



Indigenous Peoples, local communities and area-based conservation targets

A briefing for the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

This briefing seeks to bring greater clarity to the intersection between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the land and resource rights, collective governance and self-determination of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, particularly in the context of Target 3. The term ‘other effective area-based measures’ is part of the proposed text for the global biodiversity framework, in draft Target 3, but remains relatively unknown, despite recent attempts to define and systematise its use. The briefing will consider the use of this designation and explore the implications it has for Indigenous Peoples and local communities. It concludes with some considerations for how Target 3 could be improved from the perspective of securing and enhancing the rights and self-determination of Indigenous Peoples and communities with collective tenure and governance systems.

About this briefing

This briefing has been produced as part of a co-authored series to explore the policy implications of the research and findings in the 2nd edition of the Local Biodiversity Outlooks (localbiodiversityoutlooks.net). It is intended to contribute towards the evidence-based negotiations and dialogues towards the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It has been produced with financial support from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) through Swedbio at the Stockholm Resilience Centre, the Arcadia Foundation and the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy.

Image credit: Inuit hunting lodges at the mouth of the Serpentine River on the Alaskan tundra. Credit: Global Warming Images.

Summary

- Indigenous peoples and local communities play crucial roles as custodians of their lands, waters, and territories that are conserved and governed according to their own values, criteria and cosmovisions
- Lands, waters, and territories that are customarily owned, occupied, or otherwise used by Indigenous Peoples or other communities with collective claims to resources, should be recognised and supported through national policies and laws that protect these specific land and resource rights
- Indigenous Peoples and local communities should have the opportunity to recognize their collective lands and territories on their own terms and through their self-determined systems and institutions and should be given the necessary support (financial, technical or other) where requested
- Governments have a responsibility to engage in consultative processes, or where relevant, free, prior and informed consent processes, with Indigenous Peoples and communities about what each form of recognition implies in terms of decision-making, management and other responsibilities and what forms of support are available to them
- ‘Other effective area-based conservation measures’ – known as OECMs – have only recently been defined and their implications for Indigenous Peoples and local communities remain to be seen. Where requested, capacity support should be provided for comprehensive consultation processes and, where relevant, free, prior, and informed consent processes, so that Indigenous Peoples and local communities can determine the potential benefits and constraints associated with identifying with the OECM definition.
- OECMs could have potential value to Indigenous Peoples and to local communities where this designation would advance or extend the recognition of rights to lands, waters, and territories or where such an identification could ensure more support for existing rights or governance systems^(a)
- OECMs could also pose potential challenges. The designation is likely to have limited utility where national jurisdictions continue to deny the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and could create risks for further discrimination where governments or private actors identify OECMs in conflict with existing Indigenous governance systems, and/or where states do not allow the identification of community/Indigenous conservation under national OECM policies

Introduction

Parties to the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) are currently negotiating the text of the [post-2020 global biodiversity framework](#), which is expected to be adopted at the second session of the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP15), to be held in 2022. The current draft^(b) of the framework - called “[First Draft](#)” - includes a 2050 Vision, 2030 Goals and Milestones, Action Targets and a few other elements. In the ‘transformative change’ vision in the framework there are some bold steps being called for.

a For the purpose of this briefing, ‘rights to lands, territories and resources’ or ‘rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities’ are both used in the widest sense, including also associated rights such as tenure rights, rights to access resources, rights recognized under customary systems and all associated cultural rights.

b As of December 2021

In the 21 draft targets currently being proposed, Target 1 calls for comprehensive planning for the entire planet towards sustainable balance,^c Target 2 calls for restoration of huge areas of the degraded planet^d and Target 3 calls for a significant increase in the areas covered by protected and conserved status.^e Taken together these point to potentially radical shifts in the way lands and waters are classified, owned, managed, and governed, and the implementation of these Targets are likely to have direct impacts on the land, resource, and access rights of millions.

Rights to lands, territories and resources

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples confirms that states must develop dedicated legal and policy frameworks with the full and effective participation of Indigenous Peoples. Governments should ensure that such frameworks sit within broader legal and institutional frameworks that recognise and support the full spectrum of Indigenous peoples' and local communities' cultures, customary laws and institutions, governance, and rights and responsibilities. The extent to which commitments under the global biodiversity framework might contribute to this goal should be assessed in each context, and for each element of the framework.

It is essential that Indigenous Peoples and local communities have an opportunity to recognize their collective lands and territories *on their own terms and through their self-determined systems and institutions and with the necessary support (financial, technical or other) where requested*. And the process of negotiating the global biodiversity framework, and the conservation target it contains, must not constrain the choices that Indigenous Peoples have before them in terms of how their lands and territories are recognised and governed.

It is now widely understood that recognizing and upholding the rights of Indigenous Peoples and of local communities – including rights to collective lands and territories and self-determined governance systems – is essential for conservation,¹ and beyond conservation to sustainable use and restoration. Yet the area-based targets fail to make reference to the rights of Indigenous peoples and local communities, a silence which is particularly stark in the context of conservation.

A key question for Indigenous Peoples and local communities when assessing the new ambitions of Target 3 is the extent to which the content of the Target is likely to advance, or to constrain, the recognition and protection of fundamental rights to access, to free, prior and informed consent, lands, territories, and resources. There has been both considerable excitement at the potential of Target 3 to advance and secure land rights and access to resources, and real, and widespread fears that it may exacerbate the alienation of land rights and rights to access, care for, and manage resources. This briefing considers the implications of 'other effective area-based measures' in relation to this core issue.

c Target 1. Ensure that all land and sea areas globally are under integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning addressing land- and sea-use change, retaining existing intact and wilderness areas.

d Target 2. Ensure that at least 20 per cent of degraded freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems are under restoration, ensuring connectivity among them and focusing on priority ecosystems.

e Target 3. Ensure that at least 30 per cent globally of land areas and of sea areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and its contributions to people, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.

Target 3 and ‘other effective area-based measures’

Target 3 is a conservation target with different components. The current draft includes reference to systems of both ‘protected areas’ and ‘other effective area-based conservation measures’:

Ensure that at least 30% globally of land areas and of sea areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and its contributions to people, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.

This reference echoes language that was included in Aichi Target 11, the previous protected and conserved area target set under the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 – 2020. When Aichi Target 11 was negotiated, the term ‘other effective area based conservation measures’ was used in the Target, but OECMs were not defined by the CBD parties until 2018.⁽²⁾ No OECMs were identified and reported until later, in December 2019 when the World Database on OECMs was first published.⁽³⁾ Now there is an IUCN Specialist Group on OECMs, and these areas are beginning to be identified at the national level and reported to the World Database on OECMs, managed by the UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC). Currently, processes for identifying and regulating OECMs are being developed largely at the global scale, and in ad hoc ways in particular countries, and there have only been very limited opportunities for Indigenous Peoples and for local communities to engage with and understand the terminology and to consider the opportunities and challenges posed by the framework.

To understand the potentials and the risks of area-based targets under Target 3, a key challenge is clarifying how OECMs are, or could be, defined and implemented at the (sub-)national level and what OECMs *could* mean for Indigenous Peoples and local communities. There are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of sites that already exist that may qualify as ‘conserved areas’ but may be adversely affected by new criteria or other criteria adopted by governments to define OECMs. The land and other rights of Indigenous peoples and local communities remain woefully under-recognised and under-supported, and the emergence of OECMs needs to be understood against that context. This document provides a brief introduction to this concept in the context of the CBD, potential opportunities, and challenges for Indigenous peoples and local communities.

Background on OECMs

In 2018, Parties to the CBD agreed a definition and criteria for ‘[other effective area-based conservation measures](#)’ (OECMs) in Decision 14/8. The decision contains the definition of an OECM and four annexes.^(f)

Parties agreed to the following definition of OECMs:

^f The Annexes set out information as follows: Annex I provides voluntary guidance on the integration of protected areas and OECMs into wider landscapes and seascapes; Annex II provides voluntary guidance on effective governance models for management of protected areas, conserved areas and OECMs; Annex III sets out scientific and technical advice on OECMs, including criteria for identifying and reporting against international biodiversity targets; and Annex IV provides a set of considerations in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 (which was still then extant) in marine and coastal areas.

A geographically defined area other than a Protected Area, which is governed and managed in ways that achieve positive and sustained long-term outcomes for the in-situ conservation of biodiversity with associated ecosystem functions and services and where applicable, cultural, spiritual, socio-economic, and other locally relevant values. (CBD, 2018).

Decision 14/8 represents an important acknowledgement by Parties to the CBD that territories and areas *beyond protected areas* are delivering conservation outcomes – through a diversity of management and governance systems – and that these territories and areas are both locally important and should count towards global conservation targets.

Differences between protected areas and OECMs

Protected areas are sites that are dedicated to the conservation of biodiversity (as per the definition in the CBD, 1992). OECMs are areas that deliver the long-term conservation of biodiversity, without being designated or otherwise recognised as protected areas. In addition, for OECMs conservation does not need to be a primary objective of the governance or management of the area, it simply needs to be an outcome of it. Both of these aspects may make the OECM framework more appropriate to many territories and areas governed by Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

According to Decision 14/8, there are four core criteria for identifying OECMs:

1. The area is not currently recognised as a protected area;
1. The area is geographically defined, governed and managed;
1. The area achieves sustained and effective contribution to in situ conservation of biodiversity; and
1. Associated ecosystem functions and services and cultural, spiritual, socio-economic and other locally relevant values are respected, upheld and supported.

A major difference between protected areas and OECMs is the following: protected areas are often ‘created’ or ‘designated’, with the establishment of new boundaries and governance and management bodies. The OECM framework uses the terms ‘identify’ and ‘recognize’ to underscore that there are already areas around the world that meet the criteria and would benefit from being identified and recognised, and do not need to be ‘created’.

This approach was part of the design, developed to recognise conservation outside protected areas, including areas and territories governed or managed by Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

As part of global efforts to track the identification and reporting of OECMs, the UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) established, in 2019, a [World Database on OECMs](#). Along with the World Database on Protected Areas, this database is a core component of the Protected Planet Initiative, which tracks progress towards relevant CBD targets and Sustainable Development Goals. An IUCN Task Force is developing further technical guidance and methodologies on OECMs.

Box 1

The Decision also contains useful language in the associated Annexes. Annex II provides voluntary guidance on the steps needed to recognize OECMs and notes that “*in the case of territories and areas under the governance of indigenous peoples and local communities, such steps should be taken with their free, prior and informed consent, consistent with national policies, regulations and circumstances, and applicable international obligations, and based on respect for their rights, knowledge and institutions.*”⁴⁾ Annex II also states that good governance principles should be applied to both protected areas and OECMs.

Annex III on scientific and technical advice also underscores that recognition of OECMs should “*be supported by measures to enhance the governance capacity of their legitimate authorities⁸⁾ and secure their positive and sustained outcomes for biodiversity, including, inter alia, policy frameworks and regulations to prevent and respond to threats.*” While it was agreed that ‘legitimate authorities’ would include both formal and customary/traditional authorities, Decision 14/8 also states that it must be “consistent with national policies, regulations and circumstances and applicable international obligations.” This may be problematic for Indigenous Peoples and for local communities in countries where States fail to recognise and respect their rights, and do not provide for full secure land rights and associated rights. At the same time, reference to ‘applicable international obligations’ provides opportunities to insist on the fulfilment of obligations under both international human rights law and international environment law. Much remains to be seen at the implementation level.

Annex III also states that identifying OECMs “*within the territories of indigenous peoples and local communities should be on the basis of self-identification and with their free, prior and informed consent, as appropriate, and consistent with national policies, regulations and circumstances, and applicable international obligations*”.⁵ The repetition of ‘consistent with national policies’ here again underscores the challenges for peoples and communities with unrecognised rights. Positively, the Annex also makes specific mention of the need to take into account the [2016 report](#) of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples on the theme ‘Indigenous Peoples and conservation’ and the [2017 report](#) of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on human rights and the environment.

It is notable and positive that the Annexes to Decision 14/8 contain reference to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, as well as two reports by Special Rapporteurs, as it is still uncommon in CBD decisions to refer to human rights instruments and mechanisms, although it is important to note that these are *voluntary guidance and thus not legally binding*.



Kichwa villagers transporting wood downstream in Ecuador. Credit: Tomas Munita

⁴⁾ While it was agreed that ‘legitimate authorities’ would include both formal and customary/traditional authorities, Decision 14/8 also states that it must be “consistent with national policies, regulations and circumstances and applicable international obligations.” This may be problematic for peoples and communities that are not recognized by national authorities. It is also important to note that this is voluntary guidance and thus legally non-binding.

Concerns with Decision 14/8

Language in Decision 14/8 and related Annexes give rise to the question of who will assess the ‘validity’ of an OECM and against what standards. For instance, the Decision requires that “the area achieves sustained and effective contribution to in situ conservation of biodiversity” and “associated ecosystem functions and services and cultural, spiritual, socio-economic and other relevant values are respected, upheld and supported” in any area that would be identified as an OECM. In both these instances, who will assess and decide and/or confirm that these standards and values are being upheld? It also gives rise to a paradox under which Indigenous Peoples and local communities could be held to a higher (and externally defined) standard than government managed protected areas, given that only OECMs are required to be effective in order to be recognised.

Furthermore, some Indigenous Peoples and local communities are concerned that government agencies and other actors may not uphold the standards referred to in the Annexes to Decision 14/8 when interpreting OECM guidance in their own jurisdictions and/or will not properly engage and consult with Indigenous Peoples or with communities, particularly in countries where existing recognition of the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities to their lands, waters, territories, and resources is weak or non-existent.

They also note that the substance of the decision may not suit many Indigenous Peoples’ territories due to the subjective and likely externally assessed nature of the criteria, and the fact that the criteria will be regulated by national governments. Some have also raised concerns that the OECM designation may be inappropriately used to displace Indigenous peoples and/or land grab as has been the case during the creation of existing protected and conserved areas in many regions.

Box 2

Indigenous peoples, local communities, other non-government actors and governments are all still working out how to apply OECMs and exactly “what counts” and whether existing legislation might be used to legally recognise them. In the current guidance for OECMs, it is noted that they should contain important biodiversity or be capable of restoration to such a condition. Thus, not all areas will be necessarily eligible for designations as OECMs and such decisions will be made by national governments as per decision 14/8.

There is also concern that, if OECMs are seen as an easy option, they may be designated over areas that offer few benefits to biodiversity. For instance, multiple-use production areas (ie. production forests, plantations and industrial fisheries areas) that are managed with some biodiversity considerations should not be promoted as OECMs. Furthermore, as OECMs are not limited to lands governed by Indigenous Peoples or by communities, but can include lands held by the state (e.g. military land, or exclusion zones) or by businesses (e.g. old quarries), or a mixture of governance structures. Government agencies may find it easier to only apply OECMs to these other 2 categories of land management and not to establish the required partnerships with, and support for, Indigenous peoples or local communities to benefit from the category directly, under their own governance and self-determination.

Thus, while OECMs may be a potentially powerful tool for both people and nature, decisions related to the expansion of this category require careful monitoring particularly as governments and other actors engage more directly and in new ways with Indigenous Peoples and with communities in seeking to expand areas under protected and conserved status.

Indigenous Peoples and local communities and OECMs

While in some contexts Indigenous Peoples and local communities might choose to pursue the identification of their lands and territories, or parts of them, as an OECM or as a protected area - as an Indigenous or Community Conserved Area, or ICCA, or territory of life - in other contexts they may choose something entirely different, and that choice must remain entirely their self-determined decision. Many Indigenous Peoples and local communities do not want their collective lands and territories to be subsumed into official protected areas, nor into OECMs, in order to be contributing to conservation.

For some Indigenous Peoples and local communities, OECMs may potentially be a useful tool that may help to leverage greater recognition and support for their rights to their lands, territories and resources, and more broadly a tool to account better for the contributions of Indigenous Peoples and local communities to global and national conservation targets.

Potential opportunities

Identifying and reporting Indigenous Peoples' and local communities' collective lands and territories (or parts thereof) as OECMs could provide potential opportunities and benefits to the governance authorities of those areas, including:

- Improved visibility at a global level of the conservation contributions of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and of their actions in support of biodiversity that exists – whether thriving or under threat – outside protected areas
- Increased security and visibility as well as greater recognition and support for the territory or area where government and private actors respect and support OECMs identified by Indigenous Peoples and local communities
- Improved relations between Indigenous Peoples and local communities and the government recognizing the OECMs, where national agencies are incentivized to work with Indigenous Peoples and local communities to support OECMs and their conservation practices
- Opportunity to embrace areas where sustainable use is part and parcel of delivering conservation outcomes and to seek and obtain necessary government technical and financial support to sustain governance practices.

These opportunities, however, are contingent on governments upholding human rights and social safeguards.

Potential challenges

For other Indigenous Peoples and local communities OECMs may not be locally suitable, appropriate, or desired⁽⁶⁾ and there remain concerns with language in Decision 14/8 and with how the Decision will be implemented at the national, regional and local level. Below are some potential challenges with OECMs that Indigenous Peoples and local communities have identified^(h) though this is not an exhaustive list and others have also raised potential challenges and concerns.⁽⁷⁾

Lack of clarity

OECMs remain a point of confusion for many as the definition and related guidance is relatively new and technical and OECMs have not yet been incorporated into national laws or regulations in most national contexts. As of January 2022, the total number of OECMs registered was 671 covering 9 countries and territories.⁽⁸⁾ Of these, 318 were in Morocco and the remainder in Canada, South Africa, the United Kingdom, Eswatini, Algeria, the Philippines and Colombia. Beyond the coverage statistics made available by UNEP-WCMC, there has yet to be an analysis of registered OECMs. Ten OECMs in the Philippines and Eswatini have been reported as under the governance of indigenous peoples or local communities. Other OECMs in the database have been reported as under collaborative governance, or do not have a reported governance type.

The current lack of clarity about OECMs at the national level in many countries is a challenge that will increase if national authorities define legislation or make decisions without proper consultation and without the full and effective participation of Indigenous peoples, of local communities, and of other interested stakeholders. This lack of clarity at the (sub-) national level might also represent an opportunity for Indigenous Peoples and local communities if they are able to build a constructive dialogue with government agencies at the (sub-)national level to help develop a roadmap for implementation that includes opportunities for Indigenous Peoples and local communities to develop for themselves ways to identify and register their territories as OECMs.

Potential for co-option where rights are unrecognised

Despite rights language in Decision 14/8 as mentioned above, there remain concerns that governments could identify and recognize OECMs without full respect for the rights, self-determination, and governance of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, particularly in countries in which those rights remain unrecognised or weakly enforced.

Ensuring that OECMs, where indigenous peoples are involved, require and ensure FPIC, and support self-determination is critical to ensuring that injustices perpetrated against Indigenous Peoples and other customary rights holders under some protected area-related regulatory frameworks are not repeated in the context of OECMs. This is especially important in the context of Target 3, if state agencies under pressure to boost their area-based coverage are tempted to identify collective lands and territories under the (potentially unrecognised) ownership or governance of Indigenous Peoples or communities as OECMs without due process. If this led to efforts to remove Indigenous Peoples or communities from their collectively held lands, or restrict their actions therein, or limit their governance authority or customary law, then the identification of OECMs could actively drive an increase in the violation of the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

^h This list is not exhaustive and will likely increase as national governments begin to implement Decision 14/8 and/or begin to develop national guidance on OECM identification, designation and recognition.

The process of registering OECMs in the [World Database on OECMs](#), managed by UNEP-WCMC, is another potential challenge for Indigenous Peoples and local communities. According to the User Manual for the World Database on Protected Areas and world database on other effective area-based conservation measures,⁹ all OECMs must meet four requirements to meet the Protected Planet data standards:

1. All sites must meet the CBD definition of an “other effective area-based conservation measure”
1. Spatial data from Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and an associated list of attributes must be providedⁱ
1. Source of Information must be provided
1. The Data Contributor Agreement must be signed

These requirements may make it difficult for many Indigenous Peoples and local communities to register their lands and territories as OECMs, as it can be time consuming and costly, thereby potentially imposing dependencies on foreign aid or technical support that may not be appropriate or may curtail the potential of locally-led conservation. In some instances where national governments are supportive, partnerships with them may be an avenue to secure technical support, but this will not be suitable in all countries. This suggests training, outreach, capacity building and appropriate technical support provided by organizations trusted by Indigenous Peoples and local communities is likely to be needed if OECMs are to be effectively considered at the local level unless these requirements can be simplified and streamlined - something which should be discussed at the national level.

Implications for governance

Declaring an OECM may also bring additional obligations. To prove effectiveness, monitoring and reporting on the status of biodiversity is likely to be required, which can be an onerous task. Declaring an OECM also in effect commits the custodians and/or rightsholders to maintaining management as it is at present, which may reduce options, and might not be agreeable to all community members.

Furthermore, in many contexts, Indigenous Peoples and local communities may not want to be subjected to the specific criteria and requirements of OECMs as it does not align with their worldviews, values and ways of life or way of doing things – or the nationally specific criteria are not yet known. This may change if OECM criteria and requirements at the national level account for the interests of Indigenous Peoples and of communities, but the choice needs to remain open. It is also clear that currently national jurisdictions in too many countries simply do not adequately recognize or protect the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

Where Indigenous Peoples and communities are already using area-based management tools, or governance systems, which qualify as OECMs or may be expected to be reclassified as such, it is important to remain vigilant that the evolving guidelines and criteria for OECM takes place in local or national contexts - and not just in the international scale - as has been discussed above.

ⁱ This may be potentially problematic especially in areas with overlapping jurisdictions, or where conflicts exist between claims made about management, use or ownership rights by indigenous peoples and local communities, when compared to officially recognised titles and ownership.

Recommendations

The current language in Target 3 only refers to protected areas and to ‘other effective area-based measures’, with no mention of Indigenous Peoples or local communities, nor of rights, collective governance or self-determination. The same is true for Target 1 and for Target 2, although they also propose significant changes in the way land is managed and governed.

Given the risks to land tenure, governance, self-determination and other rights posed by the potential expansion of protected and conserved areas specific reference is needed in Target 3 to the need for appropriate recognition and support for the collective lands, territories and resources of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and the crucial importance of free, prior, and informed consent.

The relationship between commitments in the global biodiversity framework and the land, resource, access and ownership rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities needs more explicit recognition in the framework. This is true for the overarching Vision and Goals of the framework, as well as relevant for specific targets beyond Target 3.

The implementation of Target 3, and area-based targets more broadly, will need to see new partnerships emerge between governments, sub-national governments, funding agencies and Indigenous peoples and local communities to create the conditions in which rights can be better recognised and where conservation and sustainable use outcomes can be secured.

References

1. ICCA Consortium. 2021. Territories of Life: 2021 Report. ICCA Consortium: worldwide. Available at: report.territoiresofflife.org
- 2 CBD/COP/DEC/14/8 30 November 2018 - 14/8
- 3 <https://www.protectedplanet.net/en/thematic-areas/oecms?tab=About>
- 4 Annex II, paragraph 6
- 5 Annex III, paras ...
- 6 For more information see [‘Will OECMs increase recognition and support for ICCAs’](#) and [Parks Journal Special Issue on OECMs](#)
- 7 See for instance Simon Counsell “Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures’ (OECMs): an acceptable face of protected areas that can save biodiversity conservation? Available at <https://redd-monitor.org/2022/02/22/other-effective-area-based-conservation-measures-oecms-an-acceptable-face-of-protected-areas-that-can-save-biodiversity/>
- See the January 2022 update of the WDPA and WD-OECM available at: <https://www.protectedplanet.net/en/resources/january-2022-update-of-the-wdpa-and-wd-oecm>
- 8 See the January 2022 update of the WDPA and WD-OECM available at: <https://www.protectedplanet.net/en/resources/january-2022-update-of-the-wdpa-and-wd-oecm>
- 9 User Manual for the World Database on Protected Areas and world database on other effective area-based conservation measures Available at: https://wdpa.s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/WDPA_Manual/English/WDPA_WDOECM_Manual_1_6.pdf

Acknowledgements

This briefing was written by Ameyali Ramos Castillo and Helen Tugendhat, with many thanks in particular to the IUCN Commission on Environment, Economic and Social Policy (IUCN CEESP), Holly Jonas, Joji Carino, Harry Jonas, Maurizio Ferrari, María-Carolina Rodríguez-Acero, Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Jessica Stewart, Heather Bingham, Hugh Govan, Cristina Eghenter, Lazaro Mecha, Laura Peña, Nataly Domicó, Carolina Amaya Pedraza, Arely Garcia, Gerardo Basán, Leonardo Parra, Heriberto Mejía Barros, Ignacio Krell Rivera, Nigel Dudley, Juan Alex Alvarez del Castillo, Stan Stevens and Oliver Hymas, for contributions and review. Faults remain the responsibility of the authors.