

Expression of Interest

ICES/IUCN-CEM FEG Workshop on Testing OECM Practices and Strategies (WKTOPS)

Nomination of possible expert participants and sites for testing at WGTOPS should be made using the accompanying form. Individuals may self-nominate, and institutions and organizations may nominate multiple individuals and/or sites, but each nomination should use a separate form.

If nominating individuals, the final part of the form on Justification of ABFM does not need to be completed.

If nominating a site, it is not necessary to specify expertise and gender, and "country" should be the authority responsible for the ABFM.

Justification of nominated sites only needs to specify the type of area based measure(s) in place, the biodiversity feature(s) that might be receiving benefits from the ABFM, and the general nature of the data that could be available for testing the evaluation process.

Name:

Affiliation (Institution/Department):

Government/Private Sector/Academia/NGO/Other (specify):

Country:

Expertise:

Gender:

Nomination of Case Study ABFM:

Justification of ABFM in terms of the evaluation steps below. Is there public information (data, publications etc.) to address the steps? Briefly explain why you think the nominated area is a good choice to consider.

Evaluation Steps:

1. Taking note of the jurisdictional status of the selected ABFMs;
2. Documenting the relevant biodiversity features and ecosystem services in the selected areas;
3. Identifying the pressures and threats to the biodiversity and ecosystem service features of interest, both present and in a plausible future, and considering sectors other than fisheries;
4. Assessing the extent and relative status of the biodiversity features and benefits, identifying indicators, reference values, enabling and impeding factors;

5. Describing the full suite of management measures actually in place and suggest additional ones in the candidate-OECM to obtain, maintain or improve biodiversity benefits;
6. Using the information from steps 1-6, test the draft elements of guidance available by attempting to establish eligibility of each area for being considered an OECM, and assessing the likelihood that the area and measures will produce long-term benefits for biodiversity and ecosystem services – noting any issues in applying the steps and undertaking the trial assessment;
7. Assess the additional properties of OECMs described in Aichi Target 11 and Annex III of CBD Decision 14/8 (e.g., in terms of governance and inclusive processes; OECM's representativeness and connectivity; and other locally relevant values, etc.) and determine whether there is sufficient knowledge on their properties or characteristics in each case study such that they should be considered for OECM reporting.