

### 3 Accepting new jurisdictions to the IUCN Green List Programme

The following process is how the Management Committee shall accept new jurisdictions into the IUCN Green List Programme, facilitated by the Operations Team.

#### Enabling conditions

New jurisdictions committing to engage in the Green List Programme should meet the following four enabling conditions:

- 1. Commitment from sites (or organisations managing sites) to the Green List Programme:** Participation in the Green List Programme is voluntary and requires commitment to implementing the IUCN Green List Standard by the PA Manager and relevant authorities, agencies or organisations involved with managing or supporting management of PAs. The commitment has to be expressed in writing to an IUCN Green List Operations Team member or Secretariat Staff (via [greenlist@iucn.org](mailto:greenlist@iucn.org)), or WCPA Regional Vice Chair (see <https://www.iucn.org/commissions/world-commission-protected-areas/regions>), or to an IUCN Green List partner organisation.
- 2. Commitment to financial and/or in-kind support from at least one organisation:** Launching the Green List Programme in a new jurisdiction involves coordination costs to form and facilitate the EAGL: staff time costs to form and coordinate the EAGL, and logistical costs for at least 1 meeting of 2 to 3 days for EAGL training, and 1 evaluation meeting of the EAGL – 2 meetings per year; and, 5-10 days for a professional reviewer (assigned by ASI): an estimate to cover both (not including staff time) is USD 10,000 per year. Coordination costs are typically optimised by identifying ‘Implementing Partners’ in the country that are already working on PA management effectiveness and equitable governance. Financial support for the actions that PAs will need to undertake to reach the Green List Standard may be needed but is not expected to be available from the onset – being part of the Green List process could unlock or leverage funding subsequently.
- 3. Diversity and reliability of local experts to form EAGLs** (see section 5.7 in this document for more detail on EAGL formation): The independent evaluation against the Green List Standard of committed sites in a jurisdiction is conducted by the EAGL. The EAGL is formed through a transparent selection process coordinated by the Implementing Partner as well as WCPA, identifying local, regional, national experts from a diversity of backgrounds, sectors and experiences relevant to PA management and/or governance. Countries getting involved in setting up a Green List process should generally indicate an available pool of appropriately educated and trained candidates to form a new EAGL in the jurisdiction, e.g. through WCPA members in the country / region, or membership numbers of other relevant networks, or

identifying organisations with extensive networks of relevant contacts. In some cases, such as very small countries in regions with common regional context or shared sustainability challenges (e.g. Small Island Developing States), it could be considered to establish a “regional EAGL” (i.e. an EAGL working across various regions or countries) or consider adapting and using a neighbouring country EAGL at first (where they exist and are active), in order to meet this enabling condition.

- 4. Consultation with the relevant IUCN Secretariat Regional Director and/or IUCN WCPA Regional Vice Chair:** Before a new jurisdiction joins the Green List Programme, consultation with the relevant IUCN Secretariat Regional Director<sup>1</sup> and/or the relevant WCPA Regional Vice Chair<sup>2</sup> (ideally both, but at least one) shall be sought.

Finally, consideration should be given to political stability. Political stability can be an important enabling condition as it indicates the likelihood for the country to engage in a long term process of continuous improvement of PA management and governance towards an ambitious and globally consistent benchmark Standard. Implementation of the Green List standard for a site, at a minimum could take between 6 months to 1 year, while for sites facing challenges it could take several years. The higher the political stability, the greater the likelihood of government ministries or PA agencies living up to long term Green List commitments. Political stability can be measured through the World Bank’s political stability index that reports aggregate and individual indicators for over 200 countries for six dimensions of governance: Voice and Accountability; Political Stability and Absence of Violence; Government Effectiveness; Regulatory Quality; Rule of Law; and, Control of Corruption.

However, political stability is not a requirement, given that the Green List programme will require significant local area-based governance improvements through compliance with the Standard, even in jurisdictions that may be considered to be politically unstable. Therefore, it should not be a barrier to entry to the Green List programme.

A ‘New Jurisdiction Entry Checklist’, for which a template is available on COMPASS, or an email briefly describing how the 4 enabling conditions listed above are met, shall be submitted by a relevant member of the Operations Team to [greenlist@iucn.org](mailto:greenlist@iucn.org)

### 3.1 Multi-Site Applications to the IUCN Green List Programme

These are the requirements for **joint or multi-site applications (MSAs)** to the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas. MSAs are where one application includes two or more protected or conserved areas.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.iucn.org/regions>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.iucn.org/commissions/world-commission-protected-areas/regions>

## Criteria for IUCN Green List Multi-Site Applications

Each site in an MSA must:

1. Meet the IUCN definition of a [protected area](#)<sup>3</sup>, or the definition of a conserved area<sup>4</sup>
2. Be connected ecologically to other sites in the MSA, have key shared values, and have common, coordinated or harmonised governance and management arrangements;
3. Be able to demonstrate how it meets all IUCN Green List criteria and indicators for the duration of the listing (if any sites are not meeting the IUCN Green List Standard at the time of renewal, the network would revert back to Candidate status until all sites are demonstrating compliance); and
4. Demonstrate how the protection and management of all sites contributes to achieving broader conservation values as an ecological network.

Sites that meet the criteria above can be assessed together in a single MSA to the IUCN Green List. The most common cases will be the following:

- Sites that are adjacent, and where the successful conservation of key values (outcomes) of each site are co-dependent (i.e. a site cannot deliver its conservation objectives without effective management of another site); and/or
- Sites that are adjacent and are managed by the same or collaborating agencies for related or complementary values and outcomes; and/or
- Sites that are not adjacent, yet the outcomes of the sites, in relation to the IUCN Green List Standard, are co-dependent and being actively managed under clearly coordinated and harmonized governance arrangements (especially Marine Protected Area designations and networks, fly ways, river and other freshwater systems); and/or
- Transboundary sites with joint designations (e.g. a transboundary World Heritage Site, or a transboundary Biosphere Reserve or Ramsar site), when there is a joint management plan or explicit harmonization of management across the international boundary.

Sites that cannot be considered as an MSA for the IUCN Green List include:

---

<sup>3</sup> Dudley, N. (ed.) 2008. Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

<sup>4</sup> CBD/COP/DEC/14/8

- Sites with separate governance and management; and/or sites where key values are not shared, are separate ecologically, and therefore have conservation outcomes that are not co-dependant;
- Transboundary sites that are simply adjacent across an international boundary without common management and governance, and with limited interdependence of key values;
- Entire national/regional networks of protected areas that may be managed by one agency but are not ecologically connected, e.g. National/Provincial Park systems, national/regional collections of MPAs under one marine authority.

In some cases, areas proposed for Green List candidacy may include overlapping designations of protected or conserved areas. Often these may fall under one management unit, in part or in whole. In such cases, the proponent site must clarify the designation(s) that are included in the nomination. The EAGL may judge that further adjacent or overlapping designations should be included within the site's nomination, especially where Green List criteria (i.e. related sound design and planning, and conservation outcomes) require integration of governance and decision-making, and especially to aid ecological integrity within the landscape. These may or may not qualify as 'multi-sites', depending on the governance and ecological context. In all cases, for any further guidance, please contact [greenlist@iucn.org](mailto:greenlist@iucn.org)

### **Examples where Multi-Site Applications could be used**

1. Successful conservation of an estuarine habitat in an urban wetland protected area may depend on collaboration with an upstream watershed forest protected area. In this case, each site could choose independent application, or an MSA could be made for the estuarine protected area and the upstream watershed protected area together. The advantage of an MSA would be that the criteria related to the identification of key values and their effective and equitable conservation would be more likely to be demonstrated.
2. Two or more sites that conserve key life stages for a species, such as ungulates or birds, that together protect the full life cycle of the species, such as separate spawning or calving areas, in conjunction with other sites critical for breeding or overwintering.
3. A set of marine protected areas (MPA) specifically designed as an ecological network that includes multiple, ecologically connected sites designed according to the IUCN MPA network criteria (2008)<sup>5</sup> to achieve: Protection of ecologically and biologically significant areas; Representation of key habitats and features; Connectivity between habitats and populations and life history stages; Replication of

---

<sup>5</sup> Laffoley, D. d'A. (ed.) 2008. Towards Networks of Marine Protected Areas. The MPA Plan of Action for IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas. IUCN WCPA, Gland, Switzerland.

ecological features; Adequate and viable sites; as well as resilience to climate change.

### **Considerations for Multi-Site Applications**

The IUCN Green List is voluntary, focussed on improving **site-level** performance in the conservation of key values (natural values with associated ecosystem services and cultural values) at participating sites. Single-site applications will continue to be the foundation of the IUCN Green List, which was designed as a site-based tool.

In conserving key values, the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas Standard (v1.1) encourages collaboration between adjacent management authorities and governance bodies as part of the 'Good Governance' component criteria. In addition, the IUCN Green List Standard clearly requires evidence of **integration of the site into its surrounding landscape** – in ecological terms as well as in the socio-economic and governance context. Finally, the IUCN Green List Standard requires demonstration of conservation outcomes for identified key values, noting that those outcomes may often be dependent on **connectivity to adjacent ecosystems and habitats**, or other **external 'upstream' factors**. Therefore, a multi-site application could realise conservation success of key natural values, as well as encourage / demonstrate 'good governance' criteria.