INTRODUCTION

1. The meeting was opened by Mr Natarajan Ishwaran, Secretary of the MAB Programme, who addressed the participants on behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO. Mr Ishwaran welcomed the members of the International Advisory Committee for Biosphere Reserves (IACBR) and the observer delegation from Indonesia (list of participants attached). He informed in particular the six new members of the IACBR of the important role they together with the other members of the Committee would play in contributing to the work of the World Network of Biosphere Reserves (WNBR).

2. Mr Ishwaran expressed his regrets that Ms Gretchen Kalonji, the Assistant Director-General for the Science Sector could not join this meeting due to other prior commitments. He added that Mr Qunli Han, the Director of the Executive Office of the Science Sector would be joining the meeting on 3 April 2012.

ELECTION OF THE CHAIR, VICE-CHAIRS (2) AND RAPPORTEUR

3. In accordance with its Statutes, the Advisory Committee elected its Bureau, which consisted of Mr Ghasan Ramadan-Jaradi, Chair; Ms Vanja Debevec-Gerjevič and Mr G.S Ramangason, Vice-Chairs; and Mr Sergio Guevara. S, Rapporteur.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND THE TIMETABLE

4. The Committee adopted the agenda and the timetable for the meeting.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THEIR WORK AS “AMBASSADORS” FOR BIOSPHERE RESERVES

5. Mr Ghasan Ramadan-Jaradi (Lebanon) reported on a regional workshop which was conducted in May 2011 at the Shouf Biosphere Reserve in Lebanon on the effective management of biosphere reserves in the Arab Region. He mentioned that one of the
recommendations from this workshop specifically addressed to the MAB secretariat was the need to assist managers of biosphere reserves to become members of the National MAB Committee. This workshop was funded by the Embassy of Italy in cooperation with the UNESCO regional office and the Ministry of Environment of Lebanon. He also reported that the Shouf Biosphere Reserve completed and submitted its management plan to the MAB secretariat in 2011 whereas the Jabal Moussa Biosphere reserve is developing its management plan and currently fine tuning it. He informed participants that despite the “Arab Spring” the communication relevant to biosphere reserves in the Arab countries remained activated through electronic messages and scattered meetings with individual representatives of National MAB Committees for coordination of activities and assistance in preparing nomination forms. Finally he added that one of the members of the Association for the Protection of Jabal Moussa Biosphere Reserve is preparing her doctoral thesis on the effective evaluation of management of biosphere reserves after she studied the ArabMAB management performance.

6. **Ms Anusha Amarasinghe** (Sri Lanka) expressed her appreciation for having been selected member of the Advisory Committee for Biosphere Reserves. As Secretary-General of the Sri Lanka MAB National Committee under the National Science Foundation, she is promoting the biosphere reserve concept in her country further, which now counts four UNESCO designated biosphere reserves.

7. **Mr Petr Cupa** (Czech Republic) is a practitioner at the grassroots level of the MAB Program with brief overlapping at the regional and international levels. He stated that it is not easy for a lay-person to distinguish between nature reserve and a biosphere reserve in Europe, since promoters of each claim to have the same goals. The difference for a person directly involved comes when the implementation and the everyday management phase start. The biosphere reserve concept proves to be more “people friendly”, encouraging direct stakeholder participation, while the nature reserve authorities’ approach, despite their proclamations, seem to prefer using directives and limiting public involvement. This obsolete approach is still widely used and widely irritating for the public. This is the reason why there has never been a better time for biosphere reserve concept promotion and implementation, since the public seem to prefer biosphere reserve over other designations being declared in their area. In this regard the role of a “biosphere reserve ambassadors” is crucial. The best ambassadors in his opinion are satisfied biosphere reserve stakeholders, especially mayors of the communities and the representatives of business. When they meet with their peers on different levels, they can pass on their practical experience of being directly part of the biosphere reserve. For example in the Lower Morava biosphere reserve in the Czech republic the biosphere reserve board members who are recruited from the local community leaders, business representatives, NGOs and other stakeholders, are encouraged to refer on any suitable occasion about the main aspects of the biosphere reserve concept, types of projects and their outcomes and their personal role in the biosphere reserve management and activities. The system, based on “word of mouth” is very informal and not as elaborate as for example the system of “biosphere reserve ambassadors” in Sweden, but proved to be very efficient in terms of the biosphere reserve concept promotion.

8. **Mr Thabit Zahran Salim Al Abdessalaam** (United Arab Emirates) stated that until now only two biosphere reserves are found in the Gulf - the Marawah Marine Biosphere Reserve in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and the Reem Biosphere Reserve in Qatar. Efforts are underway in the region to assess the current status and effectiveness of all the regions’s marine protected areas with the view of assisting with efforts to develop a regional network of Protected Areas. Coordination and consultative discussions have been ongoing between UAE, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and Qatar to establish regional coordination on protected areas with the impetus for this provided by the need to implement the CMS/UNEP Dugong MOU. With the UAE efforts have been intensified to enhance the involvement and engagement of local communities in the affairs of the biosphere reserve through formal and
informal interactions and employment of members of the local community as Rangers for the Marawah Biosphere Reserve

9. **Ms Maria Thorell** (Sweden) who recently changed jobs and is now working in the private sector stated that she was employed based on her knowledge and experience of the MAB Programme. She talked about opportunities in which she gave lectures to some non-governmental organisations about the biosphere reserve concept. She informed the Committee about a flora and fauna project she is managing in one of the Universities in Sweden where she hopes to introduce the people concept or the need for society’s involvement in the management of flora and fauna as a means to introducing the biosphere reserve concept to the students. She expressed her appreciation for being selected as a member of the Advisory Committee for Biosphere Reserves and added that she hoped to contribute to the work of the Committee.

10. **Mr Do-Soon Cho** (Republic of Korea) was glad to note of his active involvement in the East Asian Biosphere Reserve Network (EABRN) since its inception. He also reported on the increasing importance of the biosphere reserve concept on the Korean Peninsula which now counted seven biosphere reserves (three located in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, and four located in the Republic of Korea). He also recalled that the end of the Korean War will have been 60 years ago in 2013. Mr Cho, therefore, informed on the proposal of the Republic of Korea to designate the southern part of the Korean Demilitarized Zone as a biosphere reserve which would be discussed at the current session of the Advisory Committee.

11. **Ms Vanja Debevec-Gerjevič** (Slovenia) informed the committee that she prepared an overview or guidelines on the MAP to serve as a reference for the nomination and establishment of biosphere reserves in Slovenia. She organized a special exhibition to celebrate the 40th Anniversary of the MAB programme in Slovenia. School children prepared puzzles to describe biosphere reserves and demonstrate what happens in them for the exhibition. She added that she has designed a special schools network for biosphere reserves. She also stated that she had the opportunity to give an insight on biosphere reserves to officials of public protected areas. She has also been invited to Bulgaria to give a lecture to several non-governmental organizations on the biosphere reserve concept.

12. **Prof. Dr. Luis E. Aragón** (Brazil) stated that the level of acceptance of the biosphere reserve concept varies among the nine countries in the Amazonian region. In some countries it is considered as a protected area and in others not as such. In Brazil the concept of biosphere reserves is recognized by law as a model of management involving many protected areas. He informed the Committee about a project called Rural Development and Conservation of Biodiversity in Biosphere Reserves in the Amazonian Region. One of the objectives of this project is to involve the local people in the management of the biosphere reserve so that they would recognize the benefits of biosphere reserve. There was a meeting of all the managers of the biosphere reserves involved in this project to discuss activities ongoing. The entire project is being coordinated by the UNESCO Chair in South-South Cooperation for Sustainable Development – The Federal University of Pará – Belém - Brazil. A document was produced as a result of these meetings to show the benefits of biosphere reserves and to find solutions to challenges. Overall he mentioned that he is working with other stakeholders to get biosphere reserves recognized not as protected areas but as a system of management involving local people.

13. **Mr Sergio A. Guevara Sada** (Mexico) informed the Committee on various activities of the IberoMAB Network including an overview of meetings, workshops and publications. He stated that the major achievement of the network was the elaboration of the IberoMAB Action Plan. He added that this action plan though adapted to the MAP went beyond the
2013 MAP implementation period to 2020. One advantage of this action plan was that it had been designed to adapt to the situation in the region. He also reported on a training programme conducted for some people from Honduras, Guatemala and El Salvador to enable them to prepare the nomination of a transboundary biosphere reserve. He mentioned that he is working on changing the idea of people seeing biosphere reserves just as protected areas. In his view they should be seen as “protective areas” and not protected areas, and this should enhance the role of biosphere reserves in the face of future conservation and sustainable development. Training courses have been scheduled for the local people involved in the management of biosphere reserves. He is leading a study on the impact of global climatic and ecological changes on the biodiversity in biosphere reserves in Iberoamerica and the Caribbean region using plant and animal phenological observations made by indigenous and local people and interpreted by scientists and biosphere reserve managers, with the aim to adapt and mitigate the impact of global changes at the new reserves and eventually modify the zonation and functions of the reserves already created.

15. **Mr G.S Ramangason** (Madagascar) mentioned that the MAB Programme was a new concept in the system of protected areas in Madagascar. One challenge associated with protected areas in Madagascar is the issue of space in and around those areas for the use of stakeholders or local communities. The concept of biosphere reserves on the other hand addressed this challenge by encouraging participation of stakeholders in the management of the designated area and also the habitation of people in the buffer and transition zone. He hopes to influence decision makers and scientist to accept biosphere reserves as a new and different category of protected areas in order to ensure that marine sites are nominated as proposed biosphere reserves. This will ultimately ensure that local communities in these areas also benefit from the resources and use it in a sustainable way.

16. **Mr Ishwaran** in reacting to some of the important issues raised by Members of the IACBR during their presentations emphasized the increasing importance of the various stakeholders and their commitment to disseminating knowledge and experience in the practice of biosphere reserve management.

17. He pointed out that situation of the composition of the MAB National Committee or the extent to which management practitioners from biosphere reserves could serve as “ambassadors” of the biosphere reserve model for conservation and development varied from country-to-country and it would be almost impossible for the MAB Secretariat to issue guidelines that accommodate all the variations between and within countries. He noted with interest in the distinction of biosphere reserves as “protecting areas” – protecting ecosystem services, cultural diversity of communities etc – rather than as protected areas.

18. Nevertheless, he noted that biosphere reserves role and functions are not restricted to protection and conservation only but also to promoting development that improves local community wellbeing as well as learning through sharing lessons, knowledge and experience in a global network. He opined that the biosphere reserve concept has in fact contributed towards the evolution of protected area management thinking and practice towards a more inclusive approach of human interests. He also said that biosphere reserves have a significant opportunity to demonstrate innovative ways to link the local to the national and global to promote sustainable development of territories and regions where they are located and invited the IACBR experts to encourage and promote experiments that design, development and implement such arrangements and learn from the outcome of those experiments.
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE MAB PROGRAMME ON THE PROGRESS MADE SINCE THE LAST ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

19. Mr Ishwaran provided a brief report on activities undertaken since the last (seventeenth) meeting of the IACBR. He highlighted several national, regional and international level activities convened during 2011 to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the MAB Programme; in particular he expressed his appreciations for the German Government which hosted an international conference on the theme “For life, for the future: biosphere reserves and climate change” during 27-28 June 2011 and the 23rd session of the MAB/ICC from 28 June – 1 July 2011 in Dresden, Germany. The Dresden Declaration, adopted by the International Conference and endorsed by acclamation by the MAB/ICC was also approved by the 36th session of the General Conference held at UNESCO Headquarters in October-November 2011. The UNESCO General Conference in adopting the Dresden Declaration called upon the MAB Secretariat to think beyond the MAP for biosphere reserves which will end in 2013.

20. Mr Ishwaran drew attention to the IACBR Members that the document addressing agenda item X on MAB and WNBR Futures will address this issue in the context of Rio + 20 Summit as well as follow up opportunities. Furthermore, Mr Ishwaran informed that the Secretariat has started data gathering on and monitoring of the implementation of MAP in order to ensure an early preparation for the final evaluation of MAB due by end of 2013 and early 2014. He noted that the interim evaluation of the MAP carried out in 2010 and presented to the MAB/ICC session in Dresden, Germany in 2011 clearly illustrated the need for a more systematic data collection of MAP implementation that could occur over a longer-period of time. Furthermore, he stressed the active role of MAB National Committees, UNESCO National Commissions and biosphere reserve administrators in the monitoring of the implementation of MAP as well as in collection, collation and synthesis of information that could directly feed into the global evaluation of MAP for Biosphere Reserves for 2008-2013 and invited the IACBR Members in any way to facilitate this process. Mr Ishwaran also informed the IACBR Members that the MAB/ICC and the UNESCO General Conference adopted in 2011 revisions to the statutes of the IACBR and the MAB/ICC; he informed that while MAB/ICC had its own rules of procedures based on its statutes, IACBR had never developed its own rules of procedures.

21. Finally he informed the IACBR Members that the 24th session of the MAB/ICC will convene at UNESCO Headquarters from 9-13 July 2012. In reacting to the report presented by Mr Ishwaran, several Members expressed the wish that IACBR develop its own rules of procedures. They also enquired how the procedures could be developed and who would have to approve it. In particular Members wished that IACBR would be represented at the MAB/ICC sessions. Mr Ishwaran agreed to present the wish of the IACBR Members to the 24th session of the MAB/ICC to obtain a decision and inform IACBR Members next steps in the process of ensuring IACBR representation at the MAB/ICC as well as in preparing the rules of procedures of the IACBR.

EXAMINATION OF NEW BIOSPHERE RESERVE NOMINATIONS

22. The Advisory Committee examined 24 new biosphere reserve proposals, 3 proposals for the extension of existing biosphere reserves and 1 for re-zoning.

23. The Advisory Committee formulated their recommendations regarding specific sites following the recommendation categories as follows:

1) *Nominations recommended for approval*: the proposed site is recommended for approval as a biosphere reserve; no additional information is needed.
2) **Nominations recommended for approval pending the submission of specific information:** the proposed site is recommended for approval as a biosphere reserve subject to receiving the specific information as requested by the Advisory Committee. If the latter is received by the Secretariat by 31 May 2012, it will be considered by the next session of the MAB-ICC to be held from 9 to 13 July 2012 and the Council may approve the inclusion of the site in the WNBR.

3) **Nominations deferred:** the proposed site is deferred as it does not meet the criteria for biosphere reserves as stipulated in the Statutory Framework for Biosphere Reserves and/or major clarifications with regard to the application of the Framework to the proposed area is requested by the Advisory Committee. The relevant National Authorities are therefore invited to revise the nomination and/or provide the requested clarifications for examination by the Advisory Committee at its next meeting.

4) **Nominations rejected:** the proposed site is rejected as it is not sufficiently compatible with the principles of the MAB programme.

**NOMINATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL**

**Sheka, Ethiopia**

24. The Advisory Committee welcomed this proposal which covers a total area of 238 750 ha and consists of a mixture of forests, bamboo thickets, wetlands, agriculture lands, rural settlements and towns. The committee commended the Ethiopian Authorities for a well-prepared nomination. The forest in Sheka which is also part of the Southwest Highlands Forests of Ethiopia is important for the conservation of the Afromontane forest vegetation types especially the Afromontane Rainforest and Alpine Bamboo thickets. The area is rich in plant and animal species with over 38 threatened species both flora and fauna on the IUCN list.

25. The committee acknowledged the cultural and spiritual significance of the proposed area to the people and their commitment to maintain the integrity of the ecosystem through the practice of ecologically sustainable agriculture.

26. The Advisory Committee recommended that this site be approved and encouraged the authorities to develop the potential of the area for use as a demonstration site for environmental education and also to show the link between culture and biological diversity.

**Ferlo, Senegal**

27. The Advisory Committee welcomed this well-prepared proposal. It noted the Sahelien climate in North of the site and sudan-sahelien climate to the South. The proposed site occupies a total area of 2 058 214 ha. The great variety of habitat and vegetation makes this location very rich in biodiversity. The region hosts a rich fauna including redneck ostrich, gazelles and oryx.

28. It noted that the site has a research station which accommodates national and international institutions. The Committee acknowledged with appreciation the existence of the chart of responsibilities and the multi-stakeholder management committee including government and community representatives.

29. The Committee recommended increasing conservation activities; if possible through establishing a corridor between the core areas of the Reserve Forest of Ferlo. The Advisory Committee recommended that this site be approved.

**Aya, Japan**

30. The Advisory Committee welcomed this submission from Japan, which was the country’s first new proposal after more than 30 years since the four already existing
Japanese biosphere reserves had been designated in 1980. Situated in the eastern part of Japan’s southern Kyushu Island, the overall site is noted for harboring one of the country’s largest remaining lucidophyllous forests on the border of warm-temperate evergreen and broad-leaved temperate deciduous forests. The proposed total area is 14 580 ha and includes Aya Town in the transition zone with a population of 7 283 (as of 2010).

The Committee noted that the proposed core area is made up of the Kyushu Central Mountains Quasi National Park which has never been used for human activities and which is the object of scientific studies on the structure, functioning and dynamics of the lucidophyllous forest. The transition zone is mainly used for organic agriculture, and Aya Town has been the first community in the country to develop a traditional recycling-oriented agricultural system since 1988. Ecotourism, including “forest therapy” (for healing purposes) and forest environmental education, is currently actively developed and would benefit from the biosphere reserve designation. The Advisory Committee recommended that additional core zones be considered for inclusion in a future expansion of the biosphere reserve over the next two years based on conservation needs and including also headwater sources for the downstream areas through a consultative process with neighbouring municipalities. With this in mind, the Advisory Committee recommended that Aya be approved as a biosphere reserve.

Korgalzhyn, Kazakhstan

The Advisory Committee was glad to note that this site was Kazakhstan’s first ever proposal for the designation of a biosphere reserve in the country. Situated in the northern/central part of Kazakhstan, the site is a complex of freshwater and saline lakes embedded in the dry steppe zone of Eurasia making it an important wetland site for migratory water birds (including globally threatened species, among them the extremely rare Siberian white crane, the Dalmatian pelican, Pallas’s fish eagle) under the RAMSAR Convention; Korgalzhyn State Nature Reserve is also one of the clusters of the UNESCO World Heritage site “Saryarka – Steppes and Lakes of Northern Kazakhstan”. The total proposed area covers 1 603 171 ha. About 500 people live in the buffer zone and around 12 000 in the transition area.

The territory is characterized by elevated plains, hills, lake depressions and marked by an extreme-continental climate (with absolute temperatures ranging from -45°C to +41.5°C). Findings through a GEF/UNDP Wetlands Conservation Project (2004-2011, which also provided the basis for the zonation of the proposed biosphere reserve) revealed human emigration caused by overall environmental degradation (unsustainable use of water and biological resources, unsustainable “wild” tourism) and which is now addressed through a variety of pilot projects such as to foster sustainable pasture management, ecotourism, the creation of fishing and hunting farms, and the demonstration of alternative power sources. Scientific studies focus on large-scale complex geobotanic, floristic and faunistic research, including the monitoring of species, and socio-economic studies including demography and migration, agriculture, industry, fishing and hunting industries. The Advisory Committee recommended that Korgalzhyn be approved as Kazakhstan’s first biosphere reserve. It also recommended that the currently proposed 2km wide buffer zone be expanded in the future into the transition zone where appropriate.

Demilitarized Zone (DMZ), Republic of Korea

The Advisory Committee considered this interesting proposal which is situated on the northern border of the territory of the Republic of Korea, and which spans the country from East to West. The Advisory Committee noted that the entire Korean Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) is a military buffer zone formed as a result of the Armistice Agreement on 27 July 1953, which ended the Korean War (1950-53). In accordance with the Agreement, the DMZ is defined as 4km wide, with the Military Demarcation Line running through the middle of the entire Korean DMZ. The core area of the proposed biosphere reserve covers the southern
half of the Korean DMZ, which is a 2km wide area between the Military Demarcation Line (in the north) and the Southern Limit Line (in the south), an area which is under the jurisdiction of the Commander-in-Chief of the United Nations Command. In addition, the proposed core areas also cover several conservation areas in Gangwon Province of the Republic of Korea. The buffer zone of the proposed biosphere reserve covers a substantial part of the area between the Southern Limit Line and the Civilian Control Line in the south. The proposed transition areas are located south of the Civilian Control Line in the Republic of Korea’s Gyeonggi and Gangwon provinces and are subject to various land-uses (farmlands, forests, urban areas and protected nature areas). The total surface area of the proposed site covers 297 913ha. Over 2 200 people live in the buffer zone and over 244 000 in the transition areas.

35. The Advisory Committee noted that the areas located between the Military Demarcation Line and the southern Civilian Control Line (core and buffer zones) have been protected from direct human interventions and economic activities for some 60 years entailing a unique natural process that restored once completely ruined areas to rich habitats for a variety of plant and animal species, thus underlining the conservation value of the proposed site. With regard to the proposed core zone under the jurisdiction of the United Nations Command, the Advisory Committee was informed by letter of the MAB National Committee of the Republic of Korea to the Secretary of the MAB Programme, dated 28 February 2012, that the United Nations Command (UNC) has expressed its neutrality as regards the international community’s recognition of the proposed biosphere reserve and that it is not in a position to endorse or oppose the proposal from the Republic of Korea. The letter also informed that the UNC will be aware if the proposed biosphere reserve if it is realized and that it will continue to manage this part of the DMZ in accordance with the Korean War Armistice Agreement of 1953.

36. The Advisory Committee underlined the extraordinary conservation value of the core and buffer zones, which had been a de facto “no go” area for the past 60 years. Many abandoned agricultural lands have turned into wetlands through a natural recovery process being now the habitat of a variety of endangered species. As a vestige of the Korean War, the DMZ is considered as a symbol of peace drawing increasing numbers of tourists, in particular for historical and cultural reasons which is planned to be complemented by eco-touristic offers. The Advisory Committee recommended that the Republic of Korea Authorities consider extending the buffer and transition zones to Cheorwon Country in Gangwon Province through a consultative and awareness raising process with the local residents regarding the potential benefits of the biosphere reserve designation and encouraged the Government of the Republic of Korea to step up its compensation efforts to foster sustainable development in particular in Cheorwon County. The Advisory Committee recommended that the proposed site be approved as a biosphere reserve.

Wakatobi, Indonesia

37. The Advisory Committee commended the Indonesian Authorities for a well-prepared nomination. It recognized that this site’s nomination including detailed data of biodiversity was supported by various stakeholders. The site has diverse ecosystems with many marine and coastal species of seagrass, coral reefs, fish used both for consumption and for sale, sea birds, turtles, cetaceans, and mangroves.

38. The proposed core area of this site is of great value in the protection of marine ecosystems as the habitats of various important plant and animal species. It also noted that the proposed multi-stakeholder cooperation and coordination is the key driver in developing a management plan and many other concrete actions.

39. The Committee asked the Indonesian authorities to provide the printed zonation map showing the whole transition area with a clear explanation of each zone/area. In addition a
management scheme is needed to solve the conflict between conservation of biodiversity and traditional sustainable use of natural resources such as mangrove trees and sea turtles by indigenous people. The Advisory Committee recommended that this site be approved.

**East Vättern Scarp landscape, Sweden**

40. The Advisory Committee welcomed this proposal, the second Sweden’s largest cold water lake, the fifth largest lake in Europe with a total surface of 105 520 ha. This history of the site is well documented. Almost 40,000 people live in the area. The majority of the proposed biosphere reserve is dominated by agriculture and forestry lands, with villages and settlements consisting of small farms and individual homes. There are also several large scale farms and manors, as well as three urban areas.

41. The core areas consist of existing nature reserves, Natura 2000 sites and forest habitat protection areas and shorelines protected areas. The three functions are very well described as well as the comprehensive and extensive consultation process. The development of new technology is linked to the conservation objective to enhance bio cultural heritage. Involvement of the private sector, support to social entrepreneurship for sustainable use of meadows, grasslands, energy through demonstration areas are well documented and are considered as a pilot model. Adaptation and mitigation to climate change is one key objective of this proposed biosphere reserve, with many research and activities described. The coordination structure and engagement process of the different stakeholders and group were commended, including the Biosphere Centre.

42. The Advisory Committee recommended the site to be approved, highly commended the Swedish authorities for the quality of the proposal and recommended that this proposal is shared within the WNBR as a model and source of inspiration and that the sustainable development activities be closely monitored.

**Bassin de la Dordogne, France**

43. The Advisory Committee welcomed this very well-prepared and comprehensive proposal which consists of the whole Dordogne watershed, which is a hydro system of 24 000 km². The Dordogne’s catchment area shelters a great biodiversity (flora and fauna) and represents a diversity of landscapes from mountains to cliffs and contains one of the biggest estuaries. Human activities are mainly rural, with low population density and no large cities. Among main activities are tourism based on natural and cultural heritage and agriculture and forest exploitation. It is one of the three most hydroelectric power production places in France. The main objective of the proposed site is to reduce pressure on the water and aquatic ecosystems and to link water policies to the management of land and biodiversity. One million people live along the two biogeographic regions.

44. The Advisory Committee commended the authorities for the intensive communication and coordination processes, with strong involvement of local communities and decision makers through inter alia public forums and considered that the proposal should be shared in the World Network of Biosphere Reserves as a source of inspiration. The Advisory Committee commended this very well-prepared, clear proposal and recommended that the site be approved.

**Tehuacán-Cuicatlán, Mexico**

45. The Advisory Committee welcomed the re-submission of this proposal. It was submitted for the first time in 2011. This reserve is located on an arid mountain and high lands system and has one of the highest biodiversity as well as higher plant and animal endemism both of wild and domesticated species in Mexico. It is the most emblematic of the old landscapes of Mesoamerica. It is a very relevant area because it includes the original domestication sites for maize, cucumber, avocado and beans. Currently it has important
mesoamerican cultural values and eight different ethnic groups. The most relevant ecosystem is a densely wooded expanse of arborescent cactus species (bosque de cactáceas columnares) and the tropical dry forest (selva baja caducifolia) which includes several numbers of endemic species in Mexico.

46. The Committee highlighted the mechanism developed for local participation involvement and appreciates their efforts to improve the dialogue between academic and local knowledge. The Advisory Committee notes that the new proposal incorporates the recommendation by showing a good zonation system. The Advisory Committee recommended that this site be approved.

La Selle, Haiti
47. The Advisory Committee welcomed the first submission of a biosphere reserve in Haiti. The proposed area includes a large number of different ecosystems (mountain, plain, tropical dry forest and coastal ecosystem) and protected areas like La Visite or Forêt-des-pins (with the endemic species, Pinus occidentalis). The area is located in the ecological continuum of the Jaragua-Bahoruco-Enrique Biosphere Reserve of the Dominican Republic and contributes to the Caribbean Biological Corridor as an example of collaboration among countries. Four percent of the Haitian population lives in the biosphere reserve and the main economic activities are agroforestry, fishery, tourism and handicraft industry.

48. The Advisory Committee commended the national authorities for this new nomination and recommended that this site be approved. The Advisory Committee suggested that the national authorities consider this as an opportunity to develop a transboundary biosphere reserve with the Dominican Republic and to use this new nomination as an important place to test local community involvement and resource use in the context of sustainable development.

The Island of Príncipe, Sao Tome and Principe
49. The Advisory Committee welcomed the first submission of a biosphere reserve in Sao Tome and Principe. The island of Príncipe is one of the three existing oceanic volcanic islands of the Gulf of Guinea and is geologically the oldest of the group. The area includes the entire emerged area of the island of Principe, its islets and Tinhosas islands. It is home to great biodiversity in terrestrial as well as in marine ecosystems, considering this area as an important place for the reproduction of sea turtles, seabirds and cetaceans. The main economic activities are agriculture, fishing and tourism. The Advisory Committee congratulated the national authorities for this new nomination and recommended that this site be approved. The Committee recommended that the national authorities consider this opportunity as a model for promoting an integrated eco-tourism development in similar islands and to suggested the future creation of a larger marine and terrestrial buffer zone.

La Gomera, Spain
50. The Advisory Committee welcomed this submission and congratulated the national authorities for the high quality of the proposal. The proposed area is part of the Canary archipelago, situated in a central location surrounded by the Tenerife, La Palma and El Hierro islands. In the central part of the island, called “meseta”, is located the Garajonay National Park. This park is also nominated as an UNESCO World Heritage site and encompasses laurisilva rainforest ecosystem. The landscape is also well modelated by the agriculture system exploitation in “terrace”. They have strong cultural values. The Advisory Committee recommended that this site be approved.

Las Ubiñas-La Mesa, Spain
51. The Advisory Committee welcomed this submission. The new proposal is located in the central zone of the Cantabrian Range. It encompasses an old growth forest, which maintains very pristine conditions and a high biodiversity. The area also has protected
species such as the Cantabrian brown bears, woodpeckers as well as unique domestic species. It has a rich cultural heritage. The area is surrounded by other biosphere reserves: Bibia, Los Valles de Omaña y Luna, Alto Bernesga and Somiedo. This new nomination will be part of the concept to create a unified biosphere reserve called Gran Reserva de la Biosfera Cantábrica. The Advisory Committee recommended that this site be approved.

**NOMINATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL PENDING THE SUBMISSION OF SPECIFIC INFORMATION**

**Jinggangshan, China**
52. The Advisory Committee recognized that this proposed biosphere reserve has diverse landscapes of mountains, valleys, structural basins and karst with elevation varying from 381m to 1779m above sea level. Local residents live on agriculture and forest industries, such as rice, potato, vegetables, bamboo and tea-tree oil cultivation. Tourism industry has developed not only because of the marvellous landscapes and scenic spots but also the historical sites of China’s revolution.

53. With regards to the zonation system of this site, the committee requested the Chinese Authorities to provide a clear zonation and land-use map with English translations. Clarification is needed for the direct connection of the core area to the transition area. The authorities are also encouraged to provide a management plan for the entire proposed area and the evidence of an integrated coordinating body for the three zones. Regarding the nomination dossier, the committee recognized the necessity of correcting scientific names of plants and animals.

54. The Advisory Committee recommended that this site be approved pending the receipt of the above requested information by the MAB Secretariat by 31 May 2012.

**Niubeiliang, China**
55. The Advisory Committee commended the Chinese Authorities for this well-prepared nomination. The site is located in the eastern segment of the Qinling Mountains, with a typical temperate broad-leaved mixed mountain forest system. The site exhibits high biodiversity with many endangered species including golden takin (*Budorcas taxicolor bedfordi*) and dwarf musk deer (*Moschus berezovskii*). Local residents in the transition area have developed rural tourism for increased income. Research, monitoring, and programs of public awareness and training have been carried out very actively in this site.

56. With regards to the zonation system of this site, the committee has requested the Chinese Authorities to provide a clear zonation map with the text translated into English. The two transition areas should be clearly delineated. The committee also asked the authorities to provide an outline of the management plan for the proposed area and evidence of an integrated coordinating body. The Advisory Committee recommended that this site be approved pending the receipt of the above requested information by the MAB Secretariat by 31 May 2012.

**Bashkirskiyi Ural, Russian Federation**
57. The Advisory Committee welcomed this proposal located in the western slopes on southern Ural, for a total surface area of 345 700 ha. The proposed site is of very rich diversity, with a high variety of landscapes from gorges of mountain rivers, mountains steppes, meadows, floodplains to reservoirs. There are more than 1650 plant species, of which 44 are endemic and a list of over 2000 animal species. The interpenetration of flora and fauna from Europe and Siberia make it uniquely rich. The proposed site contains five different protected areas, including national parks and forestry districts. There are unique archaeological sites linked to culture and history of the Bashkir people as well as the cult
cave of “Shulgan Tash” preserved since the Stone age. The total population resident is 14,957 with main activities being forestry and small scale farming and traditional bee keeping with the tourism increasing in importance (180,000 from May to September).

58. The Advisory Committee noted that the conservation objective was very well documented, with clear vision, resources and legal and institutional support. However, it noted that there was insufficient explanation on local settlements involvement. The research and logistic function was also very well documented with research facilities, research staff and research stations as well as cooperation with universities, dated back since 100 years, mainly focusing on nature conservation.

59. However the Advisory Committee noted that the sustainable development function was very weak, with no management plan proposed and a management structure that was not directly involving the small settlements.

60. The Advisory Committee recommended that this proposal be approved pending the submission of an improved management plan which ensures the direct involvement of local stakeholders including settlements, to the secretariat by 31 May 2012. It was also recommended that the research function be broadened to include the social sciences.

**Galloway and southern Ayrshire Biosphere, United Kingdom**

61. The Advisory Committee welcomed this proposal, located in the south western of Glasgow. The proposal is the merging of two former biosphere reserves which were not fulfilling the Statutory Framework criteria. The proposed total area is of 520,000 ha, composed of open field landscapes, lochs, moorlands, arable lands, pastures and afforested areas.

62. The proposed site has a very low human density with less than 100,000 inhabitants, and has suffered from post-industrial crisis with the closing of mining and textile industries. There are few cities with no more than 10,000 inhabitants. The biodiversity is very high with important bird population such as grouse, golden eagle and mountains hares. The core area is composed of various protected areas under the management and ownership of the Scottish National Heritage. The tourism demand is growing, with more than 850,000 visitors per year.

63. The zonation is based on the river drainage systems and is very functional with strong local support and adequate funding is provided from European leader projects. The Advisory Committee commended the engagement of the local communities in the process. The Committee requested that additional elements of clarification vis a vis the development of the wind mill situation, as well as the trade off with tourism development were to be provided. It also recommended to improve the research function and to seek cooperation with the EuroMAB working group on charter development.

64. The Advisory Committee recommended that the site be approved pending the following elements by 31 May 2012.

- The missing signatures of the community councils.

- A detailed description of the dialogue process for wind mill development as well as the tourism development.

**Salzburger Lungau & Kärntner Nockberge, Austria**

65. The Advisory Committee welcomed this proposal. It consists of a representative example of inner-alpine landscapes with high mountains and deep valleys. It is a richly structured landscape with a wide range of altitude (600-3000 m above sea level) and encompasses typical ecosystems, including man-made, of the Central Alps such as
mountain meadows, and mires (Ramsar and Natura 2000 sites) and has a high biodiversity. The proposed site covers an area spreading along two provinces, with separate nature conservation legislation. The Kärntner Nockberge part is a whole national park.

66. The proposed area is a total of 149 000 ha. Human history is characterized by migration. Apart from hunting and gathering, early farming techniques including meadows for fodder, trade and mining have been important ways for earning a living. The permanent population is 33 350 of which 21 000 live in small towns. More than 50% of the jobs are found in construction industry, public health sector and commercial goods industries (cosmetics, luxury food, wood, rubber, plastics). In the side valleys, service sector including tourism is the most important job provider.

67. The Advisory Committee noted that the zonation provided was not clear; especially as regards the national park area and that the objective of conservation was not well defined with numerous disconnected landscapes and fragmentation. In addition, the description is vague on how the proposed site will become a model area for sustainable development. Furthermore, information is missing as regards involvement of local communities in the regional association that would manage the proposed biosphere reserve.

68. The Advisory Committee recommended that the proposal be approved pending transmission of the following elements to the secretariat by 31 May 2012.

- Clarification and rational of the zonation.
- Clarification on future benefits for the designation of the proposed area and sustainable development vision.
- Clarification on the coordination authority for the management of the proposed site with involvement of local communities.

**Mura Drava Danube, Croatia/Hungary**

69. The Advisory Committee welcomed the submission of this proposal for a second time, which was deferred in 2010. The Advisory committee welcomed the joint submission from the two countries and the efforts made to provide the elements requested at the previous session, namely statements on transboundary cooperation and to describe the envisaged mechanisms for coordination of activities between the two countries. The Advisory Committee recommended that the site be approved pending the submission of the following elements:

- Clarification on the coordination structure between the two countries and the partnership with the upstream management bodies;

- Clarification on how they expect to address the water and sediment management issues, including in the management plan of the whole area;

- Explanation on how they plan to involve local municipalities and local communities in both countries in the management of the proposed area.
NOMINATIONS DEFERED

Gouritz, South Africa
70. The Advisory Committee welcomed the submission of this proposal and recognized the importance of this site for the conservation of biological diversity as well as its potential for sustainable economic development of the local communities through eco-tourism.

71. However, the Committee noted lack of involvement of the local people in the nomination process as well as the management of the proposed biosphere reserve. Also it noted lack of information to ensure the performance of the logistic/education function of the proposed site.

72. The Advisory Committee advised that this site be deferred and encouraged the South African Authorities to re-submit a new proposal in conformity with Seville Strategy and Statutory Framework of Biosphere Reserves. The revised proposal should bear the original signatures of the relevant authorities and stakeholders and also include clear information on the following:
- the involvement of local communities in the nomination process and their participation in the management of the biosphere reserve if approved;
- maps showing clearly the extent of the core areas, buffer and transition zones and
- a clearly outlined education/logistic functions of the proposed biosphere reserve.

Tang-Sayyad, Iran
73. The Advisory Committee commended the Iranian Authorities for the sustainability programmes planned in the proposed site although the nomination was incomplete. The Committee recommended that a new nomination file which consolidates all the information contained in the different previous nomination files, including the official endorsements from all the stakeholders, should be submitted to the UNESCO MAB Secretariat. The Committee encouraged the authorities to get technical support from the UNESCO regional office and the MAB Secretariat with respect to the nomination process. The Advisory Committee thus recommended that this site be deferred.

Samothraki, Greece
74. The Advisory Committee welcomed this proposal which comprises the entire island of Samothraki located in the Aegean archipelago. The proposed total surface is 22 853 ha, mainly composed of mountains rising up to 1611 m with high endemic biodiversity. The very early human presence on the island since the prehistoric times created cultural landscapes and there are two archaeological protected sites. There are about 2 700 inhabitants whose means of livelihood are mainly agriculture, livestock rearing, fisheries and tourism. Tourism activities in the area peak between July and August with more than 40 000 visitors. These activities impact both the marine and terrestrial ecosystem. The Advisory Committee noted with appreciation the efforts put in the nomination file as well as the focus on the development of tourism but highlighted that the following aspects were weak.
- The conservation function was not satisfactory as the core area is only protected through Natura 2000 status; the impact of tourism was not well documented especially with regards to the planned development of mountainous tourism in the core area
- Lack of a detailed management plan and information on the land tenure system;
- The lack of a clear coordination structure for the management of the proposed biosphere reserve;
- The need for more information on the and coordination with World Heritage site located in the village of Chora;
- The weakness of the research and logistic function.

75. Therefore the Advisory Committee recommended that the proposal be **deferred** and encouraged the authorities to resubmit the proposal in accordance with Seville Strategy and Statutory Framework of Biosphere Reserves.

**Real Sitio de San Ildefonso, Spain**

76. The Advisory Committee welcomed this submission and congratulated the national authorities for the quality of the proposal. The area is located in the province of Segovia. The mountain of Valsaín constitutes an important woodland area in the country, and is of incalculable ecological, economic, aesthetic and social value. The Advisory Committee noted the unusual zonation system as a first step of a process to include all the Guadarrama Range zone. However, the Advisory Committee would like to obtain a clarification about the satellite buffer zone that is disconnected from the main biosphere reserve and consider the need for it to be part of the general structure.

77. The Advisory Committee recommended that this site be **deferred**.

**NOMINATIONS REJECTED**

**Terres de l’Ebre, Spain**

78. The Advisory Committee takes note of this submission. This proposal includes the delta and the watershed of the Ebro River. The Ebro River is the largest river in Spain in terms of volume. It has a large number of different ecosystems from inland to the coastal area. The main part of productive land is used for cattle system.

79. However, the Advisory Committee noted that three of the eight nuclear power plants of Spain are located in the proposed biosphere reserve. The Advisory Committee stated that nuclear energy is not compatible with principles of the MAB Programme. Therefore, the large majority of the Advisory Committee members recommended that this proposal be **rejected**.

**EXTENSION, RENAMING OR CHANGES IN THE ZONATION OF BIOSPHERE RESERVES**

**Réserve de biosphère des Iles et de la Mer d’Iroise Extension and renaming (former Iroise), France**

80. The Advisory Committee commended this well-prepared proposal for the extension of Mer d’Iroise, which now includes a marine park and the island of Sein and is based on engagement and support from local communities with a clear vision for sustainable development supported by a charter. The total surface area is 99 149 ha, with 1324 inhabitants.

81. The Advisory Committee is pleased to note that the extension of the site will strengthen the implementation of the objectives and the three main functions of the biosphere reserve. Therefore, the Committee recommended that this extension and renaming be **approved**. The Committee requested for further information on the implementation of the coordination process and further encouraged cooperation with other marine and islands biosphere reserves.
Sierra Nevada Biosphere Reserve, Spain, Re-zoning
82. The Advisory Committee welcomed the re-submission of this biosphere reserve nominated in 1986. This new submission is a re-zoning that incorporates the transition zone that was not included in the previous nomination. The Advisory Committee noted the effort of the national authorities to adjust this post-Seville biosphere reserve to conform to the Seville Strategy and Statutory Framework requirement and therefore recommended that this proposal be approved.

Doñana Biosphere Reserve, Spain, Extension
83. The Advisory Committee welcomed this submission for this biosphere reserve nominated in 1980. This extension incorporates the transition zone that was not included in the previous nomination and enlarges the buffer zone thus increasing the total area by more than three times. The Advisory Committee congratulated the national authorities for adjusting this post-Seville site to conform to the Seville Strategy and Statutory Framework requirements.

84. The Committee encouraged the authorities to enforce the dialogue between stakeholders in the new extended area to achieve common agreement between conservation and sustainable development as an example of conflict resolutions. This proposal was recommended for approval.

Fray Jorge Biosphere Reserve, Chile, Extension
85. The Advisory Committee welcomed this submission of the existing biosphere reserve. This new extension incorporates the transition zone that was not included during the nomination in 1977 and enlarges the buffer zone thus the biosphere reserve has more than doubled in size. The Advisory Committee noted the strong local participatory method. The Committee congratulated the national authorities on adjusting this post-Seville site to conform to the Seville Strategy and Statutory Framework requirements and recommended that this proposal be approved.

EXAMINATION OF PERIODIC REVIEW REPORTS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Manu Biosphere Reserve, Peru
86. The Advisory Committee welcomed the second periodic review report submitted by the Peruvian Authorities and acknowledged the efforts made since the last periodic review report submitted in 1999 in particular by the increase of the transition area. The Advisory Committee noted that the site fulfills the biosphere reserve criteria by including the three zones in the biosphere reserve that was not included during its nomination in 1977.

87. The Committee recognized the important support and technical information collected from the research center of this area and the involvement of the indigenous communities. The biosphere reserve is part of the Rural Development and Biodiversity Conservation of the Amazonian Biosphere Reserves project to improve the well-being of the local communities. The Advisory Committee requested the authorities to send a copy of the management plan of the biosphere reserve to the MAB secretariat by 31 May 2012.

Huascarán Biosphere Reserve, Peru
88. The Advisory Committee welcomed the second periodic review report submitted by the Peruvian Authorities and acknowledged the efforts made since the last periodic review report submitted in 1999 and the progress report in response to the recommendation in 2005. The biosphere reserve was nominated in 1977. It noted that the site continues to fulfill the biosphere reserve criteria in line with the Seville Strategy and Statutory Framework of
Biosphere Reserves. The zonation system protects the core area very well and the use of the buffer and transition areas promote sustainable development activities.

89. The Advisory Committee noted their important effort to integrate the mining exploitation and decrease its impact on the biosphere reserve. It recommended excluding these activities from the core zone. The Advisory Committee encouraged the authorities to put in place the action plan of the Huascarán working group and the application of the strategy of climate change to improve the management system of the biosphere reserve and the local participation.

**Noroeste Biosphere Reserve, Peru**

90. The Advisory Committee welcomed the second periodic review report submitted by the Peruvian Authorities and acknowledged the efforts made since the last periodic review report submitted in 1999. The Committee noted that the biosphere reserve does not have a transition area despite the clear delimitation of the core and buffer zones.

91. The authorities are encouraged to add a transition area which includes local settlements and the coastal area to the biosphere reserve. The transition area will connect the Cerros de Amotape National Park core area with Tumbes Mangroves National Sanctuary as a new proposed core area. The Advisory Committee requested a submission of an extension nomination application to fulfill the Seville Strategy and Statutory Framework of Biosphere Reserves.

**Parque Atlántico Mar Chiquito Biosphere Reserve, Argentina**

92. The Advisory Committee welcomed the submission of the periodic review by the Argentinean Authorities. The biosphere reserve was nominated in 1996.

93. The Committee highlighted the important ecological values of the site, its potential for meeting the biosphere reserve criteria and its location value by being close to Buenos Aires. The Advisory Committee welcomed the education programme developed in the area.

94. However, the Committee recommended the revision of the zonation system to include the marine area as transition zone. It stressed the importance to improve the description of species and landscape. The Advisory Committee noted that the biosphere reserve fulfils the criteria of the Seville Strategy.

**Omo Biosphere Reserve, Nigeria**

95. The Advisory Committee welcomed the periodic review report from the Nigerian Authorities. The committee also acknowledged the financial contribution of the federal and state government towards the management of the biosphere reserve.

96. The Committee also commended the authorities for the logistic and educational functions being realized in the biosphere reserve. Commendable among these activities are the trainings on the sustainable harvesting of fish and wildlife which discourages the use of chemicals and also the industrial training opportunities available to forestry, wildlife and biology students.

97. The authorities are encouraged to implement a more elaborate and substantial management and development plan for the biosphere reserve in consultation with relevant stakeholders and the local community. The authorities are also requested to provide a map clearly showing the core area, buffer and transition zones.

**Dinder Biosphere Reserve, Sudan**

98. Established along the border with Ethiopia, Dinder was declared a biosphere reserve in 1979 representing tropical savannah and grassland ecosystems. Dinder contains
important habitats for terrestrial migratory species and its wetlands act as a refuge for a large number of migratory birds. Mammal populations have dwindled largely due to illegal hunting and farming.

99. The Advisory Committee acknowledged that the report was rich in information regarding habitats and species but that it lacked detailed information relating to the status and trends of the fauna and flora over the years. The report also lacked information on the management plan or management policy of Dinder as a biosphere reserve, including in relation to fire management, livestock grazing, as well as on the reserve’s significance for biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. Additional information on these aspects was therefore requested together with a map showing the location of the biosphere reserve within Sudan accompanied by a section describing the major topographic features of the biosphere reserve.

100. The Advisory Committee also noted the quasi absence of research or monitoring programmes and the apparent lack of community participation in decision making processes or resource management. Further clarification on these issues was therefore also sought by the Committee which concluded that it would be advisable to request a resubmission of the entire report.

**Wadi Allaqi Biosphere Reserve, Egypt**

101. Located in the South of Egypt close to Sudan, Wadi Allaqi was declared as a Biosphere Reserve in 1993. It is internationally recognized as an Important Bird Area. The ecosystem includes desert, mountain, wadi and wetland habitats, including the Elba mountain group. The biosphere reserve also includes Lake Nasser formed with the establishment of the Aswan High Dam. The establishment of the Lake Nasser and the reclamation of the shores have improved the status of species that used to be rare (Nile crocodile). Furthermore, the lake has proved to be an important location for wintering migratory birds.

102. The Director of Protected Areas department oversees management of the national network of protected areas including the Wadi Allaqi Biosphere Reserve which has 24 personnel, in addition to many researchers. Facilities include at least 4 research stations inside (3) and outside the biosphere reserve. There are between 700-800 Bedouins living within the biosphere reserve with others coming there to work but they do not live there. The main activities practiced by these groups are quarrying, fishing, and agriculture. The Bedouins almost exclusively live in the transition areas.

103. The Advisory Committee while welcoming the report, noted that it did not contain any zonation map and that the chapters in the report dealing with the status of ecosystems and habitats in the reserve was very general and lacked statistics on changes over time. Therefore, the Committee recommended that this missing information should be requested in order to complete the report.

**Sahamalaza-Iles Radama Biosphere Reserve, Madagascar**

104. The Advisory Committee welcomed the periodic review report submitted by the Madagascar Authorities. The committee also recognized that this is the first report submitted for this site which was designated in 2001.

105. The Advisory Committee encouraged the authorities to implement the following recommendations in order to better fulfil the Seville Strategy and Statutory Framework of Biosphere Reserves.
- Improve the zonation of the biosphere reserve by clearly delineating the buffer and core zone.
- Support the integration of the management plans for the biosphere reserve into the regional Management and Development scheme.
- Traditional leaders should be encouraged to get involved in the management of the marine resources and mangroves in the biosphere reserve.
- To reinforce the participation of the local community and their leaders in the management of the entire biosphere reserve.

Mananara-Nord Biosphere Reserve, Madagascar
106. The Advisory Committee welcomed this periodic review of the Mananara-Nord Biosphere Reserve which was designated in 1990.

107. The Committee requested that the authorities improve the data on the status and level of endemic species both flora and fauna in the biosphere reserve and submit it to the secretariat by 31 May 2012. The following recommendations were also made and the authorities are encouraged to implement them.
- Improve the zonation of the forests which have been transferred to the riverain communities to be contiguous with the National Park and also to ensure that the needs of the local people for firewood harvesting are managed in a sustainable way.
- Redefine clearly the buffer zone before the end of 2013.
- Reinforce the fight against illegal logging.
- Reinforce the laws governing the core area and build the capacity of the people managing the core area.
- Educate and build the capacity of the local community to better manage the resources in the biosphere reserve.

Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve, India
108. The Advisory Committee welcomed this re-submitted report with new information on Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve (designated in 2000). The Committee acknowledged that the site, located at the junction of three southern states of India, is one of the biodiversity hotspots for speciation in the tropics. The region harbours the largest known Indian population of two endangered species namely Nilgiri Tahr and the Lion-tailed Macaque. The core area is strictly protected from all developmental activities. The buffer zone is divided into a manipulation-forestry zone and tourism zone. Some development programmes with the involvement of local people for sustainable livelihood are welcomed.

109. Research, monitoring and public awareness and training programs have been well conducted in this site. The Management Committee at the local level plays an important role in coordination and examination of action plans.

110. The Committee noted that encroachment, illicit logging and poaching have negative impacts in the transition area. Forest fires, man-animal conflicts and invasive alien species are obstacles encountered at this site. The Advisory Committee invited the Indian MAB National Committee and the related institutes to provide technical support to help resolve the above issues. The Advisory Committee asked the Indian Authorities to provide more information about the rationale for the zonation system of this biosphere reserve.

Palawan Biosphere Reserve, Philippines
111. The Advisory Committee welcomed this report on Palawan Biosphere Reserve (designated in 1990). The archipelagic biosphere reserve contains several islands including the main island of Palawan, with unique endemic flora and fauna species in many diversified habitats including forests, grasslands, brush lands and wetlands. Most coral and mangrove species have been documented. The Committee noted that the Palawan Biosphere Reserve is legally recognized through Republic Act 7611. Institutional bodies and mechanisms are established to assist in the implementation of the law. The listening post and quick response
The Environmental Monitoring and Evaluation System (EMES) and environmental information and education system were established in implementation of Act 7611.

112. The Committee encouraged the authorities to enhance forest management to avoid bad agricultural practices, logging, and illegal wildlife trade. It was further recommended to improve coastal and marine management and to increase research, training and exchange programmes. The biosphere reserve needs to seek technical support for the preservation of indigenous culture and the conservation and management of threatened species and their habitats.

113. The Committee discussed the necessity to include the Underground River World Heritage site and its buffer into the core area of this biosphere reserve. The management plan is based upon the Strategic Environmental Plan at provincial level enacted as a law in 1992. The committee asked the authorities to provide more information about the current zones and delineate clear demarcation of the zonation. The Committee recommended that new zonation system under the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve concept should be considered. Important habitats of coral, mangrove and marine animals should be identified first and those marine areas should be incorporated into the biosphere reserve. The Committee requested that the authorities provide a zonation map of the coastal and marine part.

**Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve, Cambodia**

114. The Advisory Committee welcomed this well-prepared report on Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve (designated in 2001) which is one of the important wetlands for biodiversity conservation in Southeast Asia. The Advisory Committee endorsed the appropriate zonation of core area, buffer zone to transition area which not only encourages development and implementation of the management plan within the community fishing areas for improving local community livelihoods but also assures a refuge for a great variety of species that are extinct or highly threatened elsewhere.

115. The Committee encouraged the expansion of the existing system of fish sanctuaries and the implementation of spatially-based conservation measures. The established Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve Secretariat plays a positive role on coordinating all the stakeholders and facilitates more extensive communication, cooperation and enforcement of existing rules and regulations for establishing a learning laboratory for sustainability.

116. The Committee also recommended that some development programme and biodiversity research and monitoring activities should be conducted for the socio-economic development of local communities and the control of exotic species. The fishing lots and small scale fishery activities inside the core areas of the biosphere reserve should not be permitted.

117. The Committee asked the biosphere reserve authorities to provide full pictures and information on the existing core areas and their possible future plans. The Committee recommended that the zonation system be revised taking into account in particular the important habitats of coral and marine areas as part of the zonation system.

**Baotianman Biosphere Reserve, China**

118. The Advisory Committee welcomed this well-prepared report on Baotianman Biosphere Reserve (designated in 2001), which had been prepared following an on-site periodic review seminar held from 16 to 18 June 2011, with more than 50 participants including experts, managers, stakeholders, local residents, representatives from other nature reserves, local government as well as nature reserve administrative authorities.

119. The Advisory Committee endorsed remarkable achievements in the conservation of
biodiversity and capacity building including research, trainings and education activities. The Committee also noted the detailed findings of the review seminar and invited the MAB Secretariat to inform the Chinese Authorities thereof. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee are to:

- Keep a protection-based priority in eco-tourism development. Cooperate with local authorities to strengthen coordination for tourism development. Improve the mechanism for community participation. Optimize management with the application of advanced technologies and research results. Manage the invasion of exotic species and control pollution in scenic spots.

Saihanwula Biosphere Reserve, China
120. The Advisory Committee welcomed this well-prepared report on Saihanwula Biosphere Reserve (designated in 2001), which had been prepared following an on-site periodic review seminar held July 13-15, 2011, with more than 100 participants, including experts, manager, stakeholders, local residents, representatives from other nature reserves as well as nature reserve administrative authorities.

121. The Advisory Committee endorsed the remarkable results that have been achieved in the conservation of biodiversity and ecological restoration. The Committee also noted the detailed findings of the review seminar and invited the MAB secretariat to inform the Chinese Authorities thereof. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee are to:

- Keep the principle of protection-based development and cooperate closely with local authorities to strengthen administration and supervision for regulated management of tourism development. Improve the channels and mechanism for community participation to further community development, setting a model for harmonious development of the reserve and the community. Enhance support for the biosphere reserve and actively introduce scientific research talents for capacity building.

Dong Nai Biosphere Reserve, Viet Nam
122. The Advisory Committee welcomed the report provided by the Vietnamese Authorities as well as the progress made since 2001. It noted the significant conservation of biodiversity through assisting the survival of the unmodified habitats and the suppression of hunting and other forms of disturbance. It also noted that the link between conservation, research and education programs is well developed in this site. Similarly, the link between conservation and sustainable development appears to be sufficiently revealed at the national scale through the creation of new jobs and sources of income for biosphere reserve inhabitants and the partnerships with business and private enterprise for sustainable development.

123. The Advisory Committee noted that the site meets the biosphere reserve criteria and recommended that the Vietnamese Authorities pay more attention to the link between conservation and sustainable development at the regional scale in conformity with the aspirations of the nomination form.

Grosses Walsertal, Austria
124. The Advisory Committee welcomed the additional information sent by the Austrian authorities, following the recommendation it made on the periodic review report examined at its seventeenth session. The Advisory Committee highly appreciated the detailed, comprehensive and concrete examples provided. The biodiversity conservation activities include measures implemented in the field of biodiversity and sustainable agriculture, biodiversity monitoring with farmers, establishment of agricultural partner businesses,
meadows championships and butterfly monitoring programmes. The Advisory Committee recommended that the site is considered as a model site which practices should be shared within the World Network of Biosphere Reserves.

Lac Saint Pierre, Canada
125. The Advisory committee welcomed the report provided by the Canadian authorities. It welcomed the extension of the transition area to reinforce the sustainable development function and secure the involvement and commitment and engagement of local communities. The total surface of the transition area is now 6,504 ha. The Advisory Committee considered that the biosphere reserve is fulfilling the criteria of the Statutory framework. The Advisory Committee recommended that the site is considered as a model site which practices should be shared within the World Network of Biosphere Reserves.

Long Point, Canada
126. The Advisory Committee welcomed this second periodic review report by the Canadian authorities. The Advisory Committee welcome the comprehensive report and the quality of the information provided, which addresses the recommendations issued by the Committee, following the report submitted in 2001. The Advisory Committee considers that the site fulfills the criteria of the Statutory Framework. It also noted that the site is planning to integrate an additional buffer zone and that there is a plan to extend the core areas. The Advisory Committee requested that the reconfiguration of the biosphere reserve should be further explained with a detailed zonation maps as soon as possible as well as that the authorities provides the document on “Request for boundary expansion, recognition of additional core buffer and name change” mentioned in the report.

Redberry Lake, Canada
127. The Advisory Committee welcomed the report from the Canadian authorities. The Committee acknowledged the work being carried at the international level and the god cooperation with other biosphere reserves, as well as the progress made in terms of conservation and monitoring, development, research. The Advisory Committee considers that the site fulfills the criteria of the Statutory Framework. The Advisory Committee recommended that the authorities continue the involvement of the farmers, and share practices on farming systems with an expanding organic food market as sustainable practices with the World Network of Biosphere Reserves.

Southwest Nova, Canada
128. The Advisory Committee welcomed the report from the Canadian authorities. The site was designated in 2001. The Committee acknowledged the limited budget that was available for the site which explains the delay in the implementation of many activities. It noted the efforts made to address the governance structure, and the design of strategic plan and action plan. It also noted the need to improve the communication with local communities and first nations to increase their awareness about the site and their involvement in its management. The Advisory Committee requested an update in the next three years on the implementation of the 15 recommendations for future activities based on the findings of the review, as well as evidence on the engagement of the local communities in the process.

Bile Karpathy, Czech Republic
129. The Advisory Committee welcomed the report from the Czech Republic authorities. The site was established in 1996 and is managed as a landscape protection area. The Protected Landscape Area is managing the whole biosphere reserve but it seems that there is a lack of coordination with the different stakeholders. The Advisory Committee acknowledged the quality of the management plan for the protected landscape areas and the information provided on these landscapes, with clear conservation objectives, and noted with satisfaction that the zonation is clear and functional. The Advisory Committee however considered that the site is partially meeting the criteria. The Advisory Committee encouraged
the authorities to pursue their efforts and recommended to improve the overall coordination of the site as well as the governance structure for a better coordination of the biosphere reserve. It also recommended to the national authorities to support participatory processes and to work with other sites in the World Network of Biosphere Reserves for sharing experience and practices on work on sustainable development at the biosphere reserve level with different stakeholders including the private sector.

Krkonose/Karkonosze, Czech Republic Poland

130. The Advisory Committee welcomed the report from the two countries. It acknowledged the quality of the joint report of this transboundary site designated in 1992. The Advisory Committee acknowledged the quality of the conservation work being done at both national parks levels in both countries with some prize received at the European level as well the quality of the work done on the effects of tourism on biodiversity and its implementation for reaching conservation objectives. The Advisory Committee noted that the main function was the conservation and that this function was well fulfilled by the national parks. It also acknowledged that the research and demonstration functions were strong but that the development function was weak as well as the transboundary biosphere reserve cooperation. The site is thus partially meeting the criteria, and the Advisory Committee encouraged the authorities of both countries to pursue their efforts and recommended to improve the overall coordination of the site as well as the governance structure for a better coordination of the transboundary biosphere reserve. It also recommended to support participatory processes and to work with other sites in the WNBR for sharing experience and practices on work on sustainable development at the biosphere reserve level with different stakeholders including private sector.

Schaalsee, Germany

131. The Advisory Committee welcomed the report from the German authorities. The Committee acknowledged that the site fully fulfils the biosphere reserve criteria of the Statutory Framework. Despite the relative small size of the site (30 900 ha), it acknowledged that it was one of the first to establish a strategy for mitigation and adaptation to climate change, via several projects which contribute to the implementation of the Madrid Action Plan. The potential for sustainable tourism is very high but it needs to be integrated within regional planning. The logistic function is to be emphasized with an environmental education programme for sustainable development developed through the Centre of Education. The socio economic and ecological monitoring is well established but need more staff resources for maintaining the sustainability of the results over time. There is a potential to extend the site with an adjacent protected area, which could reinforce the role of the biosphere as regional unifying model for sustainable development in close cooperation with local communities. Furthermore, the Advisory Committee recommended that the periodic review process and report be shared amongst the World Network of Biosphere Reserves as a good practice.

Vessertal-Thüringen Forest, Germany

132. The Advisory Committee welcomed this second report from the German authorities. The site was established 1978. The Advisory Committee welcomed the well-prepared and comprehensive report submitted; the quality of the data provided and commended the participative and consultation process in the biosphere reserve. It acknowledged the efforts and progress made since the submission of the first periodic review in 2002. It considered that the site fully fulfils the biosphere reserve criteria of the Statutory Framework. Furthermore, the Advisory Committee recommended that the periodic review process and report be shared amongst the World Network of Biosphere Reserves as a good practice.
Circeo, Italy
133. The Advisory Committee welcomed the report from the Italian authorities. The site was designated in 1977 and is also a Ramsar site and was the first biosphere reserve in Italy. It is state forest with Mediterranean species. 20 people are living in this site. Tourism is one of the main activities. Research function is important but the Advisory committee noted the absence of a management plan. The Advisory Committee also noted that there is no functional zonation. The Advisory committee considered that the site was not fulfilling the criteria and requested to receive:
- a comprehensive zonation map, to enable the implementation of the three functions;
- information on the coordination structure that would secure the involvement of local people;
- a plan for tourism development.

The Committee requested all the above information by 2013 to meet target 13 of the Madrid Action Plan.

Collemeluccio-Montedimezzo, Italy
134. The Advisory Committee welcomed the report from the Italian authorities. The site was designated in 1977. Many tourists are visiting the area and it was the first site in Italy to provide access to disable people. The Advisory Committee welcomed the project for the extension of the biosphere reserve with three zones as well as the setting up of a coordination structure. The extended site will comprises 5 500 inhabitants. It also noted the involvement of local communities in the process. The Advisory Committee encourages the authorities to implement the proposed extension with the zonation presented and requested to received information on the implementation of the zonation as well as a the management plan for the whole area by end of 2013 to meet Target 13 of the Madrid Action Plan.

Waddensea Area, Netherlands
135. The Advisory Committee welcomed this report from the Netherlands authorities for the site which was established in 1996. The Advisory Committee thanks the authorities for the preliminary report and is looking forward receiving the comprehensive report in order for the Committee to evaluate if the site fulfills the criteria as soon as possible.

Barguzinskyi, Russian Federation
136. The Advisory Committee welcomed this report from the Russian Federation authorities. The site was designated in 1978. It took note of the plan for developing ecotourism to involve local communities but requested additional information on this development. It acknowledged the research facilities and research activities being carried out as well as the conservation measures. It also noted that the zonation is in place but that the site was partially fulfilling the criteria. It also noted that a transition area of 5 million hectares was delimited. The Advisory Committee requested that additional information was to be provided on the delimitation of this large transition area and management plan describing the activities in all three zones; to present a clear report on the status of biodiversity in all three zones; to provide more specific scientific research report for the biosphere reserve; to ensure the involvement of local people and communities in management, development of sustainable activities, nature and culture protection. It further requested information on the location and functioning of the oil pipeline as well as safety management plan linked to this pipeline in the three zones. It also requested a safety plan for avoiding ecological damages possibly caused by hazardous activities in the transition area. It finally requested the submission of the new zonation map with planned extension of buffer zones by the end of 2013 at the latest, in accordance with the Target 13 of the Madrid Action Plan.
Vodlozersky, Russian Federation
137. The Advisory Committee welcomed this report from the Russian Federation authorities. The site was designated in 2001. The Advisory Committee noted that the site has three zones as well as a management strategy for 10 to 20 years. It acknowledged new working places for forest management. It also noted the lack of consultation and participation of local and regional authorities in the management and development of the area. It requested to provide information on monitoring programmes related to the development for chrome ores with location and assessment of impact and to provide information about dam on the Vama River, its construction and location. The Advisory Committee further requested to involve consultation and involvement of local and regional authorities in the management and development of the area. It requested the submission of all these documents by the end of 2013 at the latest, in accordance with the Target 13 of the Madrid Action Plan.

Golića-Studenica, Serbia
138. The Advisory Committee welcomed this report from the Serbian authorities. It was designated in 2001. It noted that the zonation is in place and that that it overlaps with the national park. 7200 people living in the transition area engaged in forestry and agriculture. The main focus is nature conservation. The Committee noted that the there is no management structure and plan for the overall biosphere reserve. It noted the lack of involvement of local communities and sustainable development vision and activities. The Advisory Committee noted that the site is partially fulfilling the criteria and requested additional information related to the vision for sustainable development for the whole area and evidence of activities in cooperation with the local communities. It also encouraged cooperation with other sites in the World Network of Biosphere Reserves.

Entlebuch, Switzerland
139. The Advisory Committee welcomed this very well documented and comprehensive second report from the Switzerland authorities. It considered that the site is fully fulfilling the three functions of the biosphere reserve and meet the criteria of the Statutory Framework. The site is 39446 ha. It also noted the efforts made to limit the increasing negative effects of agriculture as well as measures undertook to limit the urban extension and agricultural intensification, such as ecological compensation targeted at conserving precious ecological habitats at the country level. It also noted that tourism has increased from 40,000 to 80,000 within ten years. It acknowledged that sustainable tourism is jointly marketed with the region, which ensures a harmonious development and an efficient exploitation of infrastructures and of economic opportunities. It also noted that monitoring was reinforced by several international projects at the landscape level including socio economic monitoring on tourism benefits. It also acknowledged the work of the “Académie de la biosphère” in education and public training, especially as regards youth, private sector and universities. It congratulated the authorities for their work as the site is a model for the whole country and strongly acknowledged the support and engagement of local citizens and communities. The Advisory Committee recommended that the site is considered as a model site which practices should be shared within the World Network of Biosphere Reserves.

Askaniya-Nova, Ukraine
140. The Advisory Committee welcomed this second report from the Ukrainian authorities. The first report was done in 1998. The Advisory Committee congratulates the authorities for addressing the burning practices with the establishment of an internal fire-prevention team as well as the establishment of watch tower and noted with satisfaction that the situation has improved on the buffer zone. It encourages the main features of the management plan but noted that the zoning of the transition area is not clear on the map. It requested to send as soon as possible:

- a zonation map;
141. It also requested to clarify how the local communities will be involved in the whole process of zoning and management. It also encouraged cooperation with other sites in the World Network of Biosphere Reserves especially for socio-economic aspects. The Advisory Committee requested that the authorities provide the zonation map as well as a management plan for the whole area by end of 2013 to meet Target 13 of the Madrid Action Plan.

Chernomorskiy, Ukraine
142. The Advisory Committee welcomed this second report from the Ukrainian authorities. The Advisory Committee congratulated the authorities for addressing the zonation issue as per previous recommendation, and for providing better protection to some areas as well as for the design of the management plan. The Advisory Committee requested that the authorities provide the zonation map as well as a management plan for the whole area by end of 2013 to meet Target 13 of the Madrid Action Plan. It also requested to clarify how wind power will be taken into account in the management plan.

EXAMINATION OF THE NOMINATIONS FOR THE 2012 MICHEL BATISSE AWARD FOR BIOSPHERE RESERVE MANAGEMENT
143. The Secretariat informed the Advisory Committee Members that it had received six files from six countries and that only five of these met the criteria for consideration. The Committee Members were asked to fulfil the evaluation table. After receipt of the rankings assigned by the Advisory Committee Members to the 5 candidates, the Advisory Committee recommended Ms Elizabeth Taylor Carolina, Marine biologist in the Seaflower Biosphere Reserve, from Colombia, for her case study on “Improving sustainable development and coral reef conservation through community-based watershed management in the Seaflower Biosphere Reserve”, as the winning candidate for the 2012 Michel Batisse Award to the Members of the Bureau of the MAB Council. This recommendation was sent to the MAB ICC Bureau members for their endorsement.

REVIEW OF CRITERIA AND THE DRAFT NOMINATION FORM FOR “MAB SUPPORT/STUDY SITES”
144. Following the decision of the MAB ICC made at its 23rd session (June 2011), the Advisory Committee further reflected on the future designation of “MAB Support/Study Sites”. The MAB Secretariat recalled the MAB ICC’s view that in particular those pre-Seville Biosphere Reserves which cannot meet the criteria of the Seville Strategy by 2013, but which have demonstrated scientific and/or societal value for the MAB Programme and for which a Member State wishes to retain an international UNESCO designated status, may constitute a new category. These sites would not be part of the World Network of Biosphere Reserves. The new category could be labeled support/study sites for the MAB Programme, for example to:

- provide scientific data/monitoring for biosphere reserves and for study themes of local, national and international interests;
- focus on a specific theme, such as on climate change, through networking with other similar support/study sites and biosphere reserves, particularly those in developing countries;
- study sustainable development, and encourage cooperation with biosphere reserves.

145. As requested by the MAB ICC at its 23rd session, the Advisory Committee considered a draft Nomination Form for MAB Support/Study Sites worked out by the MAB Secretariat, although several members questioned the desirability for the creation of a category of MAB
Support/Study Sites. The Advisory Committee suggested that a clear definition be given to the MAB Support/Study Sites and to expand the section in the draft Nomination Form on how such sites would interact with the MAB Programme and existing biosphere reserves. Moreover, it proposed that the section on “zonation” be reformulated to reflect the specific research functions of the core/buffer zones.

146. Over lunch time, several members of the Advisory Committee considered the “pros” and “cons” for the creation of a new category of sites as follows:

**Pros:**
- For political and geopolitical reasons, some Member States would not be excluded from the MAB network;
- MAB National Committees would be encouraged to dismiss non-functional biosphere reserves;
- Information sources available in the MAB network could be retained and environmental monitoring sites would not be lost, in particular long-term monitoring data sets which would be in the interest of the MAB network.

**Cons:**
- The MAB Programme is also about promoting sustainable development and not only science;
- Decreasing visibility and understanding of the public and scientists of what a biosphere reserve actually is compared to other designations and sites;
- No accountability of these sites, as it is not clear who will manage and oversee them;
- Growing number of international networks of long-term monitoring worldwide;
- The category of MAB Study/Support Sites would be counterproductive to the biosphere reserve concept, as it gives a signal to countries and managers to not try to reach the Seville criteria;
- Reducing the time of the UNESCO-MAB Secretariat’s human resources affected to the MAB Programme in charge of research, support and activities related to biosphere reserves;
- Loss of credibility of the MAB Programme at the local and national levels;
- The proposal of MAB Support/Study Sites stresses again the need to clarify what kind of research the MAB Programme wishes to promote. From the perspective of the Advisory Committee, the focus of the research and the added value of the MAB Programme and its biosphere reserves is research done on the interaction and integration between Humans and the Biosphere.

147. The members of the Advisory Committee agreed to submit by e-mail concrete proposals for modifications of the draft Nomination Form for MAB Support/Study Sites by 23 April 2012 to the MAB Secretariat which in turn would prepare a new consolidated version for consideration by the MAB ICC at its 24th Session. In a lively e-mail discussion which went beyond 23 April 2012, several members of the Advisory Committee expressed their uneasiness about the creation of a new category of MAB Support/Study Sites or felt that more in-depth discussions were needed regarding selection criteria for such sites. One member of the Advisory Committee provided a modified draft Nomination Form which is attached to this report as Annex xy (Option A); another member of the Advisory Committee provided a different version of the draft Nomination Form for First Generation Biosphere Reserves which goes more into the direction of renominating pre-Seville biosphere reserves (see attached as Annex xy; Option B). In sum, it was concluded that the MAB ICC at its 24th session will have to decide whether work on MAB Support/Study Sites be pursued or not, and if work thereon be continued, which direction it should take.
REVIEW OF THE UPDATED NOMINATION AND PERIODIC REVIEW FORMS TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE MAB INTERNATIONAL CO-ORDINATING COUNCIL

148. The MAB Secretariat introduced document SC-12/CONF.618/7 which consists of the updated nomination and periodic review forms presented by the electronic working group, under the Presidency of the Chair of the French MAB National Committee, Prof. Robert Barbault.

149. Main comments focused on part 16 of the nomination form, on the term management plan, more adequate for protected areas than biosphere reserves and on the need to formulate some of the questions in a future tense.

150. Since the Members of the Advisory Committee did not have the time to provide additional comments, the MAB Secretary invited them to provide comments on both draft by end of April 2012 through email.

INFORMATION ON MADRID ACTION PLAN (2008-2013) – FINAL EVALUATION PROCESS

151. The MAB Secretariat introduced document SC-12/CONF.618/8 which provided a summary of the discussions of the 23rd session of the MAB ICC (Dresden, Germany, June 2011) on the 2010 Mid-term Evaluation of the Madrid Action Plan. The large majority of the MAB ICC members had decided that an external evaluation on the accomplishments of the Madrid Action Plan (MAP) be carried out towards the end of 2013/beginning of 2014, so that the results of the MAP can be submitted to the consideration of the MAB ICC at its session in 2014.

152. Since early 2012, the MAB Secretariat has worked closely with UNESCO’s Internal Oversight Service (IOS) so as to elaborate a methodology for the final evaluation of the MAP. Mr Amir Piric, Head of IOS’s Evaluation Section, and Ms Elena Shishkova (IOS) presented a power point presentation proposing ways to effect the final evaluation. In essence, IOS noted that a total of 159 actions need to be tracked, of which 67 actions figure in the MAP and 92 recommendations emanate from the Seville Strategy for Biosphere Reserves. Moreover, Over 700 actors are involved, including 580 biosphere reserves, over 100 MAB National Committees, 15 regional networks, the WNBR itself and the MAB Secretariat. Regarding “monitoring”, IOS was of the opinion that data collection on 159 actions from over 700 actors would not be cost-effective; therefore, a smaller set of key measurable indicators from the MAP should be monitored over time, ideally through the creation of a web-based relational database (e.g. using MS Access, and online questionnaires e.g. Survey Monkey). Data aggregation should be effected at national levels by MAB National Committees, and the reporting on implementation rates for actions and targets in the MAP could be carried out by region and country.

153. IOS proposed that in early 2014, an external evaluation should be effected with the purpose of assessing results achieved, drawing lessons from the implementation of MAP, and to shape the next Action Plan (in case this is desired). Evaluation questions would focus on the following: (a) has the MAP been successful as a tool for further implementing the Seville Strategy? (b) were MAP targets helpful for achieving MAP objectives? (c) Did the MAP help to promote functioning biosphere reserves and improve the overall WNBR? With regard to the methodology, IOS suggested interviews, a desk review, questionnaires, on-site visits and case studies selected through stratified sampling. IOS would define the terms of references for the external evaluation in consultation with the international MAB Secretariat to be presented for approval by the MAB-ICC in 2013.
154. The Advisory Committee welcomed the proposals by IOS. Some members observed that not all biosphere reserves are connected to Internet and that direct consultations (e.g. via telephone) may need to be effected. Moreover, in some countries, MAB National Committees are not always directly involved with activities happening at the local levels of individual biosphere reserves. Advisory Committee members therefore suggested that the monitoring of biosphere reserves and evaluation of the MAP be effected both at the national level (involving MAB National Committees) and at the local level involving biosphere reserve managers directly and using information emanating from the periodic reviews of biosphere reserves. Some thought was also given to use stratified sampling (e.g. focusing on biosphere reserves that have submitted periodic reviews, or using biosphere reserves that have been designated since the adoption of the MAP in 2008). Advisory Committee members were also made aware of the cost factor involved in carrying out the external evaluation of the MAP in 2014; in the interest of time and cost effectiveness, a stratified sampling would be the most feasible way of going about the final evaluation of MAP.
MAB/WNBR role at the Rio + 20 and the post-Rio + 20 period

155. Mr Ishwaran introduced this agenda item to members of the Advisory Committee by giving them a brief background on a concept note for the preparation of a strategy for the MAB Programme for 2014-2021. He informed the Committee of UNESCO’s planned events for the upcoming Rio + 20 Conference. He stated that UNESCO will organize two side events; 1) Oceans and Coastal zones, 2) Education for Sustainable Development. He added that the MAB Programme has expressed interest to contribute and participate in the UNESCO side events.

156. Mr Ishwaran informed the Committee that it was critical to think of positioning the MAB programme very well when MAP ends in 2013 in order to effectively showcase its added advantages. He mentioned that there are important global events coming up in which the MAB Programme could play very important roles. He cited the adoption of the new framework of commitments for the Kyoto Protocol by 2015 under the UN-REDD and REDD+ mechanism as an avenue through which the MAB programme and therefore biosphere reserves can contribute and demonstrate their importance. He added that one critical area to consider was the UN Decade for Sustainable Development. He informed the Committee that in the light of the Millennium Development Goals there is an effort to shift to the concept of Sustainable Development Goals. With respect to this new development, biosphere reserves and the WNBR can be positioned as testing sites and a platform for this concept.

OTHER BUSINESS

157. The Advisory Committee was informed that the trilateral agreement for the establishment of the West Polesie transboundary biosphere reserve between Belarussia, Poland and Ukraine has been submitted and will be transmitted to the MAB International Co-ordinating Council for its consideration, so the site can be officially designated as a biosphere reserve.

CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

158. Mr Ishwaran thanked the Advisory Committee for contributing to the work of the World Network of Biosphere Reserves and the MAB Programme. He expressed the hope that the new members of the Committee enjoyed the experience and would continue to promote the biosphere reserve concept whenever the opportunity arises. Lastly, he thanked the Chair for conducting the meeting successfully. The Chair then declared the meeting closed.
MAB Support/Study Sites are areas which are internationally recognized by UNESCO’s Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme for their value in demonstrating the interrelationship between people and their environment for long-term scientific research, environmental monitoring, demonstration, education and training, and conservation purposes. They reflect the commitment of States and the scientific community to use MAB Support/Study Sites for national and international collaboration to generate and share scientific knowledge on ecosystem functioning for the benefit of human well-being and for environmental integrity.

MAB Support/Study Sites are designated by the International Coordinating Council of the MAB Programme at the request of the State concerned. Individual sites remain under the sovereign jurisdiction of the State where they are situated.

The designation of MAB Support/Study Sites is exclusively reserved for those sites which had been listed in the World Network of Biosphere Reserves, but which cannot, or can no longer, fulfill the criteria for biosphere reserves as stipulated in the “Seville Strategy for Biosphere Reserves” and the “Statutory Framework of the World Network of Biosphere Reserves”, adopted under 28 C/Resolution 2.4 of the UNESCO General Conference in November 1995. For example, the designation of a MAB Support/Study Site could apply to pre-Seville type of biosphere reserves which, for different reasons, cannot contain one or more core areas, buffer zones and a transition area to accommodate the multiple functions of a post-Seville type of biosphere reserve. And yet many of these sites have great societal value and international significance for research and demonstration studies on issues related to human-environment interactions through the availability of long-term data series in a wide range of scientific topics.

At its 23rd session (Dresden/Germany, 2011), the MAB International Coordinating Council decided that every attempt should be made so that all existing biosphere reserves meet the criteria of the Seville Strategy and the Statutory Framework in line with Madrid Action Plan by the end of 2013. Only those sites that cannot meet the criteria could be moved into a separate category of MAB Support/Study Sites established within the MAB Programme and those sites would not be part of the World Network of Biosphere Reserves.

The proposed MAB Support/Study Site needs to evidence that it:
- provides scientific data/monitoring for biosphere reserves and for study themes of local, national and international interests;
- focuses on a specific theme, such as on global change including climate change, or urbanization, through networking with other similar support/study sites and biosphere reserves, particularly those in developing countries;
- studies sustainable development, and encourages cooperation with biosphere reserves.

The information presented on this nomination form will be used in a number of ways by UNESCO:

---

1 Over 42% of all pre-Seville biosphere reserves contain a core area only, but no buffer zones or transition areas, since many of these sites had been designated during the period since the launch of the MAB Programme and the Seville Conference for Biosphere Reserves held in 1995, when the main objectives of biosphere reserves focused primarily on research and protection.
(a) for examination of the site by the Advisory Committee on Biosphere Reserves and by the Bureau of the MAB International Coordinating Council;
(b) for use in a world-wide accessible information system, notably the UNESCO-MABnet, facilitating communications and interaction amongst persons interested in *MAB Support/Study Sites* throughout the world.

The form should be completed in English, French or Spanish. Two copies should be sent to the UNESCO-MAB Secretariat, as follows:
a) The original hard copy, with the original signatures, letters of endorsement, zonation map and supporting documents. This should be sent to the Secretariat through the Official UNESCO channels, i.e. via the National Commission for UNESCO and/or the Permanent Delegation to UNESCO.
b) An electronic version of the nomination form and maps (especially the zonation map). These can be sent directly to the MAB Secretariat:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNESCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAB Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Ecological and Earth Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, rue Miollis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-75352 Paris Cedex 15, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel: ++33 1 45 68 41 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: ++33 1 45 68 58 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:mab@unesco.org">mab@unesco.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NAME OF THE CURRENTLY DESIGNATED BIOSPHERE RESERVE:

2. COUNTRY:

3. YEAR OF DESIGNATION AS A BIOSPHERE RESERVE:

4. PROPOSED NEW NAME (IF ANY):

5. MAJOR ECOSYSTEM TYPE / BIOGEOGRAPHICAL REGION:

6. LOCATION (LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE):
   [Indicate in degrees - minutes, seconds - the coordinates of the central point AND the external limits of the proposed biosphere reserve to be used for a Geographic Information System (GIS)]

7. PROVIDE THE MAIN REASON(S) WHY THE SITE SHOULD NO LONGER BE REFERRED TO AS A *BIOSPHERE RESERVE* BUT AS A *MAB SUPPORT/STUDY SITE*
8. INDICATE THE MAIN FUNCTION(S) OF THE MAB SUPPORT/STUDY SITE
[e.g. for scientific studies as a long-term ecological research site, environmental monitoring, conservation of rare or endemic species, demonstration site for environmental education and training, learning and study site for sustainable development and ecosystem services, sustainable land use, importance for international collaboration on any of these functions].

9. INDICATE IN WHAT MANNER THE PROPOSED SITE WOULD CONTRIBUTE AS A SUPPORT AND / OR STUDY SITE TO THE MAB PROGRAMME
[e.g. through on-going international research agreements, monitoring of species and their habitats as control sites, demonstration site for educational and training purposes, learning sites for sustainable development]

9.1 Potential to contribute to the World Network of Biosphere Reserves
[Collaboration with biosphere reserves at a national, regional and global level in terms of exchange of scientific information, experience in conservation and sustainable use, study tours of personnel, joint seminars and workshops, Internet discussion groups, etc.]

9.2 Collaboration with existing biosphere reserves at the national, regional or international levels, including promoting transboundary sites and twinning arrangements
[Indicate on-going or planned activities. Note: Here, ‘regional’ refers to the regions as Africa, Arab region, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe and Northern America. Transboundary sites can be created by two or more contiguous countries to promote cooperation to conserve and sustainably use ecosystems which straddle the international boundaries. Twinning arrangements usually consist of agreements between sites located at some distance in different countries to promote activities such as cooperative research projects, cultural exchanges for schoolchildren and adults, etc.]

9.3 Collaboration with existing biosphere reserves in thematic networks at the regional or international levels
[Indicate on-going and planned activities in networks of sites which have a common geographic theme such as islands and archipelagoes, mountains, drylands, tropical forests or a common topic of interest such as climate change, ecotourism, ethnobiology etc.]
10. ZONATION AND HUMAN POPULATION OF THE PROPOSED SITE

10.1 Current zonation and human population when the site was designated as a biosphere reserve (in ha):

Size of core area(s): _______________ ha / human population: _______________________
Size of buffer zone(s): _______________ ha / human population: _______________________
Size of transition area: _______________ ha / human population: _______________________
Total area: _______________________ ha / total human population: __________________

10.2 Proposed new study zonation, if any (in ha):

Size of area(s) for natural scientific studies: _____________ ha / human population: __________
Size of area(s) for societal studies: ________________ ha / human population: __________
Size of area(s) for other studies: ________________ ha / human population: __________
Total area: _______________________ ha / total human population: __________________

10.3 Provide rationale (if any) for the study zonation:

11. MECHANISM FOR IMPLEMENTATION:

11.1 Does the proposed MAB Support/Study Site have a research/management plan or policy for the area?
[Briefly describe]

11.2 Does the proposed MAB Support/Study Site have a designated authority or mechanism to implement this policy or plan?
[Briefly describe]

11.3 In what manner have the local communities and authorities been consulted that the current biosphere reserve will no longer be designated as a biosphere reserve but will be listed as a support / study site for the MAB Programme?

12. SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS:
[Special designations recognize the importance of particular sites in carrying out their functions such as experimental research, monitoring, conservation, and environmental education. These designations can help]
strengthen these functions where they exist or provide opportunities for developing them. Check each designation that applies to the proposed biosphere reserve and indicate its name.

Name:

( ) Long term ecological research site and/or monitoring site [Please specify]

( ) Educational and/or demonstration site [Please specify]

( ) UNESCO World Heritage Site

( ) Geopark

( ) RAMSAR Wetland Convention Site

( ) Other international/regional conservation conventions/directives [Please specify]

( ) Other [Please specify]

13. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (to be submitted with nomination form)

[Clear, well-labelled maps are indispensable for evaluating site proposals. The maps to be provided should be referenced to standard coordinates wherever possible. Electronic versions are encouraged]

( ) General location map

[A GENERAL LOCATION MAP of small or medium scale must be provided showing the location of the proposed study/support site, and all included administrative areas, within the country, and its position with respect to major rivers, mountain ranges, principal towns, etc.]

( ) Zonation map (otherwise zonation map as a pre-Seville Biosphere Reserve)

[Large scale - preferably in black & white for photocopy reproduction - showing the delimitations of all study areas must be provided]

( ) Thematic maps

[Related to the specific functions of the proposed MAB Study/Support Site, thematic maps should be provided, such as vegetation, geological, hydrological maps, and land use/land cover maps].

( ) List of legal documents

[List the principal LEGAL DOCUMENTS authorizing the establishment and governing use and management of the proposed MAB Study/Support Site and any administrative area(s) they contain. Please provide a copy of these documents, if possible with English or French translation].

( ) List of land use and management plans

[List existing LAND USE and MANAGEMENT PLANS (with dates and reference numbers) for the administrative area(s) included within the proposed site. Provide a copy of these documents]

( ) Species list (to be annexed)

[If conservation and monitoring of species are main functions, please provide a LIST OF IMPORTANT SPECIES (threatened species as well as economically important species) occurring within the proposed MAB Study/Support Site, including common names, wherever possible.]

( ) List of main bibliographic references (to be annexed)

[Provide a list of the main publications and articles of relevance to the proposed site over the past 5-10 years].
14. ADDRESSES

14.1 Contact address of the proposed MAB Study/Support Site:
[Government agency, organization, NGO or other entity (entities) to serve as the main contact on the MABnet to whom all MAB-related correspondence should be addressed.]

Name:
Street or P.O. Box: __________________________________________________________
City with postal code: __________________________________________________________
Country: ____________________________________________________________________
Telephone: __________________________________________________________________
Telefax: _____________________________________________________________________
E-mail: _____________________________________________________________________
Web site:

14.2. Administering entity of the core area:

Name:
Street or P.O. Box: __________________________________________________________
City with postal code: __________________________________________________________
Country: ____________________________________________________________________
Telephone: __________________________________________________________________
Telefax: _____________________________________________________________________
E-mail: _____________________________________________________________________
Web site:

14.3. Administering entity of the buffer zone:

Name:
Street or P.O. Box: __________________________________________________________
City with postal code: __________________________________________________________
Country: ____________________________________________________________________
Telephone: __________________________________________________________________
Telefax (or telex): __________________________________________________________________
E-mail:
Web site:
15. ENDORSEMENTS

15.1 Signed by the local authority/authorities in charge of the management of the MAB Support/Study Site:

Full name: ______________________________________________________________
Title: __________________________________________________________________
Date:  _________________________________________________________________

Full name: ______________________________________________________________
Title: __________________________________________________________________
Date:  _________________________________________________________________

15.2 Signed as appropriate by the National (or State or Provincial) administration responsible for the management of the MAB Support/Study Site:

Full name: ______________________________________________________________
Title: __________________________________________________________________
Date:  _________________________________________________________________

Full name: ______________________________________________________________
Title: __________________________________________________________________
Date:  _________________________________________________________________

15.3 Signed on behalf of the MAB National Committee or focal point:

Full name: ______________________________________________________________
Title: __________________________________________________________________
Date:  _________________________________________________________________
**Annex to MAB Support/Study Site Nomination Form**

**MABnet Directory of Support/Study Sites**

**Biosphere Reserve Description**

---

**Administrative details**

Country:
Name of site:
Year designated: *(to be completed by MAB Secretariat)*
Administrative authorities:
Name contact:
Contact address:
**Related links** *(web sites):*

---

**Description**

General description: *(Site characteristics in 11.1; human population in 10; land management units in 17.2)*

Approximately 25 lines

---

Major ecosystem type:
Major habitats & land cover types:
Location (latitude & longitude):
Total area (ha):
Core area(s):
Buffer zone(s):
Transition area(s) *(when given)*:
Altitudinal range (metres above sea level):

---

**Research and monitoring**

Brief description:

Approximately 15 lines

---

2 To be posted on the MABnet once the nomination has been approved.
Specific variables (please fill in the table below and tick the relevant parameters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abiotic</th>
<th>Biodiversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abiotic factors</td>
<td>Afforestation/Reforestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acidic deposition/Atmospheric factors</td>
<td>Algae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>Alien and/or invasive species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air temperature</td>
<td>Amphibians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate, climatology</td>
<td>Arid and semi-arid systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contaminants</td>
<td>Autoecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>Beach/soft bottom systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion</td>
<td>Benthos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Biodiversity aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomorphology</td>
<td>Biogeography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysics</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaciology</td>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global change</td>
<td>Birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Boreal forest systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat issues</td>
<td>Breeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy metals</td>
<td>Coastal/marine systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Community studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorology</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Degraded areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/methodologies</td>
<td>Desertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrients</td>
<td>Dune systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical oceanography</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution, pollutants</td>
<td>Ecosystem assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siltation/sedimentation</td>
<td>Ecosystem functioning/structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>Ecotones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speleology</td>
<td>Endemic species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>Ethology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicology</td>
<td>Evapotranspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV radiation</td>
<td>Evolutionary studies/Palaeoecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fires/fire ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshwater systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genetic resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genetically modified organisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invertebrates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island systems/studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangrove systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean type systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microorganisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrating populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/methodologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain and highland systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and other resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural medicinal products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perturbations and resilience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pests/Diseases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytosociology/Succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plankton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polar systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population genetics/dynamics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare/Endangered species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration/Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species (re) introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species inventorying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-tropical and temperate rainforest systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate forest systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate grassland systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical dry forest systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical grassland and savannah systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical humid forest systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tundra systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volcanic/Geothermal systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
<td>Integrated monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Other production systems</td>
<td>Biogeochemical studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agroforestry</td>
<td>Carrying capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropological studies</td>
<td>Conflict analysis/resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture</td>
<td>Ecosystem approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>Education and public awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioprospecting</td>
<td>Environmental changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Geographic Information System (GIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage (home-based) industry</td>
<td>Impact and risk studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural aspects</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demography</td>
<td>Indicators of environmental quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic studies</td>
<td>Infrastructure development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically important species</td>
<td>Institutional and legal aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy production systems</td>
<td>Integrated studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnology/traditional practices/knowledge</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewood cutting</td>
<td>Land tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishery</td>
<td>Land use/Land cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Landscape inventoring/monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human health</td>
<td>Management issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human migration</td>
<td>Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Monitoring/methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators of sustainability</td>
<td>Planning and zoning measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous people's issues</td>
<td>Policy issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Remote sensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood measures</td>
<td>Rural systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and related impacts</td>
<td>Sustainable development/use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local participation</td>
<td>Transboundary issues/measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-credits</td>
<td>Urban systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>Watershed studies/monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/methodologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural hazards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-timber forest products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoralism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People-Nature relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality economies/marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Socio-economic aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders' interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAB Support/Study Sites are areas which are internationally recognized by UNESCO’s Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme for their value in demonstrating the interrelationship between people and their environment for long-term scientific research, environmental monitoring, demonstration, education and training, and conservation purposes. They reflect the commitment of States and the scientific community to use MAB Support/Study Sites for national and international collaboration to generate and share scientific knowledge on ecosystem functioning for the benefit of human well-being and for environmental integrity.

MAB Support/Study Sites are designated by the International Coordinating Council of the MAB Programme at the request of the State concerned. Individual sites remain under the sovereign jurisdiction of the State where they are situated.

The designation of MAB Support/Study Sites is exclusively reserved for those sites which had been listed in the World Network of Biosphere Reserves, but which cannot, or can no longer, fulfil the criteria for biosphere reserves as stipulated in the “Seville Strategy for Biosphere Reserves” and the “Statutory Framework of the World Network of Biosphere Reserves”, adopted under 28 C/Resolution 2.4 of the UNESCO General Conference in November 1995. For example, the designation of a MAB Support/Study Site could apply to pre-Seville type of biosphere reserves which, for different reasons, cannot contain one or more core areas, buffer zones and a transition area to accommodate the multiple functions of a post-Seville type of biosphere reserve. And yet many of these sites have great societal value and international significance for research and demonstration studies on issues related to human-environment interactions through the availability of long-term data series in a wide range of scientific topics.

At its 23rd session (Dresden/Germany, 2011), the MAB International Coordinating Council decided that every attempt should be made so that all existing biosphere reserves meet the criteria of the Seville Strategy and the Statutory Framework in line with Madrid Action Plan by the end of 2013. Only those sites that cannot meet the criteria could be moved into a separate category of MAB Support/Study Sites established within the MAB Programme and those sites would not be part of the World Network of Biosphere Reserves.

The proposed MAB Support/Study Site needs to evidence that it:

- provides scientific data/monitoring for biosphere reserves and for study themes of local, national and international interests;
- focuses on a specific theme, such as on global change including climate change, or urbanization, through networking with other similar support/study sites and biosphere reserves, particularly those in developing countries;
- studies sustainable development, and encourages cooperation with biosphere reserves.

The information presented on this nomination form will be used in a number of ways by UNESCO:

---

3 Over 42% of all pre-Seville biosphere reserves contain a core area only, but no buffer zones or transition areas, since many of these sites had been designated during the period since the launch of the MAB Programme and the Seville Conference for Biosphere Reserves held in 1995, when the main objectives of biosphere reserves focused primarily on research and protection.
(a) for examination of the site by the Advisory Committee on Biosphere Reserves and by the Bureau of the MAB International Coordinating Council;

(b) for use in a world-wide accessible information system, notably the UNESCO-MABnet, facilitating communications and interaction amongst persons interested in *MAB Support/Study Sites* throughout the world.

The form should be completed in English, French or Spanish. Two copies should be sent to the UNESCO-MAB Secretariat, as follows:

a) The original hard copy, with the original signatures, letters of endorsement, zonation map and supporting documents. This should be sent to the Secretariat through the Official UNESCO channels, i.e. via the National Commission for UNESCO and/or the Permanent Delegation to UNESCO.

b) An electronic version of the nomination form and maps (especially the zonation map). These can be sent directly to the MAB Secretariat:

UNESCO
MAB Programme
Division of Ecological and Earth Sciences
1, rue Miollis
F-75352 Paris Cedex 15, France
Tel: ++33 1 45 68 41 51
Fax: ++33 1 45 68 58 04
Email: mab@unesco.org

1. NAME OF THE CURRENTLY DESIGNATED BIOSPHERE RESERVE:

2. COUNTRY:

3. YEAR OF DESIGNATION AS A BIOSPHERE RESERVE:

4. PLANS FOR RENOMINATION OF BIOSPHERE RESERVE:
   - specify the process at the local and national level
   - provide an action plan with timeframe and milestones

5. PROPOSED NEW NAME (IF DIFFERENT FROM 1):

6. MAJOR ECOSYSTEM TYPE / BIOGEOGRAPHICAL REGION:

7. LOCATION (LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE):
   [Indicate in degrees - minutes, seconds - the coordinates of the central point AND the external limits of the proposed biosphere reserve to be used for a Geographic Information System (GIS)]

8. PROVIDE THE MAIN REASON(S) WHY THE SITE DOES NOT FULFIL THE BIOSPHERE RESERVE CRITERIA ACCORDING TO THE SEVILLE STRATEGY AND THE MADRID ACTION PLAN FOR BIOSPHERE RESERVES:
8.1 Provide the proposed solutions for the above-mentioned reasons

9. INDICATE THE MAIN FUNCTION(S) OF THE EXISTING BIOSPHERE RESERVE
[e.g. for scientific studies as a long-term ecological research site, environmental monitoring, conservation of rare or endemic species, demonstration site for environmental education and training, learning and study site for sustainable development and ecosystem services, sustainable land use, importance for international collaboration on any of these functions].

9.1 Indicate the main function(s) of the renominated biosphere reserve

10. INDICATE IN WHAT MANNER THE RENOMINATED SITE WOULD CONTRIBUTE TO THE MAB PROGRAMME
[e.g. through on-going international research agreements, monitoring of species and their habitats as control sites, demonstration site for educational and training purposes, learning sites for sustainable development]

10.1 Potential to contribute to the World Network of Biosphere Reserves
[Collaboration with biosphere reserves at a national, regional and global level in terms of exchange of scientific information, experience in conservation and sustainable use, study tours of personnel, joint seminars and workshops, Internet discussion groups, etc.]

10.2 Collaboration with existing biosphere reserves at the national, regional or international levels, including promoting transboundary sites and twinning arrangements
[Indicate on-going or planned activities. Note: Here, ‘regional’ refers to the regions as Africa, Arab region, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe and Northern America. Transboundary sites can be created by two or more contiguous countries to promote cooperation to conserve and sustainably use ecosystems which straddle the international boundaries. Twinning arrangements usually consist of agreements between sites located at some distance in different countries to promote activities such as cooperative research projects, cultural exchanges for schoolchildren and adults, etc.]

10.3 Collaboration with existing biosphere reserves in thematic networks at the regional or international levels
11. ZONATION AND HUMAN POPULATION OF THE PROPOSED SITE

11.1 Current zonation and human population when the site was designated as a biosphere reserve (in ha):

Size of core area(s): _____________ ha / human population: _______________________
Size of buffer zone(s): _____________ ha / human population: _______________________
Size of transition area: _____________ ha / human population: _______________________
Total area: ______________________ ha / total human population: __________________

11.2 Proposed new zonation, if any (in ha):

Size of core area(s): _____________  ha / human population: _______________________
Size of buffer zone(s): _____________ ha / human population: _______________________
Size of transition area: _____________ ha / human population: _______________________
Total area: ______________________ ha / total human population: __________________

11.3 Provide rationale (if any) for modified zonation:

12. MECHANISM FOR IMPLEMENTATION:

12.1 Does the renominated biosphere reserve have a research/management plan or policy for the area? [Briefly describe]

12.2 Does the renominated biosphere reserve have a designated authority or mechanism to implement this policy or plan? [Briefly describe]

12.3 In what manner have the local communities and authorities been consulted that the current biosphere reserve will no longer be designated as such, but is submitted to a renomination process to meet the criteria?
13. SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS:
[Special designations recognize the importance of particular sites in carrying out their functions such as experimental research, monitoring, conservation, and environmental education. These designations can help strengthen these functions where they exist or provide opportunities for developing them. Check each designation that applies to the proposed biosphere reserve and indicate its name]

Name:
( ) Long term ecological research site and / or monitoring site [Please specify]
( ) Educational and/or demonstration site [Please specify]
( ) UNESCO World Heritage Site
( ) Geopark
( ) RAMSAR Wetland Convention Site
( ) Other international/regional conservation conventions/directives [Please specify]
( ) Other [Please specify]

14. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (to be submitted with nomination form)
[Clear, well-labelled maps are indispensable for evaluating site proposals. The maps to be provided should be referenced to standard coordinates wherever possible. Electronic versions are encouraged]

( ) General location map
[A GENERAL LOCATION MAP of small or medium scale must be provided showing the location of the proposed study / support site, and all included administrative areas, within the country, and its position with respect to major rivers, mountain ranges, principal towns, etc.]

( ) Zonation map
[Large scale - preferably in black & white for photocopy reproduction - showing the delimitations of all core area(s), buffer zone(s) and transition areas must be provided]

( ) Thematic maps
[Related to the specific functions of the proposed renominated biosphere reserve, thematic maps should be provided, such as vegetation, geological, hydrological maps, and land use/land cover maps].

( ) List of legal documents
[List the principal LEGAL DOCUMENTS authorizing the establishment and governing use and management of the proposed renominated biosphere reserve and any administrative area(s) they contain. Please provide a copy of these documents, if possible with English or French translation].

( ) List of land use and management plans
[List existing LAND USE and MANAGEMENT PLANS (with dates and reference numbers) for the administrative area(s) included within the proposed site. Provide a copy of these documents]

( ) Species list (to be annexed)
[If conservation and monitoring of species are main functions, please provide a LIST OF IMPORTANT SPECIES (threatened species as well as economically important species) occurring within the proposed renominated biosphere reserve, including common names, wherever possible.]

( ) List of main bibliographic references (to be annexed)
[Provide a list of the main publications and articles of relevance to the proposed site over the past 5-10 years].
15. ADDRESSES

15.1 Contact address of the proposed renominated biosphere reserve:
[Government agency, organization, NGO or other entity (entities) to serve as the main contact on the MABnet to whom all MAB-related correspondence should be addressed.]

Name:
Street or P.O. Box: __________________________________________________________
City with postal code: ______________________________________________________
Country: ____________________________________________________________________
Telephone: __________________________________________________________________
Telefax: ____________________________________________________________________
E-mail: ____________________________________________________________________
Web site:

15.2. Administering entity of the core area:

Name:
Street or P.O. Box: __________________________________________________________
City with postal code: ______________________________________________________
Country: ____________________________________________________________________
Telephone: __________________________________________________________________
Telefax: ____________________________________________________________________
E-mail: ____________________________________________________________________
Web site:

15.3. Administering entity of the buffer zone:

Name:
Street or P.O. Box: __________________________________________________________
City with postal code: ______________________________________________________
Country: ____________________________________________________________________
Telephone: __________________________________________________________________
Telefax (or telex): ___________________________________________________________
E-mail: ____________________________________________________________________
Web site:
16. ENDORSEMENTS

16.1 Signed by the local authority/authorities in charge of the management of the renominated biosphere reserve:

Full name: ______________________________________________________________

Title: __________________________________________________________________

Date:  _________________________________________________________________

Full name: ______________________________________________________________

Title: __________________________________________________________________

Date:  _________________________________________________________________

16.2 Signed as appropriate by the National (or State or Provincial) administration responsible for the management of the renominated biosphere reserve:

Full name: ______________________________________________________________

Title: __________________________________________________________________

Date:  _________________________________________________________________

Full name: ______________________________________________________________

Title: __________________________________________________________________

Date:  _________________________________________________________________

16.3 Signed on behalf of the MAB National Committee or focal point:

Full name: ______________________________________________________________

Title: __________________________________________________________________

Date:  _________________________________________________________________
Annex to MAB Support/Study Site Nomination Form
MABnet Directory of Biosphere Reserves
Biosphere Reserve Description

Administrative details
Country:
Name of site:
Year designated: (to be completed by MAB Secretariat)
Administrative authorities:
Name contact:
Contact address:
Related links (web sites):

Description
General description: (Site characteristics in 11.1; human population in 10; land management units in 17.2)

Approximately 25 lines

Major ecosystem type:
Major habitats & land cover types:
Location (latitude & longitude):
Total area (ha):
Core area(s):
Buffer zone(s):
Transition area(s) (when given):
Altitudinal range (metres above sea level):

Research and monitoring
Brief description:

Approximately 15 lines

4 To be posted on the MABnet once the nomination has been approved.
Specific variables (please fill in the table below and tick the relevant parameters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abiotic</th>
<th>Biodiversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abiotic factors</td>
<td>Afforestation/Reforestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acidic deposition/Atmospheric factors</td>
<td>Algae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>Alien and/or invasive species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air temperature</td>
<td>Amphibians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate, climatology</td>
<td>Arid and semi-arid systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contaminants</td>
<td>Autoecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>Beach/soft bottom systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion</td>
<td>Benthos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Biodiversity aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomorphology</td>
<td>Biogeography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysics</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaciology</td>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global change</td>
<td>Birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Boreal forest systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat issues</td>
<td>Breeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy metals</td>
<td>Coastal/marine systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Community studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorology</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Degraded areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/methodologies</td>
<td>Desertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrients</td>
<td>Dune systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical oceanography</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution, pollutants</td>
<td>Ecosystem assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siltation/sedimentation</td>
<td>Ecosystem functioning/structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>Ecotones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speleology</td>
<td>Endemic species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>Ethology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicology</td>
<td>Evapotranspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV radiation</td>
<td>Evolutionary studies/Palaeoecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fires/fire ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshwater systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genetic resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genetically modified organisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invertebrates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island systems/studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangrove systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean type systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microorganisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrating populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/methodologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain and highland systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and other resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural medicinal products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perturbations and resilience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pests/Diseases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytosociology/Succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plankton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polar systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population genetics/dynamics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare/Endangered species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration/Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species (re) introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species inventorying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-tropical and temperate rainforest systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate forest systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate grassland systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical dry forest systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical grassland and savannah systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical humid forest systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tundra systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volcanic/Geothermal systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
<td>Integrated monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Other production systems</td>
<td>Biogeochemical studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agroforestry</td>
<td>Carrying capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropological studies</td>
<td>Conflict analysis/resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture</td>
<td>Ecosystem approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>Education and public awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioprospecting</td>
<td>Environmental changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Geographic Information System (GIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage (home-based) industry</td>
<td>Impact and risk studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural aspects</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demography</td>
<td>Indicators of environmental quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic studies</td>
<td>Infrastructure development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically important species</td>
<td>Institutional and legal aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy production systems</td>
<td>Integrated studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnology/traditional practices/knowledge</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewood cutting</td>
<td>Land tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishery</td>
<td>Land use/Land cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Landscape inventoring/monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human health</td>
<td>Management issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human migration</td>
<td>Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Monitoring/methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators of sustainability</td>
<td>Planning and zoning measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous people's issues</td>
<td>Policy issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Remote sensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood measures</td>
<td>Rural systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and related impacts</td>
<td>Sustainable development/use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local participation</td>
<td>Transboundary issues/measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-credits</td>
<td>Urban systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>Watershed studies/monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/methodologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural hazards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-timber forest products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoralism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People-Nature relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality economies/marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Socio-economic aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders' interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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