

Memorandum 1/11/2018

## **IAB3: Arctic marine protected areas: identification, effectiveness, co-management and cooperation**

This memo provides a summary of reports submitted on the session IAB3 organised at the Arctic Biodiversity Session in Rovaniemi, Finland on October 11 organised by *CAFF, PAME and NRDC*.

### **Session Organisers:**

- Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) Arctic Council Working Group
- Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME) Arctic Council Working Group
- Natural Resources Defence Council (NRDC)

**Attendance:** 65

### **Arctic Biodiversity Assessment recommendation themes most prominently addressed in the session:**

- Climate change
- Addressing stressors
- Identifying and safeguarding important areas

### **Key points raised in the session that were important to note:**

- Urgent to establish Marine Protected Areas (MPA) in response to increasing human pressures, Climate change
- The total Arctic area (marine and terrestrial) under protection remained low until the 1970s. Today 11.4% of the Arctic (marine and terrestrial) about 3.7 million km<sup>2</sup>, has protected status. The nature of protection and governance of these areas varies and there are varying levels of protection within countries.
- 4.7% of the Arctic (as defined by CAFF) is protected while 20.3% of the Arctic's terrestrial areas are protected.
- While the Arctic exceeds the UN CBD Aichi Target for terrestrial (in terms of extent) however it falls short (in terms of extent) for protection of Arctic MPAs.
- There is a need to follow-up on AMSA IIc in the light of climate change and increasing multiple marine uses.
- The WWF Pan-Arctic Marine Protected Areas Network (PAMPAN) Systematic Conservation planning approach presents one approach to consider when considering Arctic MPAs i.e. it presents a transparent, replicable, adaptable, faster, cheaper approach when considering the establishment of MPAs
- CAFF and PAME are working with the UN Environment World Database on Protected Areas (ProtectedPlanet.net) and CAFF to integrate these two data holdings in order to better understand the extent of protected areas across the Arctic. Preliminary results indicate that MPAs coverage is more extensive (5.9%) than captured in either CAFF/PAME inventory or the ProtectedPlanet.net.

- A case-study on MPA management in the Inuvialuit settlement region of Northern Canada was presented as a successful model on how to work with local communities in protected area management and in establishing research priorities.
- Greenland has conducted work to assess the sensitivity of marine and coastal areas to ocean uses and in helping identify ecologically and biologically important areas.

**Recommendations/actions identified for how to deal with the issues raised in the session:**

- There is a need for joint action on MPAs in order to ensure practical outcomes
- There is a need to implement the relevant Arctic Biodiversity Assessment recommendations and the MPA framework
- The outcomes from the series of MPA workshops organised by PAME should be considered when planning next steps
- Important to consider representativeness and connectivity of MPAs when considering future actions related to MPAs
- Transboundary protection initiatives are required for bilateral Conservation (i.e. Russia/US and Russia/Norway bordering areas)

**Take home message from the session:**

- Increasing human activities and climate change impacts in Arctic marine areas raise the urgent need to consider how to improve the protection of marine areas