



4th APAP Technical Workshop

Managing Protected Areas Effectively: Using the IUCN Green List, Management Effectiveness Evaluation, and other International Tools and Standards

Summary report



Asia Protected Areas Partnership

The Asia Protected Areas Partnership (APAP) has been designed as a key platform to help governments and other stakeholders collaborate for more effective management of protected areas in the region.

APAP was initiated in 2013 at the first-ever Asia Parks Congress held in Japan, and formally launched the following year at the IUCN World Parks Congress in Australia. It is chaired by IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature, and co-chaired by an APAP Member organisation on a rotational basis. The Ministry of Environment, Republic of Korea, is the current co-chair.

The goal of APAP is to facilitate improved conservation outcomes for protected areas in Asia by:

1. Promoting best practices and innovative solutions to the challenges facing the region's protected areas, through knowledge sharing and capacity building;
2. Strengthening transboundary and regional cooperation;
3. Raising awareness of the multiple benefits of Asia's protected areas, both within and outside the region.

APAP also aspires to support national and regional efforts to implement the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, a global set of goals and targets which has been adopted by countries around the world to halt the loss of biodiversity.

4th APAP Technical Workshop

Managing Protected Areas Effectively: Using the IUCN Green List, Management Effectiveness Evaluation, and other International Tools and Standards

Summary report

The designation of geographical entities in this book, and the presentation of the material, do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IUCN or APAP concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of IUCN or APAP.

This publication has been made possible in part by funding from the Ministry of Environment, Republic of Korea and the Korea National Park Service.

Published by: IUCN Asia Regional Office, Bangkok, Thailand in collaboration with the Ministry of Environment, Republic of Korea and the Korea National Park Service

Copyright: © 2018 IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources

Reproduction of this publication for educational or other non-commercial purposes is authorised without prior written permission from the copyright holder provided the source is fully acknowledged.

Reproduction of this publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without prior written permission of the copyright holder.

Citation: Asia Protected Area Partnership 2018. *4th APAP Technical Workshop. Managing Protected Areas Effectively: Using the IUCN Green List, Management Effectiveness Evaluation, and other International Tools and Standards*. Bangkok, Thailand: IUCN Asia Regional Office. iv+21pp.

Cover photo: Odaesan National Park, Republic of Korea © Korea National Park Service

Layout by: IUCN Asia Regional Office

Printed by: IUCN Asia Regional Office

Available from: IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature)
Asia Protected Areas Partnership (APAP)
63 Sukhumvit Soi 39
Klongton – Nua, Wattana
10110 Bangkok, Thailand
Tel +66 (2) 662 4029 ext.152
Fax +66 (2) 662 4387
scott.perkin@iucn.org
www.iucn.org/resources/publications

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| List of acronyms and abbreviations | iv |
| 1 Background and introduction | 1 |
| 2 Objectives | 2 |
| 3 Opening session | 2 |
| 4 Summary of sessions..... | 4 |
| 4.1 Session 1: setting the context | 4 |
| 4.1.1 In-depth introduction to the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas | 4 |
| 4.1.2 Overview of protected areas management effectiveness | 6 |
| 4.2 Session 2: looking at the IUCN Green List in detail | 7 |
| 4.2.1 Applying the IUCN Green List Standard in Asia: Case studies from the Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China..... | 7 |
| 4.2.2 Small group discussions | 7 |
| 4.3 Session 3: Members' presentations | 9 |
| 4.3.1 Bangladesh | 9 |
| 4.3.2 Bhutan | 9 |
| 4.3.3 Cambodia | 10 |
| 4.3.4 Japan..... | 10 |
| 4.3.5 Mongolia..... | 11 |
| 4.4 Session 4: Members' presentations (continued)..... | 11 |
| 4.4.1 Myanmar | 11 |
| 4.4.2 Nepal | 12 |
| 4.4.3 Pakistan..... | 12 |
| 4.4.4 Sri Lanka | 12 |
| 4.4.5 Viet Nam..... | 13 |
| 4.4.6 Small group discussions | 13 |
| 4.4.7 Overview of the field visit | 14 |
| 5 Closing session..... | 14 |
| Annex I: Agenda..... | 15 |
| Annex II: List of participants | 20 |
| Annex III: Photos of field visit to Odaesan National Park | 22 |

List of acronyms and abbreviations

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| APAP | Asia Protected Areas Partnership |
| CA TS | Conservation Assured Tiger Standards |
| CBD | Convention on Biological Diversity |
| COMPASS | Community of Protected Areas Sustainability Standards |
| COP | Conference of the Parties |
| EAGL | Expert Assessment Group for the Green List |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| IUCN | International Union for Conservation of Nature |
| IUCN Green List | IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas |
| KNPS | Korea National Park Service |
| MEE | Management Effectiveness Evaluation |
| METT | Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool |
| MoEK | Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Korea |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organisation |
| PAME | Protected Area Management Effectiveness |
| RAPPAM | Rapid Assessment and Prioritisation of Protected Area Management |
| SMART | Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool |
| WCPA | IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas |
| WWF | World Wide Fund for Nature |

1 Background and introduction

The Asia Protected Areas Partnership (APAP) has been designed as a regional platform to help governments and other stakeholders share experiences and best practices on protected areas. As of June 2018, APAP country membership stood at 16 Members from 13 different countries across Asia, as well as one Associate Member. Under the auspices of APAP, at least one technical workshop a year is organised for member organisations.

Protected areas play a key role in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development, and there has been a dramatic increase in the number of protected areas over the last decade. However, the establishment of new protected areas is only part of the solution; effective and equitable management is also crucial for achieving both the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals.

In recognition of this need to strengthen the management of protected areas, Management Effectiveness Evaluation (MEE) is increasingly being used by many countries; however, much greater efforts will be required to meet the target of CBD Decision X/31¹. Recently, the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas (the “IUCN Green List”) has been developed as a new international standard for protected areas that deliver successful conservation outcomes through effective and equitable governance and management. In November 2017, the IUCN Council formally approved the IUCN Green List Standard and it is now ready to be implemented worldwide.

In view of the importance of effective management, the theme of the 4th APAP Technical Workshop was “Managing Protected Areas Effectively: Using the IUCN Green List, Management Effectiveness Evaluation, and other International Tools and Standards.” The workshop was jointly organised by the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Korea (MoEK), the Korea National Park Service (KNPS), and the IUCN Asia Regional Office, with the generous financial support of MoEK and KNPS.

All 16 APAP Country Member organisations were invited to the technical workshop. Each Member organisation nominated a mid- to senior-level officer with knowledge of protected area management effectiveness (PAME) to take part in the event. The workshop was held over a period of three days (19-21 June 2018), including a one-day field visit.

The workshop agenda and list of participants can be found in Annexes I and II respectively. Copies of all workshop presentations can be downloaded from [here](#).

¹ “Continue to expand and institutionalize management effectiveness assessments to work towards assessing 60 per cent of the total area of protected areas by 2015 using various national and regional tools and report the results into the global database on management effectiveness maintained by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP-WCMC).”

2 Objectives

The objectives of the workshop were to:

- Enhance APAP Members' understanding of protected area management effectiveness and the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas;
- Share experiences and lessons learned on effective management of protected areas among APAP Member organisations;
- Compile best practices and identify emerging issues within the Asia region on effective management of protected areas.

3 Opening session

The workshop was opened with speeches by Mr Jongseon Jeong, Director General, Nature Conservation Policy Bureau, MoEK, and APAP Co-Chair; Mr Sangbae Kim, Executive Director of Conservation, KNPS; Dr Scott Perkin, Head, Natural Resources Group, IUCN Asia Regional Office; Prof. Youngbae Suh, Plant Systematics Natural Products Research Institute, Seoul National University, and IUCN Regional Councillor.

Mr Jeong emphasised that APAP has taken a pivotal role as a regional knowledge hub, allowing Members to share information about global trends in protected areas through annual technical workshops. He expressed his expectation that the workshop would provide an opportunity for protected area managers to obtain new knowledge about the IUCN Green List and PAME that they could apply to their own work.

Mr Kim welcomed all participants to the event and expressed his pleasure to be hosting the workshop in Korea. He noted that this was the first APAP technical workshop to be held in the country since MoEK had become the co-chair of APAP. He mentioned that understanding of the role and importance of protected areas in conserving biodiversity is growing. He noted that effective management, along with an expansion of the protected area system, is the key to the conservation of biodiversity.

Dr Scott Perkin stressed that effective management of protected areas is crucial for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. He explained that the IUCN Green List is the new global standard for effectively and equitably managed protected areas. He also expressed his gratitude to MoEK and KNPS for their support to APAP and the technical workshop.

Prof. Suh expressed his delight at having the 4th APAP Technical Workshop in Pyeongchang and noted that it had previously hosted several significant world events such as CBD COP12 and the 2018 Winter Olympics. He explained that the Republic of Korea had taken over as co-chair of APAP from Japan towards the end of 2017 and said that he expects APAP to grow larger and stronger. He also noted that Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 is about much more than just expanding the area under protection; effective management of protected areas is also essential.



Fig. 1: Opening ceremony © Korea National Park Service



Fig. 2: Clockwise, left to right: Mr Jongseon Jeong, Mr Sangbae Kim, Prof. Youngbae Suh, and Dr Scott Perkin deliver opening speeches © Korea National Park Service



Fig. 3: Group photo of participants © Korea National Park Service

4 Summary of sessions

4.1 SESSION 1: SETTING THE CONTEXT

This session was chaired by Dr Hagyoung Heo, Senior Research Fellow, KNPS. Ms Soyoung Park, Chief Programme Officer, International Cooperation, KNPS, provided an overview of the workshop agenda and objectives. Mr James Hardcastle, Programme Development Manager, IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme, then presented an in-depth introduction to the IUCN Green List and an overview of PAME.

4.1.1 In-depth introduction to the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas

Mr Hardcastle explained that the IUCN Green List Standard has three baseline components: 1) good governance; 2) sound design and planning; and 3) effective management. These three components create the enabling conditions for successful conservation outcomes – the fourth component of the Green List.

Taken together, the four components have 17 criteria and 50 generic indicators to measure achievement. Although the criteria remain constant, the indicators can be adapted to suit the Asian context. Sites put forward for inscription on the Green List are evaluated across all four components and must successfully meet all 17 criteria.

Mr Hardcastle went on to explain the key role of the Expert Assessment Groups for the Green List (EAGLs), which are established at the national or sub-national level to oversee the Green Listing process. He also introduced the Community of Protected Area Sustainability Standards (COMPASS), which is the cloud-based Green List data management system.

Looking at the benefits of applying the standard, Mr Hardcastle noted that the IUCN Green List helps to enhance the visibility and recognition of protected areas. It provides a global benchmark for success that is applicable at the local level; unlike the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), which

is often self-assessed, the Green List Standard provides objective validation. Unlike METT, which can sometimes provide vague recommendations, the Green List provides clear feedback about what is needed to improve. The Green List is also inclusive and applicable to all protected areas, whether large or small. Inscription on the IUCN Green List can also help generate additional funding and resources.

At the global level, 73 countries are currently interested in applying the Green List Standard, including five countries within the Asia region.

Questions and answers

Q: *In Bhutan, we are using METT-Plus. How different is this from the Green List?*

A: The Green List requires evidence and METT can help provide this. The two are different, but compatible.

Q: *What is the difference between Conservation Assured/Tiger Standards (CA|TS) and the Green List?*

A: CA|TS is focused on tigers. It is similar to the Green List, but it has less of a focus on governance and no independent assurance. CA|TS and the Green List are working together to try to ensure complementarity.

Q: *How does a country go about setting up an EAGL?*

A: First, it is important to secure high-level political support from the jurisdiction in question, e.g. through a letter from the relevant minister. Next, an open call for applications is issued and experts selected. Ideally, an EAGL will be composed of approximately eight to 15 people, representing a diverse range of interests and stakeholder groups. Declarations regarding conflicts of interest must be signed. For example, protected area managers are allowed to participate but they cannot vote for their own areas.

Q: *In Myanmar, we have our own system of protected area categories. Is it still possible to apply the IUCN Green List Standard?*

A: Yes – definitely! And by going through the Green List process, it should be possible to assign an IUCN protected area management category and governance type to the protected areas in question.

Q: *What are the added benefits of the Green List? We already have Ramsar Sites and World Heritage Sites.*

A: Ramsar and World Heritage sites recognise *values*; the Green List is about management. Ultimately, the goal should be to have all natural World Heritage sites on the Green List.

Q: *Do we have to use COMPASS to collate our evidence base?*

A: Yes. COMPASS has an Application Programme Interface (API) which enables it to integrate databases from other sources. It also has an automatic translation system, so evidence can be provided in national languages. Information from SMART can also be imported.

Q: *How often do sites on the Green List have to report? Is there a process for de-listing?*

A: The Green List operates in a way that is similar to the Blue Flag scheme in Europe. Basically, a site is on the list for five years unless a reason arises to remove it. There is a system of alerts and triggers that may lead to a review (e.g. a report by an NGO of serious poaching, or a change in the area's governance status). In Year 3 of a site's Green List registration, a spot check is carried out. In Year 5, the dossier must be updated and the site re-inscribed.

Q: *Shouldn't IUCN take the lead in each country, in terms of raising awareness and piloting the Green List Standard (depending on resources)?*

A: Yes, this would be excellent. However, the IUCN Secretariat is not everywhere, and Members are equally capable. IUCN is currently looking at resourcing models, such as payment for registration. IUCN has made a commitment that by 2020 the Green List will be bringing additional resources to protected areas. IUCN does not want the Green List to be a drain on resources and is trying to keep costs low.

Q: *We carried out a METT in 2005 at our site. Can we still use this to apply for the Green List?*

A: That was a long time ago; it would probably be necessary to undertake another assessment.

Q: *How much does it cost a country to inscribe a site on the IUCN Green List?*

A: IUCN estimates that Green List registration typically costs between US \$2,000 and \$5,000 per site. The main costs are for training, documentation and the meetings of the EAGL; the costs of the independent reviewer are met directly by IUCN. In the future, it is envisioned that wealthier countries will start to pay a service fee, which will be used to create a Green List Fund to support others.

4.1.2 Overview of protected areas management effectiveness

Mr Hardcastle began the session by noting that the Green List is not an alternative to management effectiveness. There are currently some 70 to 80 different management effectiveness methodologies in use around the world. One of the most widely used methodologies is METT, developed by the World Bank and WWF. METT is based on a score card assessment consisting of some 30+ questions, and can be undertaken relatively rapidly. The use of METT is compulsory for all GEF-funded projects, and over 3,200 assessments have been carried out to date, in over 100 countries. However, only a small fraction (approximately 1.5 per cent) of the world's protected areas have been assessed.

One of the weaknesses of METT is that it tends to be donor driven, and there is often a subjective desire on the part of the assessor to demonstrate improvements to the donor. The management gaps identified by METT tend to be phrased as problems, and the tool does not necessarily provide answers to address these. An additional concern is that cultural values and ecosystem service values are often missing.

However, METT and the Green List are complementary and mutually supportive. METT+ provides roughly 80 per cent of the information required by the Green List. However, the Green List brings significant added value: it is reviewed by an independent assessor; it requires stakeholder input and transparency; it has a focus on governance and outcomes; and it identifies a clear pathway for action and achieving improvements.

With regard to governance, Mr Hardcastle emphasised the importance of recognising people, their rights and their culture in protected area management, and of achieving "conservation with justice." He explained that IUCN recognises four protected area governance types: 1) governance by government; 2) shared governance; 3) governance by private individuals and organisations; and 4) governance by indigenous peoples and/or local communities.

Equity is assessed through three dimensions: 1) recognition; 2) procedure; and 3) distribution. Governance assessments address the first two dimensions whilst social assessments address the third.

To conclude his presentation, Mr Hardcastle drew attention to PANORAMA, the online platform for sharing successful approaches to conservation and development. Protected areas wishing to be inscribed on the IUCN Green List need to submit at least one case study (a "solution") to PANORAMA: <https://panorama.solutions/en>.

4.2 SESSION 2: LOOKING AT THE IUCN GREEN LIST IN DETAIL

This session was chaired by Dr Perkin from IUCN Asia. Dr Heo from KNPS and Mr Zheng Sixian, Programme Officer for the International Forestry Cooperation Center of the National Forestry and Grassland Administration, provided in-depth case studies on the application of the IUCN Green List Standard in the Republic of Korea (three Green List sites) and China (six Green List sites) respectively. Following the case study presentations, small group discussions took place, under the guidance of Mr Hardcastle.

4.2.1 Applying the IUCN Green List Standard in Asia: Case studies from the Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China

Dr Heo delivered a presentation on the Republic of Korea's experience of adopting the IUCN Green List Standard. He summarised the rationale for adopting the standard, the national processes that were put in place, the benefits, and the challenges encountered. He said that the Republic of Korea hopes to expand the number of sites on the IUCN Green List in the future. Important next steps will include: re-organising the Expert Assessment Group; updating the Korean Standards; re-listing the existing Green List sites; and preparing a detailed implementation plan.

Mr Zheng provided a summary of China's experience of adopting the IUCN Green List Standard. He observed that a number of challenges had been encountered, including the lack of a common understanding of and a consistent definition for protected areas, and insufficient documentation to support the process and to respond to the Green List's emphasis on evidence. Mr Zheng also informed the group about the institutional re-structuring that had recently occurred in China. As of March 2018, the former State Forestry Administration has become the National Forestry and Grassland Administration as well as the National Park Authority.

During the question and answer session, Mr Hardcastle provided further information about the differences between the pilot phase and the current phase of the IUCN Green List. He explained that the current Green List Standard is different from the pilot phase in three important ways:

- Sites that aspire to the Green List Standard become "candidate sites" and retain this status until they achieve the standard. The Green List is not about "passing" or "failing," but rather, about identifying areas where improvements are needed and working together to ensure that these are addressed;
- Greater responsibility and ownership of the process have been given to the Expert Assessment Groups; and
- The new online platform (COMPASS) makes it much easier to provide and organise the necessary documentation and evidence.

4.2.2 Small group discussions

Participants were divided into three small groups to discuss the following questions:

- How could the IUCN Green List best be implemented by APAP and in each APAP Member country?
- What challenges and opportunities does the Green List present?

- What benefits could the IUCN Green List bring to APAP and Member countries?
- What are your top three recommendations to IUCN to further develop the programme?

With regard to benefits, participants highlighted: increased international recognition for the areas inscribed on the list; improvements to protected area management; and increased funding. In recognition of these benefits, participants recommended that all APAP Member countries be encouraged to adopt the IUCN Green List Standard.

However, participants also acknowledged that the Green List is confronted by a number of challenges, including insufficient knowledge, capacity and funding. To help address these constraints, it was recommended that IUCN undertake the following:

- **Provide increased support to countries wishing to adopt the IUCN Green List Standard**
 - Organise national workshops to bring together all stakeholders and build capacity on how to achieve the criteria at national level;
 - Provide technical and financial support to countries to implement the standard;
 - Organise exchange visits and study tours between sites and countries.
- **Simplify and promote the IUCN Green List Standard**
 - Simplify the IUCN Green List process;
 - Develop user-friendly guidelines and reporting;
 - Promote the IUCN Green List brand to increase visibility and benefits to sites.



Fig. 4: Small group discussions © Korea National Park Service



Fig. 5: Reporting back to the plenary following group discussions © Korea National Park Service

4.3 SESSION 3: MEMBERS' PRESENTATIONS

This session was chaired by Dr Perkin from the IUCN Asia Regional Office. At the beginning of the session, Ms Minsun Kim, Programme Officer, Protected Areas, IUCN Asia Regional Office, provided a brief summary of the first day of the workshop. Representatives from Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Japan and Mongolia were then invited to give their country presentations.

4.3.1 Bangladesh

Mr Mihir Kumar Doe, Director of the Wildlife Centre, gave the presentation for Bangladesh. He noted that Bangladesh does not yet have a systematic approach in place for assessing PAME. However, the Rapid Assessment and Prioritisation of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM) had been carried out in 19 protected areas in 2010. METT was first used in 2015 and 2016, when assessments of 37 protected areas were carried out. Among other benefits, METT had been found to be relatively easy and quick; it had also provided a harmonised and replicable reporting system. However, Mr Doe noted that there are also a number of challenges in using METT. For example, it is difficult to make comparisons between sites and to carry out a detailed evaluation of outcomes; there is also limited knowledge of the application of METT at the field level. Bangladesh expects to use the results of MEEs to enhance implementation of management plans, master plans and conservation action plans.

Lawachara National Park was presented as a site-level case study on the use of MEE in Bangladesh. The assessment had revealed that the park was under a wide variety of pressures and threats, including a railway line, a road, tourism (the site was receiving some 200,000 visitors a year at the time), local resource use, and cultivation of betel nut and lemon. The park had very limited management capacity and human resources (only the equivalent of six full-time staff). The MEE results will be used to improve capacity and enhance implementation of the management plan. Periodic use of MEE is being planned.

4.3.2 Bhutan

Mr Thinley Wangdi, Park Manager, Sakteng Wildlife Sanctuary, Department of Forests and Park Services, Ministry of Agriculture and Forests, gave the presentation on Bhutan. He explained that Bhutan has used several PAME tools and methodologies, including RAPPAM, METT and METT+.

In 2016, all of Bhutan's protected areas applied METT+ through a self-assessment process. The results indicated that Bhutan's protected areas were being managed fairly well, but that there was insufficient funding, technical resources, research and monitoring data. Amongst other benefits, Mr Wangdi noted

that the use of METT+ had enabled Bhutan to prepare a comprehensive “state of parks” report. The information generated by METT+ had also been used to develop guidelines on protected area zonation, management plan preparation, and the assessment of threats. It had also fed into the design of capacity-building programmes and the development of species conservation action plans (e.g. for tiger, snow leopard and red panda).

A case study was presented on the use of METT+ in the Sakteng Wildlife Sanctuary, which is home to some 5,000 (largely pastoral) people. The sanctuary has a vision of conserving both biodiversity and cultural heritage. Threats to the site include livestock grazing, hydropower development, and the illegal collection of medicinal plants. These are exacerbated by the lack of transboundary collaboration, the absence of a tourism “offer,” and insufficient preparedness for climate change. Mr Wangdi noted that METT+ had helped to identify gaps in the current management regime which are in need of greater attention. It had also provided a platform for better coordination among PA staff. In the future, Bhutan plans to carry out a comparative analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of different PAME tools.

4.3.3 Cambodia

The Cambodian presentation was given by Mr Kong Kim Sreng, Director, Department of Southern Boeung Tonlesap Terrestrial Protected Area Conservation, Ministry of Environment. He observed that there is no systematic implementation of MEE in Cambodia. Many different methodologies have been used by conservation projects operating in different protected areas, for example, in the Keo Seima Wildlife Sanctuary, Central Cardamom National Park and Southern Cardamom National Park. The process has been largely project and donor-driven.

The results of the MEE assessments have revealed that some protected areas have limited human and financial resources and insufficient field equipment; there is also a need for greater coordination with stakeholders. Mr Sreng mentioned that the Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool (SMART) is being used by a number of conservation NGOs but that there is no consistency within the government system. Mr Hardcastle commented that SMART facilitates data gathering and reporting, and can therefore help with the Green List process.

4.3.4 Japan

Ms Reiko Takizawa, Assistant Director, National Park Division and Mr Issei Nakahara, Assistant Director, Biodiversity Policy Division, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment, gave a joint presentation on behalf of Japan. They noted that many national parks in Japan include private lands. Management strategies must therefore maintain a balance between conservation and utilisation, and collaboration with multiple stakeholders is key.

There has been no implementation of MEE in Japan to date. The Ministry of the Environment is currently in the process of carrying out research into MEE and the strengths and weaknesses of different tools and methodologies, with a view to making recommendations in 2019. Ms Takizawa and Mr Nakahara requested APAP Members to share any reports or information that they might have about their MEE experiences. They noted that they expect the application of MEE in Japan to improve both the management and operational planning of the protected area system, and highlighted the importance of selecting appropriate criteria and indicators.

4.3.5 Mongolia

Mr Dashpurev Tserendeleg, Director of Hustai National Park, gave the presentation on Mongolia. METT was first used in 2005 to evaluate the Altai Sayan Region Special Protected Area (SPA). Modifications to the approach were made in 2012 and 2016, in order to account for Mongolia's particular requirements. In 2016, METT was implemented in 12 Strictly Protected Areas, 19 national parks, four nature reserves and two monuments. The results revealed that there is a need for better planning and an increase in funding in order to improve the effectiveness of SPA management. Mr Tserendeleg observed that it is difficult to use METT to evaluate the implementation of SPA management plans. In 2017, a ministerial order was issued to scale up the use of SMART to all protected areas in Mongolia.

Hustai National Park was presented as a case study. Hustai is the only national park in Mongolia which is managed by an NGO. An MEE was carried out by national park staff, representatives from the buffer zone communities and the local administrative authorities. The results showed that Hustai National Park needs to secure sustainable financial resources, develop tourism according to the area's carrying capacity, and improve facilities and staff capacity. Hustai plans to conduct METT every two years and also intends to evaluate management plan implementation.

4.4 SESSION 4: MEMBERS' PRESENTATIONS (CONTINUED)

This session was chaired by Dr Perkin from the IUCN Asia Regional Office. Representatives from Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam were invited to give their country presentations. After the presentations, a small group discussion was held, facilitated by Mr Hardcastle. Ms Nakyong Kim, Senior Programme Officer for KNPS, also presented an overview of the field visit that was planned for the following day.

4.4.1 Myanmar

The Myanmar presentation was given by Dr Tin Zar Kywe, Assistant Director, Nature and Wildlife Conservation Division, Forest Department. Dr Kywe explained that both METT and SMART are being promoted by the Wildlife Conservation Society as part of a protected areas programme supported by the Norwegian government, and that METT has been translated into Myanmar language. The use of these tools has enhanced understanding of the current status of protected areas and their management priorities; however, staff can find it challenging to complete the necessary forms.

Dr Kywe presented a case study on the use of MEE in Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary. In accordance with the requirements of GEF, METT had been implemented in 2013 and 2018; the total score had improved, from 49% to 53%.

Dr Kywe explained that there has been a paradigm shift in protected area management in Myanmar. Greater emphasis is now being placed on engagement with local communities and on benefits beyond the boundaries of protected areas. This is reflected in the recently adopted *Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Law* (2018), which enables community access to biological resources, public education, buffer zone management, community-based ecotourism and co-management.

4.4.2 Nepal

Mr Gopal Prakash Bhattarai, Deputy Director General, Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation, gave the Nepal presentation. He noted that systematic evaluation of management effectiveness had been initiated in Nepal as far back as 2003. In 2006, 16 protected areas conducted MEE using the RAPPAM tool. In 2017, an MEE of the same 16 protected areas was carried out again, using the IUCN WCPA framework.

Mr Bhattarai also drew attention to the use of CA|TS in Nepal. Chitwan National Park had achieved CA|TS in 2015. Following this success, all the tiger sites in Nepal (four protected areas) were registered as CA|TS sites. Mr Hardcastle commented on the relationship between CA|TS and the IUCN Green List Standard. He explained that both of them encourage a focus on performance and conservation results, and that successful CA|TS sites would demonstrate compliance with many of the criteria in the IUCN Green List Standard. However, there are differences; in particular, the IUCN Green List Standard places greater emphasis on issues dealing with governance.

Participants recommended that ways be found to integrate CA|TS and the IUCN Green List Standard into one governance and evaluation system.

4.4.3 Pakistan

Mr Muhammad Samar Hussain Khan, Deputy Conservator (Wildlife), Ministry of Climate Change and Mr Mohammad Niaz, Deputy Conservator Wildlife, Forestry, Environment & Wildlife Department, Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, gave a joint presentation about Pakistan. Mr Hussain Khan explained that Pakistan has no specific mechanism for implementing MEE and that protected areas face many challenges, including the lack of management plans, weak institutional capacity, and financial constraints. He introduced Pakistan's experience of implementing an innovative, community-based trophy hunting programme in Community Conservation Areas, which involves local communities in sustainable trophy hunting. He noted that the Green Pakistan Programme has a significant component on protected area management and that SMART is being piloted in selected areas.

Mr Niaz spoke about the use of MEE in Chitral Gol National Park, where the METT had been applied in 2005. The results of the MEE had been used to argue the case for the creation of a separate management unit for Chitral Gol. They had also led to the launch of a national park development and management project in 2015-16, and greater involvement of the community in park management. The markhor population has increased dramatically as a result of these changes.

4.4.4 Sri Lanka

Mr A.W.W.L. Abeygunasekara, Acting Additional Conservator General of Forests and Conservator of Forests (Social Forestry & Extension) for the Forest Department and Mr M.S.O.M. Amararatna, Director of Operations for the Department of Wildlife Conservation, gave a joint presentation. In Sri Lanka, MEE has only recently been adopted in a few protected areas. Methodologies and tools dealing with PAME are a new concept and not familiar to park managers. There is also a lack of management plans for most protected areas.

The Sri Lankan case study looked at the use of METT in Kahalla Pallekele Sanctuary in 2015. This site is comprised of both state and private land, and supports some 150 elephants, including many tuskless.

The results have led to plans to upgrade the sanctuary to a national park, upgrade staff and facilities, and prepare a management plan.

SMART has also recently been introduced as a tool in some Sri Lankan protected areas. The government would like to roll this out across the country.

4.4.5 Viet Nam

Dr Tran Thi Kim Tinh, Deputy Head of the Ecology Division, Biodiversity Conservation Agency, Vietnam Environment Administration, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, gave the Viet Nam presentation. She noted that METT is the most commonly used management effectiveness tool, and that there are also plans to use METT to assess the effectiveness of Ramsar sites. She presented a case study from Cham Island Marine Protected Area.

Dr Tinh identified a number of challenges, including a lack of guidance on which methodologies are best suited to Viet Nam's context, as well as limited knowledge of PAME among protected area managers.

Dr Tinh also spoke about the Green List process in Viet Nam. An EAGL has been established and nationally-relevant indicators are being developed for each of the Green List criteria. Two protected areas (Van Long and Cat Tien) have been identified as candidate sites, but challenges related to financial and human resource limitations are being encountered. Dr Tinh also mentioned that SMART is being used as a tool to manage information in some protected areas.

4.4.6 Small group discussions

Participants were divided into three small groups to discuss the following questions;

- Based on the experiences from all countries, what seem to be the common benefits from using PAME tools and methodologies?
- What are the common challenges?
- What could APAP do in the future to help countries overcome the challenges and use PAME tools and methodologies more effectively?
- Please give your top one recommendation for PAME and one priority recommendation for the IUCN Green List to take from this technical workshop to the next APAP meeting.

During the reporting back to plenary, participants identified a range of benefits arising from the use of PAME tools and methodologies. In particular, they noted that PAME can be used to identify gaps in protected area management and prioritise conservation action. The major constraints to the use of PAME were identified as the difficulties in compiling data from protected areas and insufficient technical, financial and human resources.

Participants suggested that APAP could play a valuable role helping to address these challenges by: promoting the sharing of best practices among countries; organising training and capacity-building events as well as exchange visits; providing technical and financial support; and developing standardised and user-friendly methodologies.



Fig. 6: Reporting back to the plenary © Korea National Park Service

4.4.7 Overview of the field visit

Ms Nakyong Kim, Senior Programme Officer, KNPS, provided an overview of the field visit to Odaesan National Park. She explained that Odaesan had been designated as the Republic of Korea's 11th national park in 1975 and subsequently inscribed on the IUCN Green List in 2014. During the field trip, participants would have an opportunity to visit a number of famous areas in the park, including the Fir Forest Trail, Woljeongs Temple and the Seonjae-gil Trail.

5 Closing session

Mr Myungkeun Moon, Director, Partnership Department, KNPS and Dr Scott Perkin gave the closing remarks. They noted that the 4th APAP Technical Workshop had proven to be a valuable forum for sharing experience and knowledge among protected area practitioners and APAP Member countries, and expressed their gratitude to all the participants for their contributions and for making the event a success.



Fig. 7: Closing remarks © Korea National Park Service



Fig. 8: Presentation of tokens of appreciation from the representatives of Pakistan © Korea National Park Service

Annex I: Agenda

Monday 18 June: Arrival and transfer to Pyeongchang

Tuesday 19 June:

| Time | Items |
|--|--------------|
| 09:30-10:00 | Registration |
| Opening Ceremony (Facilitator: Mr Sungwoo Yang, Team Manager, Korea National Park Service) | |

| | |
|--|---|
| 10:00-10:40 | <p>Opening remarks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr Jongseon Jeong, Director General, Nature Conservation Policy Bureau, Ministry of Environment / APAP Co-Chair <p>Welcoming statements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr Sangbae Kim, Executive Director of Conservation, Korea National Park Service - Dr Scott Perkin, Head, Natural Resources Group, IUCN Asia Regional Office <p>Congratulatory remarks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prof. Youngbae Suh, Plant Systematics Natural Products Research Institute, Seoul National University/ IUCN Regional Councillor <p>Group photo</p> |
| Session 1: Setting the Context (Chair: Dr Hagyoung Heo, Senior Research Fellow, Korea National Park Service) | |
| 10:40-10:50 | <p>Overview of the workshop agenda and objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms Soyoung Park, Chief Programme Officer in International Cooperation, Korea National Park Service |
| 10:50-12:20 | <p>In-depth introduction to the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas (IUCN Green List)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr James Hardcastle, Programme Development Manager, IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme |
| 12:20-12:30 | Q&A |
| 12:30-13:30 | Lunch |
| 13:30-15:00 | <p>Overview of Protected Areas Management Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr James Hardcastle, Programme Development Manager, IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme |
| 15:00-15:10 | Q&A |
| 15:10-15:30 | Coffee break |
| Session 2: Looking at the IUCN Green List in Detail (Chair: Dr Scott Perkin, Head, Natural Resources Group, IUCN Asia Regional Office) | |
| 15:30-16:30 | <p>Applying the IUCN Green List Standard in Asia: Case Studies from Republic of Korea and China</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dr Hagyoung Heo, Senior Research Fellow, Korea National Park Service - Mr Zheng Sixian, Program Officer, International Forestry Cooperation Center, State Forestry and Grassland Administration of China |
| 16:30-16:40 | Q & A |
| 16:40-16:50 | Introduction to the small group discussions |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| | - Mr James Hardcastle, Programme Development Manager, IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme |
| 16:50-17:50 | Small group discussion on the IUCN Green List |
| 17:50-18:10 | Reporting back to plenary |
| 18:10-18:30 | Free time |
| 18:30-21:00 | Welcome dinner - Hosted by Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Korea and Korea National Park Service |

Wednesday 20 June:

| Time | Items |
|--|---|
| Session 3: Members' Presentations (Chair: Dr Scott Perkin, Head, Natural Resources Group, IUCN Asia Regional Office) | |
| 09:30-09:40 | Summary of the first day of the workshop - Ms Minsun Kim, Programme Officer, Protected Areas, IUCN Asia Regional Office |
| 09:40-10:00 | Bangladesh country presentation - Mr Mihir Kumar Doe, Director, Wildlife Center |
| 10:00-10:20 | Bhutan country presentation - Mr Thinley Wangdi, Park Manager, Sakteng Wildlife Sanctuary, Department of Forests and Park Services, Ministry of Agriculture and Forests |
| 10:20-10:40 | Cambodia country presentation - Mr Kong Kim Sreng, Director, Department of Southern Boeung Tonlesap Terrestrial Protected Area Conservation |
| 10:40-10:50 | Q & A |
| 10:50-11:10 | Coffee break |
| 11:10-11:30 | Japan country presentation Joint presentation by: - Ms Reiko Takizawa, Assistant Director, National Park Division, Mr Issei Nakahara, Assistant Director, Biodiversity Policy Division, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment |
| 11:30-11:50 | Mongolia country presentation - Mr Dashpurev Tserendeleg, Director, Hustai National Park Trust |
| 11:50-12:00 | Q & A |
| 12:00-13:30 | Lunch |

| Session 4: Members' Presentations (Continued) (Chair: Dr Scott Perkin, Head, Natural Resources Group, IUCN Asia Regional Office) | |
|--|--|
| 13:30-13:50 | Myanmar country presentation - Ms Tin Zar Kywe, Assistant Director, Nature and Wildlife Conservation Division, Forest Department |
| 13:50-14:10 | Nepal country presentation - Mr Gopal Prakash Bhattarai, Deputy Director General (Joint Secretary), Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation |
| 14:10-14:30 | Pakistan country presentation Joint presentation by: - Mr Muhammad Samar Hussain Khan, Deputy Conservator (Wildlife), Ministry of Climate Change and Mr Mohammad Niaz, Deputy Conservator Wildlife, Forestry, Environment & Wildlife Department, Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa |
| 14:30-14:40 | Q & A |
| 14:40-15:00 | Coffee break |
| 15:00-15:20 | Sri Lanka country presentation Joint presentation by: - Mr A. W. W. L. Abeygunasekara, Actg. Addl. Conservator General of Forests and Conservator of Forests (Social Forestry & Extension), Forest Department and Mr M. S. O. M. Amararathna, Director (Operations), Department of Wildlife Conservation |
| 15:20-15:40 | Viet Nam country presentation - Dr Tran Thi Kim Tinh, Deputy Head of Ecology Division, Biodiversity Conservation Agency, Vietnam Environment Administration, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment |
| 15:40-15:50 | Q & A |
| 15:50-16:00 | Introduction to the small group discussions - Mr James Hardcastle, Programme Development Manager, IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme |
| 16:00-17:00 | Group Discussion on Protected Area Management Effectiveness |
| 17:00-17:20 | Reporting back to plenary |
| 17:20-17:30 | Overview of the field visit - Ms Nakyong Kim, Senior Programme Officer, Korea National Park Service |
| Closing of the Workshop (Facilitator: Mr Sungwoo Yang, Team Manager, Partnership Department, Korea National Park Service) | |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 17:30-17:50 | Closing remarks - Mr Myungkeun Moon, Director, Partnership Department, Korea National Park Service - Dr Scott Perkin, Head, Natural Resources Group, IUCN Asia Regional Office |
| 17:50-20:00 | Dinner (according to each participant's own schedule) |

Thursday 21 June: Field visit

| Time | Items |
|-------------|--|
| 09:00-09:30 | Alpensia resort – Odaesan National Park |
| 09:30-11:30 | Odaesan National Park (Fir Forest Trail and Woljeongsa Temple) |
| 11:30-13:00 | Lunch |
| 13:00-15:10 | Odaesan National Park (Seonjae-gil Trail) |
| 15:10-15:40 | Odaesan National Park – Daegwallyeong Skyranch |
| 15:40-16:30 | Daegwallyeong Skyranch |
| 16:30-17:00 | Daegwallyeong Skyranch – Alpensia resort |
| 17:00-18:00 | Free time |
| 18:00-20:00 | Farewell dinner Hosted by Ministry of Environment and Korea National Park Service |

Friday 22 June: Transfer to Incheon and departure

Annex II: List of participants

| No. | Country | Organization | Name |
|-----|------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Bangladesh | Wildlife Center | Mihir Kumar Doe |
| 2 | Bhutan | Sakteng Wildlife Sanctuary, Department of Forests and Park Services, Ministry of Agriculture and Forests | Thinley Wangdi |
| 3 | Cambodia | General Directorate of Administration for Nature Conservation and Protection (GDANCP), Ministry of Environment (MoE) Cambodia | Kong Kim Sreng |
| 4 | China | Forest Park Protection and Development Center, National Forestry and Grassland Administration | Hu Chunzi |
| 5 | China | Division for NGO Affairs, International Forestry Cooperation Center, National Forestry and Grassland Administration | Zheng Sixian |
| 6 | Japan | Biodiversity Policy Division, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of Environment | Issei Nakahara |
| 7 | Japan | National Park Division, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of Environments | Reiko Takizawa |
| 8 | Mongolia | Hustai National Park Trust | Dashpurev Tserendeleg |
| 9 | Myanmar | Nature and Wildlife Conservation Division, Forest Department | Tin Zar Kywe |
| 10 | Nepal | Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation | Gopal Prakash Bhattarai |
| 11 | Pakistan | Ministry of Climate Change | Muhammad Samar Hussain Khan |
| 12 | Pakistan | Forestry, Environment & Wildlife Department Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa | Mohammad Niaz |
| 13 | Sri Lanka | Department of Wildlife Conservation | M.S.O.M.Amar arathna |
| 14 | Sri Lanka | Forest Department | A.W.W.L.Abey gunasekara |

| | | | |
|----|----------------------|--|-------------------|
| 15 | Vietnam | Vietnam Environment Administration (VEA) Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) | Tran Thi Kim Tinh |
| 16 | IUCN | IUCN Asia Regional Office | Scott Perkin |
| 17 | IUCN | IUCN Asia Regional Office | Minsun Kim |
| 18 | IUCN | IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme | James Hardcastle |
| 19 | Republic of Korea | Ministry of Environment | Jongseon Jeong |
| 20 | Republic of Korea | Ministry of Environment | Soonhwan Hwang |
| 21 | Republic of Korea | Ministry of Environment | Pureunsol Lee |
| 22 | Republic of Korea | Ministry of Environment | Jian You |
| 23 | Republic of Korea | Korea National Park Service | Sangbae Kim |
| 24 | Republic of Korea | Korea National Park Service | Myungkeun Moon |
| 25 | Republic of Korea | Korea National Park Service | Soyoung Park |
| 26 | Republic of Korea | Korea National Park Service | Eunjung Kwon |
| 27 | Republic of Korea | Korea National Park Service | Taeim Yoo |
| 28 | Republic of Korea | Korea National Park Service | Heejin Kang |
| 29 | Republic of Korea | Korea National Park Service | Jiboo Park |
| 30 | Republic of Korea | Korea National Park Service | Sungwoo Yang |
| 31 | Republic of Korea | Korea National Park Service | Hagyoung Heo |
| 32 | Republic of Korea | Korea National Park Service | Nakyong Kim |
| 33 | Republic of Korea | Korea National Park Service | Dongil Ham |
| 34 | Republic of Korea | IUCN Regional Councillor | Youngbae Suh |

Annex III: Photos of field visit to Odaesan National Park

Participants on the Fir Forest Trail and Seonjae-gil Trail, Odaesan National Park © Korea National Park Service







**ASIA PROTECTED
AREAS PARTNERSHIP**

IUCN Asia Regional Office

63 Sukhumvit Soi 39
Klongton – Nua, Wattana
Bangkok 10110, Thailand
Tel: +66 (2) 662 4029
Fax: +66 (2) 662 4387
asia@iucn.org

www.asiaprotectedareaspartnership.org

