areas (MPAs).¹³

The livelihoods approach is among the most widespread and persistent frameworks for assessing costs and benefits of protected areas for local communities. From a livelihoods perspective, protected areas should at the very least bring about social and livelihoods benefits through compensation or substitution of one livelihood activity for another. However, costs and benefits may be shared unequally among groups and individuals within, and between communities.¹⁴ The livelihood approach has also come up short regarding the ability of people and communities to change long-term colonial relationships that are responsible for their limited choices.

Shifting from livelihoods to well-being

While the livelihoods approach has primarily aimed to address distributional equity issues, well-being begins to incorporate other aspects of IIED framework, including attention to recognition. IIED integrates equity and justice and draws attention to the rights of IPLCs to pursue livelihoods and secure their well-being.¹⁵ This is also associated with a move away from the “do no harm” approach.¹⁶ Well-being draws on and extends rights-based approaches (discussed later) to look at what freedoms people have and how much control they have gained or lost through processes of protected area planning and management.

Consideration of well-being offers interesting potential for Indigenous people in Canada that may consider increasing protection of their lands in order to effectively safeguard important biodiversity and traditional ways of life, but also understand PAs to hold opportunities to obtain access to infrastructure, funding, and resources that can increase development opportunities and help communities re-gain access to places that they have lost access to, or have the potential to lose. As such, an approach to equitable PA management informed by well-being may help heal ties between Indigenous peoples and the state and increase ties between people and their landscapes or seascapes. Timko and Satterfield use the example of cultural camps in Gwaii Haanas and the “Haida Watchmen Program”.¹⁷ In this program, elders act as educators within the protected area for interpretation for visitors but also protection for important sites. Cultural camps promote continuity of use of sites of cultural importance.

Well-being considers the collective power held by local communities and Indigenous groups to exert influence over their lives and development needs. With increased attention on “ability” or agency of people to make and enact choices concerning their livelihoods and well-being, it is important to evaluate

governance structures in terms of their enabling support for communities and Indigenous organisations.¹⁸

Participation and procedure in PA governance

Fortunately, the idea that IPLCs should be participants in PA management no longer has any novelty in the Canadian context. Co-management and devolution of management of PAs have been tied to various benefits for Indigenous communities, including progress towards cultural protection, economic self-reliance and political self-determination.¹⁹ However, management of living resources has proven to be one of the most tenacious aspects of colonial relations between governments and indigenous peoples in Canada.²⁰ Indeed, in historic Canadian national parks, Indigenous groups may still encounter barriers to effective participation in management.²¹ Existing parks may not incorporate full recognition of treaty rights, creating a difference in equity issues between Canada's historic and new or planned protected areas.²²

As such, for all PAs, it is important to assess whether Indigenous communities and local people are empowered to realise land use in their own vision of the future, based on their own knowledge systems, or whether they are simply given opportunities to volunteer their knowledge within a management system that is already entrenched within inequitable social relations with the state.²³ Timko and Satterfield's criteria on resolution of land tenure and decision making authority may thus be reconciled within the IIED framework in terms of recognition, but enabling conditions must be assessed for effective support of Indigenous governance systems and recognition of ongoing colonial relationships.

As conservation proponents have embraced ever larger landscapes and seascapes, new players have become involved in PA planning.²⁴ This entails polycentric governance in which it is expected that multiple stakeholders and rights holders are brought together under a single governance system, where shared objectives and equitable distribution of costs and benefits are fostered.²⁵ The risk is that weaker stakeholders and rights holders, including Indigenous peoples, may find themselves effectively excluded from important decisions, and then forced to accommodate new planning and protected areas targets. For instance, recent conservation campaigning and planning at the provincial level has focused on achieving protection for 50% of the boreal forest. This has proceeded in the absence of a transparent process, and without comprehensive prior consultation of Indigenous peoples.²⁶ There is a risk that Canada comes to rely upon such top-down, large-scale protection in order to meet targets, rather than pushing to diversify its planning strategies.

IPLCs are increasingly behind proposals for new protected areas and new types and configurations of protected areas in Canada and internationally (examples of note include conservancies in British Columbia and the Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Site proposal in Manitoba and Ontario). Equally, they are working towards justice and restitution in historical parks and protected areas that were established without their consultation and consent. Measuring or assessing equitable outcomes of such processes is tricky, and existing frameworks have little to say about them. The de facto polycentric governance reality of large parts of Canada necessarily requires working to understand local views on how well-being is constituted while addressing concerns that top-down solutions become imposed by powerful external actors.²⁷

The Canadian Parks Council encourages increased incorporation of local vision, but places the responsibility for “articulating a vision for the sustainable use and protection of their traditional lands” on Indigenous communities.²⁸ This entails a concern for the enabling conditions that can provide support for community articulation of well-being without being prescriptive on how this is achieved. A well-being approach to equity can effectively address how PAs, supported by effective governance, can help or hinder adaptation of communities as they face global and regional change. IIED’s enabling conditions, particularly their emphasis on an adaptive learning approach and recognition of all protected area governance types are relevant here, yet they need to be extended to incorporate sensitivity to novel governance approaches and recognition of ongoing process, as illustrated by Timko and Satterfield.

Guiding normative frameworks

Legal norms underwrite equity and justice in conservation by specifying rights and responsibilities of actors involved, including free and prior informed consent (FPIC), access and benefits. Protected areas governance must align with national and global commitments, constituting normative frameworks on human rights.²⁹ Conservation has broadly adopted a rights-based approach³⁰, recognising that safeguarding biodiversity and reversing paths to biodiversity loss must be accomplished in ways do not unduly impact communities and individuals.³¹ This approach necessarily delves below the community level to understand impacts experienced by different genders and households at different levels of poverty.³² A rights-based approach, such as the one under development by IUCN may contribute to assessment of recognition, procedure, distribution and enabling conditions that have been adopted in international normative and national legal frameworks.

It is helpful to understand how different international commitments are interrelated, particularly those concerning social equity, the rights of Indigenous Peoples and biodiversity conservation. Canada has committed to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), ILO Convention 169 Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Canada has only recently signed onto international commitments on FPIC and rights of Indigenous peoples. As such, Aichi Target 11 must be understood to be embedded within a negotiated process that is associated with the CBD, but is linked with other ongoing processes of importance to its signatories.

The shift in focus towards a greater set of rights and responsibilities for conservation can be traced to the fifth World Parks Congress (WPC) of 2003 in Durban and the CBD COP7 (2004). In response to these events, the CBD established a Program of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA), with a focus on governance, participation and benefits sharing. The PoWPA highlighted governance, particularly in its element 2— Governance, Participation, Equity and Benefit Sharing (goal 2.1).³³ Goal 2.2 of the PoWPA aimed at enhancing involvement of indigenous and local communities and other relevant stakeholders in PA governance. The Durban Accord that emerged from the fifth WPC resolved to look at involvement of Indigenous peoples in establishing, governing and managing PAs.

Biodiversity conservation³⁴ has most frequently been associated with protected areas, however, for ecosystems within complex landscapes, potential biodiversity safeguards include a range of area-based and value-based mechanisms. A broader understanding of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets can help us understand the language of Aichi Target 11 within a more holistic approach to safeguarding biodiversity enshrined within the CBD. Target 11 falls under Strategic Goal C: “To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity”. Also of significance is Strategic Goal D: “Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services”. Target 14 of Strategic Goal D states that: “By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.”

Interpreted more broadly, there are a number of aspects of the Aichi targets that concern protected areas management.³⁵ Equitable governance and distribution of benefits of biodiversity contain many interrelated facets that go beyond the target 11. Although the Aichi targets expire in 2020, it may be argued that a range of international normative frameworks, along with the polycentric governance reality of Canada continue to govern the ability of Canada to maintain its area-based Aichi

commitments. At minimum, the international normative frameworks and processes above offer guidance for putting goals of equitable management and greater protected areas coverage on equal footing. Perhaps IUCN's rights-based approach is most thorough in integrating these normative frameworks within a conservation context, yet little guidance has been offered thus far by this programme in terms of assessment and measurement of equitable outcomes.

Equitably meeting and measuring Aichi Target 11 at national and provincial/territorial levels

Few attempts have been made internationally to build processes to measure equity in PA management. One exception would be the IIED programme on social assessment of protected areas management.³⁶ However, in terms of gauging national progress towards Aichi Target 11, this IIED programme turned up few existing means for assessing progress. IIED looked at assessment frameworks developed to look at type and quality of governance, and their social impacts and asked whether additional modules were needed to assess equity. Pulling together existing Protected Area Management Effectiveness (PAME) and other social impact and evaluation approaches, the IIED found these tools have leaned towards assessment of management effectiveness, and propose few measures regarding equity.

The IIED SAPA programme and IUCN rights-based approach can be considered complementary in that they both aim to eventually provide international frameworks and associated assessment tools for measurement of rights and equity in PA management. It is suggested that CCEA might continue to track and seek participation in these processes to avoid mirroring important work. The Whakatane Mechanism, mentioned above, offers a template for monitoring best practices concerning redress of historic and ongoing conservation injustices (i.e., in existing protected areas). Each framework discussed here has employed community case studies to inform their development.

The CCEA may draw upon these frameworks, while focusing on the development of a subset of equity issues that represent areas of interest for Canada. As we consider how Canada may track progress on equitably meeting its area-based targets, the following three distributional issues and enabling conditions seem to warrant special attention:

1. Enabling recognition of both protected governance types and protected areas categories, reflecting diverse planning and development goals of Indigenous and community territories³⁷;
2. equitable distribution of protected areas coverage from south-to-north; and

3. enabling endogenous processes through fuller recognition of ongoing negotiations with government on Indigenous territories.

Protected areas governance types and management categories

Indigenous people and local communities understand and experience biodiversity loss (including loss of access and rights to use biodiversity) in different ways. Existing legislation for parks and protected areas may be perceived to be too restrictive or may not appropriately reflect local and Indigenous values. It is sometimes the case that strict protected areas do not make sense within Indigenous knowledge frameworks for addressing similar sets of problems (conservation risks to species and loss of abundance species).

Although Canada is moving closer to Aichi target 11 in terms of area covered, proportionally, approximately 94% of the terrestrial PA network is represented by IUCN management categories I-IV, representing the highest level of protection intended for wilderness values, while categories V and VI “representing creativity and co-existence of humans in sustainable landscapes” is a still highly underrepresented.³⁸ Figures on management categories could not be found for Canadian marine protected areas for the purpose of this report. It is suggested that CCEA may consider a specific quantitative metric in relation to IUCN management categories to inform assessment of equity.

Likewise, there are diverse ways to realise CBD goals without directing every effort into achieving specific (quantitative) targets. Where equity of existing nationally and internationally recognised protected areas models are challenged by local communities, other approaches to safeguarding biodiversity or novel area-based arrangements may be sought. Such approaches require balanced discussion on how to meet conservation needs in an equitable management context.

Different frameworks and approaches are available for safeguarding of biodiversity. This is especially important given the critique that PAs can divert attention from other means of safeguarding biodiversity outside PAs. For equitable solutions, we can look to agreed-upon standards for area-based and values-based conservation that have broader international acceptance and check to see whether these have local acceptance. If they do not, it may be necessary to create new ones. It is suggested that Canada may need to look beyond the focus on diversity of governance types suggested by IIED under enabling conditions and consider the advantages and drawbacks of incorporating different IUCN management categories within its protected areas. This opens up potential for novel area-based conservation approaches, including new endogenous categories of conservation areas, Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs) and Other Effective Area Based Conservation Mechanisms (OEABCMs).

Governance of ICCAs is tied to indigenous management institutions. Ground up institutions may be constructed with de facto or de jure control, then recognized and supported from above by state institutions. The Potato Park of Peru provides a powerful example of implementation of a category V protected area in relation to biodiversity resources viewed as culturally and materially important for Indigenous groups and for safeguarding for all of humanity (see box 1). MacKinnon et al. (2015) look at ICCAs as possibilities within the category of OEABCMs and argue that they have potential for increased recognition in Canada.³⁹ Although ICCAs may contribute to conservation or sustainable use targets, they are not a panacea, and it would be unreasonable to expect that they could contribute solely to meeting Canada’s conservation targets. Nonetheless, IUCN supports “finding careful ways to support them without imposing change [on customary management systems]”.⁴⁰

Box 1: The Potato Park, Peru, a category V protected area⁴¹

The Potato Park is located within a centre of origin of the potato. It is an Indigenous Biocultural Territory that uses the Indigenous Biocultural Heritage Area (IBCHA) designation developed by Asociación ANDES. Governance of the territory is guided by customary law, which features a system of community ownership of land and distribution of cultivated fields favouring maintenance of agricultural biodiversity.

The Park was established on an agreement with the International Potato Centre (CIP) for repatriation of potato seed for in situ conservation. The biocultural heritage management focus of the Park involves protection of traditional knowledge relevant to potato plant genetic resources (recognition and respect of obligations of international communities); the right to equitably participate in sharing benefits from the use of genetic resources (distribution); and the right to participate in making decisions at the national level on the conservation and use of genetic resources (procedure and responsibilities).

Finally, many biodiversity conservation objectives at the landscape level may be satisfactorily achieved through values-based targets, e.g. focused on addressing specific threats to a species at risk. Values-based protection targets are, however, still largely met through increased PA coverage⁴², leaving Indigenous territorial organisations with few existing alternatives for integrated landscape management or spatially explicit land-use planning that are likely to receive international support.

Equitable distribution of protected areas coverage

In the options discussed above, we must be careful not to assume that rural or remote Indigenous communities, or more broadly, the poorest cross-sections of society will make up the difference in terms of area-based targets. These options only partially address the equitable management target, i.e., where

communities voluntarily agree to support for their biodiversity conservation objectives in the form of new PAs or OEABCMs. The approaches fall short on grounds of equity if policy makers see them as a way to make up for lost opportunities elsewhere, i.e. in Canada's more developed south. A geographical indicator for assessment of distributional equity could thus be proposed to gauge distribution of PAs in areas of wealth and poverty, from south-to-north, as long as contributions of PAs to development and benefits sharing are also accounted for.

Enabling endogenous processes through fuller recognition of ongoing negotiations

In Canada, recent PA planning processes often anticipate future treaty or rights and title negotiations. PA planning may play an important role in these negotiations by validating the legitimacy of Indigenous peoples' claims to a territory.⁴³ An example is the Akaitcho Processes negotiations (see box 2).⁴⁴ Creation of territorial parks is one area of negotiation under this process.

Box 2: the Akaitcho Process Negotiations (<https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca>)⁴⁵

The Akaitcho Dene First Nations are involved in negotiating an agreement for land and resource governance with the Government of Canada and the Government of the Northwest Territories. This process involves a step-wise approach over years of work. The parties are working to:

- preserve a land base for the Akaitcho Dene First Nations;
- acknowledge and protect the spiritual and cultural ties the Akaitcho Dene have to the land, water, and animals;
- recognize the ADFN's jurisdiction to protect cultural traditions and language;
- help Akaitcho citizens, especially young people, to enjoy a good quality of life and strong economic prospects in their traditional territory; and,
- regulate development in a sustainable manner so that the Akaitcho traditional territory is a good place to invest and do business today and in the future.

An interim agreement establishes the need to consult the First Nations on decisions concerning land, wildlife and water that may affect their asserted territory, including creation of protected areas.

These negotiations are recognised to form the groundwork for sharing of expertise and knowledge, trust and cooperation, and sharing of benefits from protected areas. The contribution of these processes towards equitable PA planning and management will need to be assessed in terms of process, and not necessarily outcome (e.g., resolution of outstanding land claims, establishment of co-management agreements). A potential indicator could look at area covered under existing and ongoing processes to resolve long standing land tenure and resource governance issues. Given recognition by such an

indicator, ongoing processes can be respected. If such negotiated processes are seen as equitable by those involved, prospective PAs could potentially be counted towards equitable governance targets.

Conclusions

Indigenous people and local communities understand and experience biodiversity loss (including loss of access and rights to use biodiversity) in different ways. Likewise, there are diverse ways to realise CBD targets without directing every effort at achieving specific (quantitative) targets. Aichi Target 11 invites signatories to put equity in PA management on equal footing with quantitative, area-based targets, requiring new assessment approaches and use of novel and creative processes for safeguarding biodiversity and human well-being.

Measuring and tracking of equitable management presents a novel area of work. As such, some caution is warranted in drawing conclusions on how to measure equity without planning new research. Establishing a set of measurement and reporting tools will likely entail starting with a set of case studies to examine best practices, build upon existing assessment frameworks (e.g. SAPA) and allow endogenous indicators and measures to emerge.

Much of Canada is characterised by polycentric governance situations, often coupled with unresolved rights to land and resources. This situation is not likely to change rapidly before 2020, when Aichi Targets expire. This paper argues that Canadian policy makers must be careful to not rush to reach area-based targets at all costs, if this means overlooking ongoing and often slow moving processes of resolution of rights and title, and restitution, including through territorial land use planning.

Finally, as noted in the IIED discussion, perceptions of equity change over time. As such, any new approach to equity assessment will need to be accommodating. In other words, there is a need to try to work with, and at the same time, evaluate existing governance processes as perceptions evolve on what equitable processes and outcomes look like. Flowing from Indigenous peoples' experiences with both existing PA management and PA planning, Canadian Indigenous groups and CCEA build upon and contribute to approaches for assessment of equity, but also contribute to international dialogue on equitably addressing concerns about biodiversity loss.

Notes

- ¹ Aichi target 11 - Technical Rationale extended (provided in document COP/10/INF/12/Rev.1). URL: <https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/rationale/target-11/>
- ² Woodley, S., Bertzky, B., Crawhall, N., Dudley, N., Londoño, J. M., MacKinnon, K., ... Sandwith, T. (2012). Meeting Aichi Target 11: what does success look like for protected area systems? *Parks*, 18(1), 23-36.
- ³ Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Kothari, A. and Oviedo, G. (2004). Indigenous and Local Communities and Protected Areas: Towards Equity and Enhanced Conservation. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. xviii + 111pp. Available at: https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/pag_011.pdf; Berkes, F. (2004). Rethinking community-based conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 18: 621-630.
- ⁴ IUCN. (2008). Governance as key for effective and equitable protected area systems. briefing note 8, February '08. Implementing the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas.
- ⁵ Greiber, T. (Ed.). (2009). *Conservation with Justice: A Rights-based Approach*. IUCN: Gland, Switzerland.
- ⁶ Greiber (2009)
- ⁷ Timko, J. A. and T. Satterfield. (2008). Seeking Social Equity in National Parks: Experiments with Evaluation in Canada and South Africa. *Conservation and Society*, 6(3): 238-254.
- ⁸ <http://www.iied.org/assessing-social-impacts-protected-areas>
- ⁹ <http://pubs.iied.org/17370IIED/>
- ¹⁰ Borrini-Feyerabend et al. (2004); Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Dudley, N., Jaeger, T., Lassen, B., Broome, N.P., Phillips, A. and Sandwith, T. (2013). Governance of Protected Areas: From understanding to action. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 20, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
- ¹¹ Greiber (2009)
- ¹² <http://whakatane-mechanism.org/>
- ¹³ Bennett, N.J. and Dearden. P. (2014). From measuring outcomes to providing inputs: Governance, management, and local development for more effective marine protected areas. *Marine Policy*, 50: 96-110.
- ¹⁴ Often poor definition of what constitutes the local community on which action is focused can exacerbate inequalities between groups and individuals.
- ¹⁵ Blaustein, R.J. (2007). Protected areas and equity concerns. *BioScience*, 57: 216-221.
- ¹⁶ This was brought up in discussion at an event led by IIED and partners at the World Conservation Congress even, 04/09/2016, titled, 'Assessing equitable management and governance of protected areas'.
- ¹⁷ Timko and Satterfield (2008)
- ¹⁸ Biggs, R., Schlüter, M. and Schoon, M.L. (eds.) (2015). *Principles for Building Resilience: Sustaining Ecosystems Services in Social-ecological Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ¹⁹ Bennett, N., Lemelin, R.H. and Stephen, E. (2010). Aboriginal and local perspectives on the community benefits of conservation: A case study of a proposed Canadian national park and the Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation. *Geography Research Forum*, 30: 105-134.
- ²⁰ Natcher, D. C., and Davis, S. (2007). Rethinking devolution: Challenges for aboriginal resource management in the Yukon Territory. *Society and Natural Resources*, 20: 271-279.
- ²¹ Timko and Satterfield (2008)
- ²² Government of Canada (2000). Bill C-27: Canada National Parks Act. Ottawa, Ontario: Parliamentary Research Branch.
- ²³ Timko and Satterfield (2008)
- ²⁴ Worboys et al. (2010) in Woodley et al. (2012)
- ²⁵ Woodley et al. (2012)
- ²⁶ See for example the International Boreal Conservation Campaign: <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/projects/international-boreal-conservation-campaign> and discussion of its predecessor, the Canadian Boreal Initiative in Burlando, C. (2012). Land use planning policy in the Far North Region of Ontario: Conservation targets, politics of scale, and the role of civil society organizations in Aboriginal-state relations. Ph.D. thesis, University of Manitoba, Canada. URL: https://umanitoba.ca/institutes/natural_resources/canadaresearchchair/thesis/PhD%20Thesis%20Burlando%202012.pdf
- ²⁷ Biggs et al. (2015)
- ²⁸ <http://www.parks-parcs.ca/english/cpc/aboriginal.php> (accessed 28-09-2016)

²⁹ IIED policy briefing August 2016

³⁰ on this see Campese, J. et al. eds. (2007). Conservation and Human Rights. Special issue of *Policy Matters*

³¹ IUCN (2008)

³² Greiber (2009)

³³ Governance as key for effective and equitable protected area systems. briefing note 8, February '08.

Implementing the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas. Goal 2.1 of the PoWPA.

³⁴ Biodiversity is “the variability among living organisms – animals, plants, their habitats and their genes – from all sources including terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems, and the ecological complexes of which they are part. This includes diversity within species, between species, and of ecosystems” (<http://iucn.org/iyb/about/>).

³⁵ Woodley et al. (2012)

³⁶ <http://www.iied.org/assessing-social-impacts-protected-areas> (accessed 28-09-2016)

³⁷ Borrini-Feyerabend et al. (2013)

³⁸ Canadian Protected Areas - Status Report 2006-2011.

³⁹ MacKinnon, D., Lemieux, C.J., Beazley, K., Woodley, S., Helie, R., ... Gray, P. (2015). Canada and Aichi Biodiversity Target 11: understanding ‘other effective area-based conservation measures’ in the context of the broader target. *Biodiversity Conservation*, 24: 3559-3581.

However, ICCAs themselves are supported by international protected area policy and may be given recognition within all six IUCN categories. See: http://www.iccaconsortium.org/?page_id=35.

⁴⁰ IUCN (2008, p. 10)

⁴¹ Argumedo A. and M.Pimbert. (2008). Protecting Farmers’ Rights with Indigenous Biocultural Heritage Territories: The experience of the Potato Park. IIED and Asociación ANDES; <http://www.parquedelapapa.org/> (accessed 06-10-2016)

⁴² Andrew, M.E., M.A. Wulder and J.A. Cardille. (2013). Protected areas in boreal Canada: a baseline and considerations for the continued development of a representative and effective reserve network. *Environmental Reviews*, 22: 135-160.

⁴³ Timko and Satterfield (2008)

⁴⁴ http://www.pc.gc.ca/APPS/CP-NR/release_e.asp?bgid=962&andor1=bg (accessed 19-08-2016)

⁴⁵ <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100025959/1100100025960> (accessed 06-10-2016)