P20 / Nature Policies and Protected Areas: regulatory, governance and evidence perspectives

Topic : ENVIRONMENT, SDGs, ENERGY

Chair : Valentina Dinica (Victoria University of Wellington)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

Biodiversity persistence and ecological quality are critical for the achievement of many Sustainable Development Goals. They are a central focus to SGD 14 and 15, while contributing to SDG 13. The challenge to implement the SGDs, and wider concerns with climate change, biodiversity loss, the deterioration of critical ecosystem services and environmental public health, have led to a better appreciation of the potential roles of Protected Areas (PAs) as tools for nature policies and instruments for sustainable development (Aubertin and Rodary 2011, Ritzel et al. 2023). National and transnational regulatory reform processes have been initiated in some jurisdictions, to enhance the ecological representativeness of PA networks and transform them in integrated and functional ecological and socio-ecological *systems* (Cabin 2013, CBD Secretariate 2009).

The *functional ecological representativeness principle* of policy-making is incorporated in numerous decisions, implementing the 1992 UN Convention on Biological Diversity (Soutullo and Gudynas 2006). E.g., the 2004 Program of Work on Protected Areas requires signatory states to develop “comprehensive, effectively managed and ecologically representative national and regional systems of protected ideas” (CBD Secretariate 2004). The emphasis has shifted from the static and fragmented representation of culturally-valued landscapes and habitats (as ‘open-air-museum items’; Dinica 2022), to ecological functionality attributes and holistic indicators of ecosystem health, sustainable critical ecosystem services, and biotic persistence in the context of climate change (Mingarro and Lobo 2021, Pörtner et al. 2021, Thackway and Cresswell 1997).

Public policy and public administration perspectives to the study of PAs are essential, because PAs are spaces where human access is regulated by *special rules*. They may be grounded in legal frameworks and/or in strategies, policies or management plans for biodiversity/conservation/nature protection. The legal and policy frameworks may be generic or PA-specific; they are often multi-level, extensive, complex and - due to variable ages - conflicting and incoherent.

Currently, conceptual understandings and practitioner-focused policy insights remain severely under-developed, with respect to the fitness-for-purpose of PA designations and regulations to contribute to SDGs and to support the PAs' transition towards ecologically functional systems; likewise for the challenge to better integrate policy programs across related policy domains: nature policy programs, climate change mitigation and adaptation policies; land use, regional development and sustainable agricultural policies; and policies for urban parks or sustainable tourism.

The number of studies adopting policy perspectives remains limited (e.g. Bastmeijer 2016, Capotorti et al. 2012, Ferraro and Hanauer 2015, Kegamba et al. 2024, Lima and Ranieri 2018, Selman 2009). In the context of limited attention by public policy scholars, significant contributions have been made by natural scientists and geographers (e.g. Araújo et al. 2007, Çoruhlu and Çelik 2022, Dimitrakopoulos et al. 2004, Evans 2012, Ferraro 2013, Fuller et al 2010, Ioj? et al. 2010, Nichiforel et al. 2021, Niedzia?kowski et al. 2014, Svancara et al. 2005, Wang et al. 2021).

In so far as the regulation of human activities and infrastructures/facilities within PAs is concerned, scholars have occasionally researched the effectiveness of tourism regulations, usually in specific PAs or countries (Dinica 2017, Estima et al. 2014, Goodwin 2002, Thede et al. 2014). However, a wider range of human access options and socio-economic activities are often permitted, depending on the PA designation type (e.g. Nature/Scientific/Recreation Reserves, Nature Parks, National Parks; see Chape et al. 2008, Cumming et al. 2015).

This panel welcomes conceptual, methodological and empirical contributions, adopting public policy or interdisciplinary perspectives that advance scholarship on the following themes:

1) the interface between science and policies on nature protection generally, and on Protected Areas, specifically

2) the ecological effectiveness of nature policies, PA designations and regulations

3) the governance of Protected Areas

Selected References

Aubertin, C., Rodary E. (Ed). (2011). *Protected Areas, Sustainable Land?* Ashgate Publishing

Araújo, M.B., Lobo J.M., Moreno J.C. (2007). The effectiveness of Iberian protected areas in conserving terrestrial biodiversity. *Conservation Biology* 21(6):1423-32

Bastmeijer, K. (2016). Ecological restoration in international biodiversity law: a promising strategy to address our failure to prevent? In M Bowman, P Davies, E Goodwin (Eds), *Research Handbook on Biodiversity and Law*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Capotorti, G., et al. (2012). Do National Parks play an active role in conserving the natural capital of Italy? *Plant Biosystems - An International Journal Dealing with All Aspects of Plant Biology*, 146(2):258–265.

CBD Secretariate. (2019). Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. Discussion Paper.

Chape, S, Spalding M, Jenkins M. (2008). *The world's protected areas: status, values and prospects in the 21st century*. University of California Press

Coruhlu, Y.E., Çelik, M.Ö. (2022). Protected area geographical management model from design to implementation for specially protected environment area, *Land Use Policy*, 122:106357

Dimitrakopoulos, P.G., Memtsas D, Troumbis A.Y. (2004). Questioning the effectiveness of the Natura 2000 species areas for conservation strategy: the case of Crete. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 13: 199–207.

Dinica, V. (2022). *Protected Area Regulation and Tourism: Science-Informed Ecological Transitions*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Dinica V. (2017). Tourism concessions in National Parks: neo-liberal governance experiments for a Conservation Economy in New Zealand. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(12):1811-1829

Evans, D. (2012). Building the European Union's Natura 2000 network. *Nature Conservation* 1:11-26.

Ferraro P.J., Hanauer M.M. (2015). Through what mechanisms do protected areas affect environmental and social outcomes? *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 370:20140267.

Kegamba, J.J., et al. (2024). The influence of conservation policies and legislations on communities in Tanzania. *Biodiversity Conservation* 33:3147–3170.

Lima, E.A.C.F., Ranieri V.L.M. (2018). Land use planning around protected areas: Case studies in four state parks in the Atlantic forest region of southeastern Brazil, *Land Use Policy*: 453-458

Mingarro, M., Lobo, J.M. (2021). Connecting protected areas in the Iberian peninsula to facilitate climate change tracking. *Environmental Conservation* 48: 182–191

Nichiforel, N., et al. (2021). Forest ecosystem services in Romania: Orchestrating regulatory and voluntary planning documents, *Ecosystem Services* 49:101276,

Niedzia?kowski, K., Blicharska, M., Mikusi?ski, G., J?drzejewska, B. (2014). Why is it difficult to enlarge a protected area? Ecosystem services perspective on the conflict around the extension of the Bia?owie?a National Park in Poland, *Land Use Policy* 38:314-329

Pörtner, HO, Scholes RJ, Agard J, Archer E, Arneth et. al. (2021). Scientific Outcome of the IPBES-IPCC co-sponsored workshop report on biodiversity and climate change. IPBES Secretariat, Bonn, Germany

Ritzel, C. et al. (2023). Swiss Parks of National Importance as model regions of sustainable development – An economic success story for farmers?, *Land Use Policy* 124:106441

Soutullo, A., Gudynas E. (2006). How effective is the MERCOSUR's network of protected areas in representing South America's ecoregions? *Oryx* 40:112–116

Svancara, L.K., et al. (2005). Political policy driven versus evidence-based conservation: a review of political targets and biological needs. *Bioscience* 55:989–995

Thackway, R, Cresswell ID. (1997). A Bioregional Framework for Planning the National System of Protected

Areas in Australia. *Natural Areas Journal*, 17(3):241-247

Thede, AK, Haider W, Rutherford M. (2014). Zoning in national parks: are Canadian zoning practices outdated? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. 22(4):626-645

Wang, Y., et al. (2021). Efficacy and management challenges of the zoning designations of China's national parks, *Biological Conservation* 254:108962

CALL FOR PAPERS

This panel invites public policy scholars to contribute to the growing inter-disciplinary fields of nature policies and Protected Area policies, by means of case-studies, comparative research, syntheses, meta-analyses or integrative conceptual research. Exploratory and exploratory contributions are welcome. The key questions/topics examined in this panel address the following themes:

1) The interface between **science and policies** on nature protection generally, and Protected Areas, specifically:

· How do historical and contemporary *scientific paradigms* influence nature policies and PA designations, network structures and regulations (e.g. aspects such as the protected ecological values, management objectives and regulations on human access)?

· How to better incorporate *contemporary scientific insights* in the reform of nature policies and PA designations and the regulation of human access, for more ecologically-effective PA systems?

2) The **ecological effectiveness** of nature policies, PA designations and regulations:

· What is the *evidence* on the effectiveness of current nature policies and PA network structures, designations and regulations, for ecological objectives and SDGs? What roles does evidence play in policy-making processes? How do institutional structures and processes influence an evidence-informed policy approach?

· How to reform nature policy design and PA systems, to enhance *biotic persistence and resilience to climate change*?

· How to regulate and manage *human – wildlife interactions* more effectively, for species in different protection categories? Special attention will be paid to interactions with large carnivores.

3) The **governance** of Protected Areas:

· *Policy coordination / integration*: conceptual approaches and empirical evidence on the synergies of policies across relevant domains, to facilitate ecological outcomes and SDGs across PA

· What *participatory processes, methods and design features* help enhance public support for ecologically-effective PA systems? How can public engagement enhance the implementation of SDGs 13, 14 and 15 across PAs?

· Which regulatory approaches facilitate synergies between the rights of *indigenous peoples,* the wellbeing of *local communities* and ecologically-sound outcomes in PAs?

· How to operationalise the concepts of *adaptive governance and policies*, for climate resilient socio-ecological systems in PAs?
· What patterns of *policy leadership* help initiate and sustain successful transitions towards ecologically-effective PA systems, in *multi-level governance systems*?

The panel encourages analyses that help enhance the empirical-base on geographic regions hosting numerous multiuse Protected Areas as well as PAs located in the Global South and the Asia Pacific regions.

P20 / Nature Policies and Protected Areas: regulatory, governance and evidence perspectives

Chair : Valentina Dinica (Victoria University of Wellington)

Session 1Protected Areas: enhancing ecological effectiveness through appropriate designations & governance

Friday, July 4th 08:00 to 10:00 (B4)

Discussants

Henry Ufomba (Flinders University of South Australia)

Unpacking Inter-Scalar Dynamics in Mangrove Conservation and Restoration: Challenges and Pathways to Collaborative Governance

Syifa Afra (Universitas Indonesia)

Teguh Kurniawan (Universitas Indonesia)

Muhamad Imam Alfie Syarien (Universitas Indonesia)

Marcel Angwyn (Universitas Indonesia)

Transitioning Protected Areas towards functional ecologically-representative systems: policy challenges and options in New Zealand

Valentina Dinica (Victoria University of Wellington)

(Virtual) Monitoring and evaluation of service concessions for supporting visitation in Brazilian national parks

Grislayne Lopes (University of São Paulo (Brazil))

P20 / Nature Policies and Protected Areas: regulatory, governance and evidence perspectives

Chair : Valentina Dinica (Victoria University of Wellington)

Session 2Protected Areas: Participatory governance & implementation perspectives

Friday, July 4th 10:15 to 12:15 (B4)

(Virtual) Regulatory Governance and Participation in the District Conservation Unit System (DCUS) of the Federal District, Brazil

Jessica de Oliveira (University of Brasilia, Brazil)

Marcos Tito (Center for Sustainable Development/University of Brasília)

Andre Cunha (Universidade de Brasília)

Securing customary tenure rights of indigenous and local communities in the protected areas of Cambodia through policy and practice

Antoine Deligne (GRET, France)

Natalia Scurrah (RCSD, Faculty of Social Science, Chiang Mai University)

Stakeholders' perception of the implementation of logging prohibition in National Parks and the protection of endangered flora (Pterocarpus Erinaceus) in Nigeria

Henry Ufomba (Flinders University of South Australia)

(Virtual) Enhancing Competences for Effective Management of Protected Areas in the Brazilian Federal District

Marcos Tito (Center for Sustainable Development/University of Brasília)

Jessica de Oliveira (University of Brasilia, Brazil)

Andre Cunha (Universidade de Brasília)