



Convention on
Biological Diversity



Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossier: POLAND

With generous support from:



DEUTSCHE ZUSAMMENARBEIT

giz Deutsche Gesellschaft
für Internationale
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH



UK Government



Global Partnership on
AICHI TARGET 11



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| GLOSSARY | 3 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 5 |
| <i>Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Elements: Current status and opportunities for action</i> | 5 |
| INTRODUCTION | 8 |
| SECTION I: CURRENT STATUS | 10 |
| <i>COVERAGE - TERRESTRIAL & MARINE</i> | 11 |
| <i>ECOLOGICAL REPRESENTATIVENESS – TERRESTRIAL & MARINE</i> | 14 |
| <i>AREAS IMPORTANT FOR BIODIVERSITY</i> | 17 |
| <i>AREAS IMPORTANT FOR ECOSYSTEM SERVICES</i> | 25 |
| <i>CONNECTIVITY & INTEGRATION</i> | 28 |
| <i>GOVERNANCE DIVERSITY</i> | 29 |
| <i>PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS</i> | 30 |
| SECTION II: EXISTING PROTECTED AREA AND OECM COMMITMENTS | 32 |
| <i>PRIORITY ACTIONS FROM 2015-2016 REGIONAL WORKSHOPS</i> | 32 |
| <i>NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLANS (NBSAPs)</i> | 33 |
| <i>OTHER ACTIONS/COMMITMENTS</i> | 33 |
| ANNEX I | 34 |
| <i>FULL LIST OF TERRESTRIAL ECOREGIONS</i> | 34 |
| REFERENCES | 35 |



GLOSSARY

| | |
|----------|--|
| AZEs | Alliance for Zero Extinction sites |
| CEPF | Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund |
| EBSA | Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Area |
| EEZ | Exclusive Economic Zone |
| GCF | Green Climate Fund |
| GD-PAME | Global Database on Protected Area Management Effectiveness |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| IBA | Important Bird and Biodiversity Area |
| ICCAs | Indigenous and Community Conserved Area Area (may also be referred to as territories and areas conserved by Indigenous peoples and local communities or “territories of life”) |
| IPLC | Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities |
| KBA | Key Biodiversity Area |
| MEOW | Marine Ecosystems of the World |
| MPA | Marine Protected Area |
| NBSAP | National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan |
| OECD | Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures |
| PA | Protected Area |
| PAME | Protected Area Management Effectiveness |
| PPA | Privately Protected Area |
| PPOW | Pelagic Provinces of the World |
| ProtConn | Protected Connected land indicator |
| SOC | Soil Organic Carbon |
| TEOW | Terrestrial Ecosystems of the World |
| WDPA | World Database on Protected Areas |
| WD-OECD | World Database on Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures |



4 | Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossier: POLAND

Disclaimer

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this dossier do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD) or United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The information contained in this publication do not necessarily represent those of the SCBD or UNDP.

This country dossier is compiled by the UNDP and SCBD from publicly available information. It is prepared, within the overall work of the Global Partnership on Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, for the purpose of attracting the attention of the Party concerned and other national stakeholders to facilitate the verification, correcting, and updating of country data. The statistics might differ from those reported officially by the country due to differences in methodologies and datasets used to assess protected area coverage and differences in the base maps used to measure terrestrial and marine area of a country or territory. Furthermore, the suggestions from the UNDP and SCBD are based on analyses of global datasets, which may not necessarily be representative of national policy or criteria used at the national level. The analyses are also subject to the limits inherent in global indicators (precision, reliability, underlying assumptions, etc.). Therefore, they provide useful information but cannot replace analyses at a national level nor constitute a future benchmark for national policy or decision-making.

The preparation of this dossier was generously supported by: the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH*; the European Commission; the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; and the Government of Japan (Japan Biodiversity Fund). The dossier does not necessarily reflect their views.

This publication may be reproduced for educational or non-commercial purposes without special permission from the copyright holders, provided acknowledgement of the source is made. The SCBD and UNDP would appreciate receiving a copy of any publications that use this document as a source.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document provides information on the coverage of protected areas (PAs) and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs), as currently reported in global databases (the World Database on Protected Areas ([WDPA](#)) and World Database on Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures ([WD-OECM](#))). It also includes details on the status of the other qualifying elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 based on this data. These statistics might differ from those reported officially by countries due to difference in methodologies and datasets used to assess protected area coverage, differences in the base maps used to measure terrestrial and marine area of a country or territory, or if global datasets differ from the criteria and indicators used at the national level. This dossier also provides a summary of commitments made under Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, and a summary of potential opportunities regarding elements of the target for future planning.

The dossier has been developed in consultation with the UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), which manages the [WDPA](#), [WD-OECM](#) and Global Database on Protected Area Management Effectiveness ([GD-PAME](#)).

Parties to the CBD are requested to contact protectedareas@unep-wcmc.org with any updates to the information in these databases.

Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Elements: Current status and opportunities for action

Coverage - Terrestrial & Marine

- **Status:** as of May 2021, terrestrial coverage in Poland is 123,339.2 km² (39.5%) and marine coverage is 7,210.9 km² (22.6%).
- **Opportunities for action:** opportunities for the near-term include updating the [WDPA](#) with any unreported PAs, and the recognizing and reporting OECMs to the [WD-OECM](#). In the future, focus on relatively intact areas, while addressing the elements in the following sections, could be considered when planning new PAs or OECMs.

Ecological Representativeness— Terrestrial & Marine

- **Status:** Poland contains 4 terrestrial ecoregions, 1 marine ecoregion, and 0 pelagic provinces (all ecoregions have at least partial coverage by reported PAs and OECMs): the mean coverage by reported PAs and OECMs is 45.5% (terrestrial) and 24.3% (marine).
- **Opportunities for action:** there is opportunity for Poland to focus on effective management for terrestrial and marine ecoregions that already have higher levels of coverage by PAs or OECMs.



6 | Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossier: POLAND

Areas Important for Biodiversity

- **Status:** Poland has 170 Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs): the mean protected coverage of KBAs by reported PAs and OECMs is 87.9%, while 5 KBAs have no coverage by reported PAs and OECMs.
- **Opportunities for action:** there is opportunity for Poland to increase protection of KBAs that have lower levels of coverage by PAs and OECMs, and to focus on effective management for KBAs that already have adequate coverage; priority could be given to those with no current coverage.

Areas Important for Ecosystem Services

- **Status:** coverage of areas important for ecosystem services: In Poland, 57.6% of aboveground biomass carbon, 56.3% of belowground biomass carbon, 44.0% of soil organic carbon, 23.1% of carbon stored in marine sediments is covered by PAs and OECMs.
- **Opportunities for action:** for carbon, there is opportunity for Poland to increase PA and OECM coverage in marine areas with high carbon stocks, and to focus on effective management for terrestrial PAs with high carbon stocks. Protecting areas with high carbon stocks secures the benefits of carbon sequestration in the area.
- For water, there is opportunity to increase the area of the water catchment under protection by PAs and OECMs, or in cases where there is high levels of protection, focus on effective management for these areas. Protecting the current area of forested land and potentially reforesting would have benefits for improving water security.

Connectivity and Integration

- **Status:** coverage of protected-connected lands is 37.5%.
- **Opportunities for action:** there is opportunity to focus on PA and OECM management for enhancing and maintaining connectivity. Improving connectivity increases the effectiveness of PAs and OECMs and reduces the impacts of fragmentation.
- As well, a range of suggested steps for enhancing and supporting integration are included in the voluntary guidance on the integration of PAs and OECMs into the wider land- and seascapes and mainstreaming across sectors to contribute, inter alia, to the SDGs (Annex I of COP Decision 14/8).

Governance Diversity

- **Status:** the most common governance type(s) for reported PAs in Poland is: 98.9% under Government (Federal or national ministry or agency).
- **Opportunities for action:** explore opportunities for governance types that have lower representation, for Poland this could relate to shared governance, etc.



7 | Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossier: POLAND

- There is also opportunity for Poland to complete governance and equity assessments, to establish baselines and identify relevant actions for improvement. As well, a range of suggested actions are included in the voluntary guidance on effective governance models for management of protected areas, including equity (Annex II of COP Decision 14/8).

Protected Area Management Effectiveness

- **Status:** 38.8% of terrestrial PAs and 99.2% of marine PAs have completed Protected Area Management Effectiveness (PAME) assessments reported.
- **Opportunities for action:** the 60% target for completed management effectiveness assessments (per COP Decision X/31) **has not** been met for terrestrial PAs and **has** been met for marine PAs. Therefore, there is opportunity to increase protected area management effectiveness (PAME) evaluations for terrestrial PAs to achieve the target.
- There is also opportunity to implement the results of completed PAME evaluations, to improve the quality of management for existing PAs and OECMs (e.g. through adaptive management and information sharing, increasing the number of sites reporting 'sound management') and to increase reporting of biodiversity outcomes in PAs and OECMs.



INTRODUCTION

The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 was adopted at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) held in Nagoya, Aichi Prefecture, Japan from 18-29 October 2010. The vision of the Strategic Plan is one of “Living in harmony with nature” where *“By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people”* (CBD, 2010). In addition to this vision, the Strategic Plan is composed of 20 targets, under five strategic goals. Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 states that *“By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.”*

With the conclusion of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in 2020, Target 11 on area-based conservation has seen success in the expansion of the global network of protected areas (PA) and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs). The negotiation of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) and its future targets provide an essential opportunity to further improve the coverage of PAs and OECMs, to improve other aspects of area-based conservation, to accelerate progress on biodiversity conservation more broadly, while also addressing climate change, and the Sustainable Development Goals. This next set of global biodiversity targets are to be adopted at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. These new targets must aim to build upon lessons learned from the last decade of progress to deliver transformative change for the benefit of nature and people, to realize the 2050 Vision for biodiversity.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity have developed the Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossiers, which provide countries with an overview of the status of Target 11 elements, opportunities for action, and a summary of commitments made by Parties over the last decade. Each dossier can support countries in assessing their progress on key elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 and identifying opportunities to prioritize new protected areas and OECMs.

This dossier provides an overview of area-based conservation in Poland. Section I of the dossier presents data on the current status of Poland’s PAs and OECMs. The data presented in Section I relates to each element of Target 11. Section I also presents the PA and OECM coverage for two critical ecosystem services: water security and carbon stocks. In addition, the dossier presents potential opportunities for action for Poland, in relation to each Target 11 element. The analyses present options for improving Poland’s area-based conservation network to achieve enhanced protection and benefits for livelihoods and climate change. Section II presents details on Poland’s existing PA and OECM commitments as a summary of existing efforts towards achieving Target 11. This gives focus not only to national policy and actions but also voluntary commitments to the UN. Furthermore, where data is

9 | Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossier: POLAND

available, this dossier provides information on potential OECMs, Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs; also, often referred to as territories and areas conserved by Indigenous peoples and local communities or “territories of life”) and Privately Protected Areas (PPAs) and the potential contribution they will have in achieving the post-2020 targets.

The information on PAs and OECMs presented here is derived from the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) and World Database on Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures (WD-OECM). These databases are joint products of UNEP and IUCN, managed by UNEP-WCMC, and can be viewed and downloaded at www.protectedplanet.net. Parties are encouraged to provide data on their PAs and OECMs to UNEP-WCMC for incorporation into the databases (see e.g., Decisions 10/31 and 14/8). The significant efforts of Parties in updating their data in the build up to the publication of the Protected Planet Report 2020 (UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2021) were greatly appreciated. UNEP-WCMC welcomes further updates, following the data standards described here (www.wcmc.io/WDPA_Manual), and these should be directed to protectedareas@unep-wcmc.org. The statistics presented in this dossier are derived from the May 2021 WDPA and WD-OECM releases, unless explicitly stated otherwise. Readers should consult www.protectedplanet.net for the latest coverage statistics (updated monthly).

Some data from the WDPA and WD-OECM are not made publicly available at the request of the data-provider. This affects some statistics, maps, and figures presented in this dossier. Statistics provided by UNEP-WCMC (terrestrial and marine coverage) are based upon the full dataset, including restricted data. All other statistics, maps, and figures are based upon the subset of the data that is publicly available.

Where data is less readily available, such as for potential OECMs, ICCAs and PPAs, data has also been compiled from published reports and scientific literature to provide greater awareness of these less commonly recorded aspects. These data are provided to highlight the need for comprehensive reporting on these areas to the WDPA and/or WD-OECM. Parties are invited to work with indigenous peoples, local communities and private actors to submit data under the governance of these actors, with their consent, to the WDPA and/or WD-OECM.

Overall, PAs and OECMs are essential instruments for biodiversity conservation and to sustain essential ecosystem services that support human well-being and sustainable development, including food, medicine, and water security, as well as climate change mitigation and adaptation and disaster risk reduction. The data in this dossier, therefore, aims to celebrate the current contributions of PAs and OECMs, whilst the gaps presented hope to encourage greater progress, not just for the benefit of biodiversity and the post-2020 GBF, but also to recognize the essential role of PAs and OECMs to the Sustainable Development Goals and for addressing the climate crisis.



SECTION I: CURRENT STATUS

Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 refers to both protected areas (PAs) and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs). This section provides the current status for all elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 where indicators with global data are available. Statistics for all elements are presented using data on both PAs and OECMs (where this data is available and reported in global databases like the WDPA and WD-OECM). It is recognized that statistics reported in the WPDA and WD-OECM might differ from those reported officially by countries due to differences in methodologies and datasets used to assess protected area coverage and differences in the base maps used to measure terrestrial and marine area of a country or territory. Details on UNEP-WCMC's methods for calculating PA and OECM coverage area available [here](#). The global indicators adopted here for presenting the status of other elements of Target 11 may also differ from those in use nationally.




COVERAGE - TERRESTRIAL & MARINE

As of May 2021, Poland has **3,091** protected areas reported in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA). 10 UNESCO-MAB Biosphere Reserves are not included in the following statistics (see details on UNWP-WCMC’s methods for calculating PA and OECM coverage [here](#)).


As of May 2021, Poland has **0** OECMs reported in the world database on OECMs (WD-OECM).

Current coverage for Poland:

- 39.5% terrestrial (3,069 protected areas, 123,339.2 km²)
- 22.6% marine (40 protected areas, 7,210.9 km²)



Terrestrial Protected Areas in Poland



Marine Protected Areas in Poland


Potential OECMs

There are currently no potential OECM examples available for Poland.

Opportunities for action

Opportunities for the near-term include updating the WDPA with any unreported PAs, and the recognizing and reporting OECMs to the WD-OECM. In the future, as Poland considers where to add new PAs and OECMs, the map below identifies areas in Poland where intact terrestrial areas are not currently protected. Focus on relatively intact areas, while addressing the elements in the following sections, could be considered when planning new PAs or OECMs.

13 | Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossier: POLAND



Intactness in Poland

To explore more on intactness visit the UN Biodiversity Lab: map.unbiodiversitylab.org.

ECOLOGICAL REPRESENTATIVENESS – TERRESTRIAL & MARINE

Ecological representativeness is assessed based on the PAs and OECMs coverage of broad-scale biogeographic units. Globally, ecoregions have been described for terrestrial areas (Dinerstein et al, 2017), marine coastal and shelf ecosystems (to a depth of 200m; Spalding et al 2007) and surface pelagic waters (Spalding et al 2012).


Poland has 4 **terrestrial** ecoregions. Out of these:

- All 4 ecoregions have at least 17% protected within the country.
- The average terrestrial coverage of ecoregions is 45.5%.


Poland has 1 **marine** ecoregion and 0 **pelagic provinces**:

- Protected area coverage of this marine ecoregion is 24.3% within the country.


A full list of terrestrial ecoregions in Poland is available in Annex I.



Terrestrial ecoregions in Poland




Terrestrial ecoregions of the World (TEOW) in Poland



Marine ecoregions and pelagic provinces

16 | Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossier: POLAND



Marine Ecoregions of the World (MEOW) in Poland

Opportunities for action

There is opportunity for Poland to focus on effective management for terrestrial and marine ecoregions that already have higher levels of coverage by PAs or OECMs.

AREAS IMPORTANT FOR BIODIVERSITY

Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs)

Protected area and OECM coverage of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) provide one proxy for assessing the conservation of areas important for biodiversity at national, regional and global scales. KBAs are sites that make significant contributions to the global persistence of biodiversity (IUCN, 2016). The KBA concept builds on four decades of efforts to identify important sites for biodiversity, including Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas, Alliance for Zero Extinction sites, and KBAs identified through Hotspot ecosystem profiles supported by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund. Incorporating these sites, the dataset of internationally significant KBAs includes Global KBAs (sites shown to meet one or more of 11 criteria in the Global Standard for the Identification of KBAs, clustered into five categories: threatened biodiversity; geographically restricted biodiversity; ecological integrity; biological processes; and irreplaceability), Regional KBAs (sites identified using pre-existing criteria and thresholds, that do not meet the Global KBA criteria based on existing information), and KBAs whose Global/Regional status is Not yet determined, but which will be assessed against the global KBA criteria within 8-12 years. Regional KBAs are often of critical international policy relevance (e.g., in EU legislation and under the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands), and many are likely to qualify as Global KBAs in future once assessed for their biodiversity importance for other taxonomic groups and ecosystems. To date, nearly 16,000 KBAs have identified globally, and information on each of these is presented in the World Database of Key Biodiversity Areas: www.keybiodiversityareas.org.

Poland has **170** Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs).


- Mean percent coverage of all KBAs by PAs and OECMs in Poland is **87.9%**.
- **74** KBAs have full (>98%) coverage by PAs and OECMs.
- **91** KBAs have partial coverage by PAs and OECMs.
- **5** KBAs have no (<2%) coverage by PAs and OECMs.

Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs)


Other important areas for biodiversity may also include Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs), which were identified following the scientific criteria adopted at COP-9 (Decision IX/20; see more at: <https://www.cbd.int/ebsa/>). Sites that meet the EBSA criteria may require enhanced conservation and management measures; this could be achieved through means including MPAs, OECMs, marine spatial planning, and impact assessment.

There is 1 EBSA with some portion of its extent within Poland's EEZ, which has >40% coverage from PAs and OECMs.






Areas Important for Biodiversity in Poland



Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs) in Poland




19 | Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossier: POLAND



Key Biodiversity Area Coverage (KBA) in Poland




20 | Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossier: POLAND




Key Biodiversity Area Coverage (KBA) in Poland

21 | Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossier: POLAND




Key Biodiversity Area Coverage (KBA) in Poland

22 | Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossier: POLAND




Key Biodiversity Area Coverage (KBA) in Poland

23 | Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossier: POLAND



Key Biodiversity Area Coverage (KBA) in Poland

24 | Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 Country Dossier: POLAND



Key Biodiversity Area Coverage (KBA) in Poland

Opportunities for action

There is opportunity for Poland to increase protection of KBAs that have lower levels of coverage by PAs and OECMs, and to focus on effective management for KBAs that already have adequate coverage; priority could be given to those with no current coverage.


AREAS IMPORTANT FOR ECOSYSTEM SERVICES

There is no single indicator identified for assessing the conservation of areas important for ecosystem services. For simplicity, two services with available global datasets are assessed here (carbon and water). In future, other critical ecosystem services could be explored.

Carbon

Data for biomass carbon comes from temporally consistent and harmonized global maps of aboveground biomass and belowground biomass carbon density (at a 300-m spatial resolution); the maps integrate land-cover specific, remotely sensed data, and land-cover specific empirical models (see Spawn et al., 2020 for details on methodology). The Global Soil Organic Carbon Map present an estimation of SOC stock from 0 to 30 cm (see FAO, 2017). Data is also presented from global maps of marine sedimentary carbon stocks, standardized to a 1-meter depth (see Sala et al., 2021, and Atwood et al., 2020).

The map below presents the total carbon stocks in Poland and the percent of carbon in protected areas. The total carbon stocks is 907.1 Tg C from aboveground biomass (AGB), with 57.6% in protected areas; 289.8 Tg C from below ground biomass (BGB), with 56.3% in protected areas; 1,751.4 Tg C from soil organic carbon (SOC), with 44.0% in protected areas; and 480.1 Tg C from marine sediment carbon, with 23.1% in protected areas.




Carbon Stocks in Poland

Water

Information on the water sources for 534 cities is available via the City Water Map (CWM) and provides details on the catchment area of the watershed that supplies these cities (see McDonald et al., 2014 for details on methodology).

Forests support stormwater management and clean water availability, especially for large urban populations. Research that has examined the role of forests for city drinking water supplies shows that of the world’s 105 largest cities, more than 30% (33 cities) rely heavily on the local protected forests, which provide ecosystem services that underpin local drinking water availability and quality (Dudley & Stolton, 2003).

Drinking water supplies for cities in Poland may similarly depend on protected forest areas within and around water catchments. The map below shows the percentage forest cover and the forest loss from 2000-2020 in the most heavily populated water catchment of Poland. Intact catchments can support more consistent water supply and improved water quality.



Water supply area for the city of Warsaw

Opportunities for action

For carbon, there is opportunity for Poland to increase PA and OECM coverage in marine areas with high carbon stocks, and to focus on effective management for terrestrial PAs with high carbon stocks, as identified in the map above. Protecting areas with high carbon stocks secures the benefits of carbon sequestration in the area.

For water, there is opportunity to increase the area of the water catchment under protection by PAs and OECMs, or in cases where there is high levels of protection, focus on effective management for these areas. Protecting the current area of forested land and potentially reforesting would have benefits for improving water security.



CONNECTIVITY & INTEGRATION

Two global indicators, the Protected Connected land indicator (ProtConn; EC-JRC, 2021; Saura et al., 2018) and the PARC-Connectedness indicator (CSIRO, 2019), have been proposed for assessing the terrestrial connectivity of PA and OECM networks. To date there is no global indicator for assessing marine connectivity, though some recent developments include proposed guidance for the treatment of connectivity in the planning and management of MPAs (see Lausche et al., 2021).

Protected Connected Land Indicator (Prot-Conn)

As of January 2021, coverage of protected-connected lands (a measure of connectivity of protected area networks, assessed using the ProtConn indicator) in Poland was 37.5%.

PARC-Connectedness Index

In 2019, as assessed using the PARC-Connectedness Index (values ranging from 0-1, indicating low to high connectivity), connectivity in Poland is 0.45. This represents no significant change since 2010.

Corridor case studies

There are no corridor case studies available for Poland (but see general details on conserving connectivity through ecological networks and corridors in Hilty et al 2020).

Opportunities for action

There is opportunity to focus on PA and OECM management for enhancing and maintaining connectivity. Improving connectivity increases the effectiveness of PAs and OECMs and reduces the impacts of fragmentation.

As well, a range of suggested steps for enhancing and supporting integration are included in the voluntary guidance on the integration of PAs and OECMs into the wider land- and seascapes and mainstreaming across sectors to contribute, inter alia, to the SDGs (Annex I of COP Decision 14/8).



GOVERNANCE DIVERSITY

There is a lack of comprehensive global data on governance quality and equity in PAs and OECMs. Here, we provide data on the diversity of governance types for reported PAs and OECMs.

As of May 2021, PAs in Poland reported in the WDPA have the following governance types:

- 98.9% are governed by **governments** (by federal or national ministry or agency)
- 0.0% are under **shared** governance
- 0.0% are under **private** governance
- 0.0% are under **IPLC** governance
 - 0.0% by Indigenous Peoples
 - 0.0% by local communities
- 1.1% **do not** report a governance type
 - (All of which are international or regional designations)

OECMs

As of May 2021, there are **0** OECMs in Poland reported in the WD-OECM, therefore there is no data available on OECM governance types.

Privately Protected Areas (PPAs)

There is currently no data available on PPAs for Poland (see Gloss et al., 2019, and Stolton et al., 2014 for details).

Territories and areas conserved by Indigenous Peoples and local communities (ICCAs)

There is currently no data available on ICCAs for Poland (see Kothari et al., 2012 and the [ICCA Registry](#) for further details).

Other Indigenous lands

There is currently no data available on lands managed and/or controlled by Indigenous Peoples in Poland (see Garnett et al 2018 for details).

Opportunities for action

Explore opportunities for governance types that have lower representation, for Poland this could relate to shared governance, etc.

There is also opportunity for Poland to complete governance and equity assessments, to establish baselines, and identify relevant actions for improvement. Examples of existing tools and methodologies include: Governance Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas (Franks & Brooker, 2018), Social Assessment of Protected Areas (Franks et al 2018), and Site-level assessment of governance and equity (IIED, 2020). As well, a range of suggested actions are included in the voluntary guidance on effective governance models for management of protected areas, including equity (Annex II of COP Decision 14/8).

PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS

This section provides information on the coverage of PAs and OECMs with completed protected area management effectiveness (PAME) assessments as reported in the global database (GD-PAME). The proportion of terrestrial and marine PAs with completed PAME assessments is also calculated and compared with the 60% target agreed to in COP-10 Decision X/31. Information is also included regarding changes in forest cover nationally within PAs and OECMs.

Protected area management effectiveness (PAME) assessments

As of May 2021, Poland has 3,090 PAs reported in the WDPA; of these PAs, 143 (4.6%) have management effectiveness evaluations reported in the global database on protected area management effectiveness (GD-PAME).

- 15.4% (47,923 km²) of the terrestrial area of the country is covered by PAs with completed management effectiveness evaluations.
 - 38.8% of the area of terrestrial PAs have completed evaluations.
- 22.4% (7,155 km²) of the marine area of the country is covered by PAs with completed management effectiveness evaluations.
 - 99.2% of the area of marine PAs have completed evaluations.


The 60% target for completed management effectiveness assessments (per COP Decision X/31) **has not** been met for terrestrial PAs and **has** been met for marine PAs.

As of May 2021, there are 0 OECMs in Poland reported in the WD-OECM and no information available on the management effectiveness of potential OECMs.

Changes in forest cover in protected areas and OECMs

Forested areas in Poland cover approximately 25.2% of the country, an area of 78,781.8 km². Approximately 61.0% (48,071.9 km²) of this is within the protected area estate of Poland. Over the period 2000-2020 loss of forest cover amounted to over 9,946.2 km², or 3.2% of the country (12.6% of forest area), of which 6,027.0 km² (60.6% of forest loss) occurred within protected areas. The map below shows how forest cover has changed in Poland from 2000-2020 both inside and outside of PAs. This can indicate how effective PAs are in reducing forest cover loss.





Forest Cover and Forest Loss in Poland

Opportunities for action

The 60% target for completed management effectiveness assessments (per COP Decision X/31) **has not** been met for terrestrial PAs and **has** been met for marine PAs. Therefore, there is opportunity to increase protected area management effectiveness (PAME) evaluations for terrestrial PAs to achieve the target.

There is also opportunity to implement the results of completed PAME evaluations, to improve the quality of management for existing PAs and OECMs (e.g. through adaptive management and information sharing, increasing the number of sites reporting 'sound management') and to increase reporting of biodiversity outcomes in PAs and OECMs.

SECTION II: EXISTING PROTECTED AREA AND OECM COMMITMENTS

PRIORITY ACTIONS FROM 2015-2016 REGIONAL WORKSHOPS

National priority actions for Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 were provided by Parties following a series of regional workshops in 2015 and 2016. The Capacity-building workshop for Central and Eastern Europe on achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 took place 14 - 17 June 2016 in Minsk, Belarus. Progress towards the quantitative targets for marine and terrestrial coverage has been assessed based on data reported in the WDPA and WD-OECM as of 2021. For more information, see the workshop report at: <https://www.cbd.int/meetings/>

The following actions were identified during the workshops:

Ecological representation:

- 1) Ecological evaluation of all nature reserves (database)
- 2) Educational efforts and negotiations with local communities in at least one region.

Connectivity: Analysis of 240 green corridors effectiveness, “hot-spots” identification and preparation of the “road map” for subsequent actions.

Management effectiveness:

- 1) Establishing 370 plans for Natura 2000 sites
- 2) Establishing 200 plans for nature reserves
- 3) Finance the field study and monitoring of Nature 2000 sites according to existing management plans assumptions.

No actions were identified for the following elements of Target 11: Terrestrial and Marine coverage, Areas Important for biodiversity and ecosystem services, Governance and Equity, Integration into the wider landscape and seascape



NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLANS (NBSAPs)

Poland has submitted an NBSAP during the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (most recent NBSAP is available at: <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/search/>).

Objective B1 (Improvement of the network of the protected areas to increase effectiveness of biological diversity protection.),

Task 12: Establishment of new and expansion of existing national parks along with development and implementation the concept of system of compensations for losses related to the introduction of limitations

OTHER ACTIONS/COMMITMENTS

Poland's statement at the 2020 UN Biodiversity Summit mentions PAs, OECMs or corridors:

Despite using natural resources intensively, their wealth has been preserved and multiplied. The network of protected areas in Poland, including 23 National Parks, nature reserves and Natura 2000 areas covers around 40% of our country.



ANNEX I

FULL LIST OF TERRESTRIAL ECOREGIONS

| Ecoregion Name | Area (km ²) | % of Global Ecoregion in Country | % of Country in Ecoregion | Area Protected (km ²) | % Protected in Country |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Baltic mixed forests | 44,055.7 | 38.5 | 14.1 | 18,808.1 | 42.7 |
| Carpathian montane forests | 19,295.3 | 15.4 | 6.2 | 12,726.3 | 66.0 |
| Central European mixed forests | 241,465.9 | 32.9 | 77.4 | 89,428.4 | 37.0 |
| Western European broadleaf forests | 7,442.6 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 2,704.0 | 36.3 |



REFERENCES

- Atwood, TB, Witt, A, Mayorga, J, Hammill, E, & Sala, E. (2020). Global patterns in marine sediment carbon stocks. *Frontiers in Marine Science*.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.00165>
- BirdLife International (2021). World Database of Key Biodiversity Areas. Available at:
<http://www.keybiodiversityareas.org>
- CBD (2010). Decision adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its tenth meeting. Decision X/2. Strategic plan for biodiversity 2011–2020. Retrieved from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-10/cop-10-dec02-en.pdf>.
- CSIRO (2019). Protected area connectedness index (PARCconnectedness).
<https://www.bipindicators.net/indicators/protected-area-connectedness-index-parconnectedness>
- Dinerstein, E., et al. (2017). An ecoregion-based approach to protecting half the terrestrial realm. *BioScience* 67(6), 534-545.
- Donald et al., 2019, The prevalence, characteristics and effectiveness of Aichi Target 11's "other effective area-based conservation measures" (OECMs) in Key Biodiversity Areas. *Conservation Letters*, 12(5).
- EC-JRC (2021). DOPA Indicator factsheets: <http://dopa.jrc.ec.europa.eu/en/factsheets>
- FAO (2017). Global Soil Organic Carbon (GSOC) Map - Global Soil Partnership [WWW Document]. URL <http://www.fao.org/global-soil-partnership/pillars-action/4-information-and-data/global-soil-organic-carbon-gsoc-map/en/>.
- Franks, P and Booker, F (2018). Governance Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas (GAPA): Early experience of a multi-stakeholder methodology for enhancing equity and effectiveness. IIED Working Paper, IIED, London. <https://pubs.iied.org/17632IIED>
- Franks, P. et al. (2018). Social Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas (SAPA). Methodology manual for SAPA facilitators. Second edition. IIED, London.
<https://pubs.iied.org/14659iied>
- Garnett et al. (2018). A spatial overview of the global importance of Indigenous lands for conservation. *Nature Sustainability*, 1(7), 369.
- Global Environment Facility (GEF-5 and GEF-6); all projects can be found online at:
<https://www.thegef.org/projects>
- Gloss, L. et al. (2019). International Outlook for Privately Protected Areas: Summary Report. International Land Conservation Network (a project of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy) and United Nations Development Programme. Summary report, and individual country profiles, available at: <https://nbsapforum.net/knowledge-base/resource/international-outlook-privately-protected-areas-summary-report>

Hansen, M.C., Potapov, P.V., Moore, R., Hancher, M., Turubanova, S.A., Tyukavina, A., Thau, D., Stehman, S.V., Goetz, S.J., Loveland, T.R., Kommareddy, A., Egorov, A., Chini, L., Justice, C.O., Townshend, J.R.G., (2013). High-Resolution Global Maps of 21st-Century Forest Cover Change. *Science* 342, 850–853. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1244693>

Hilty, J et al. (2020). Guidelines for conserving connectivity through ecological networks and corridors. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 30. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. <https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/PAG-030-En.pdf>

IIED 2020. Site-level assessment of governance and equity (SAGE) <https://www.iied.org/site-level-assessment-governance-equity-sage>.

IUCN (2016). A Global Standard for the Identification of Key Biodiversity Areas, Version 1.0. First edition. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. <https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/2016-048.pdf>

IUCN-WCPA (2017). IUCN-WCPA Task Force on OECMs collation of case studies submitted 2016-2017. <https://www.iucn.org/commissions/world-commission-protected-areas/our-work/oecms/oecm-reports>

Joint Research Centre of the European Commission (JRC) (2021), The Digital Observatory for Protected Areas (DOPA) Explorer 4.1 [On-line], [Apr/2021], Ispra, Italy. Available at: <http://dopa-explorer.jrc.ec.europa.eu>

Kothari, A., et al. (Eds) (2012). Recognising and Supporting Territories and Areas Conserved By Indigenous Peoples And Local Communities: Global Overview and National Case Studies. Secretariat of the CBD, ICCA Consortium, Kalpavriksh, and Natural Justice, Montreal, Canada. Technical Series no. 64.

Lausche, B., Laur, A., Collins, M. (2021). *Marine Connectivity Conservation 'Rules of Thumb' for MPA and MPA Network Design*. Version 1.0. IUCN WCPA Connectivity Conservation Specialist Group's Marine Connectivity Working Group.

McDonald, R.I., Weber, K., Padowski, J., Flörke, M., Schneider, C., Green, P.A., Gleeson, T., Eckman, S., Lehner, B., Balk, D., Boucher, T., Grill, G., Montgomery, M., (2014). Water on an urban planet: Urbanization and the reach of urban water infrastructure. *Global Environmental Change* 27, 96–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.022>

National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAPs); most recent NBSAP is available at: <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/search/>

Newbold, T., Hudson, L.N., Arnell, A.P., Contu, S., Palma, A.D., Ferrier, S., Hill, S.L.L., Hoskins, A.J., Lysenko, I., Phillips, H.R.P., Burton, V.J., Chng, C.W.T., Emerson, S., Gao, D., Pask-Hale, G., Hutton, J., Jung, M., Sanchez-Ortiz, K., Simmons, B.I., Whitmee, S., Zhang, H., Scharlemann, J.P.W., Purvis, A., (2016). Has land use pushed terrestrial biodiversity beyond the planetary boundary? A global assessment. *Science* 353, 288–291. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf2201>

Sala, E. et al. (2021). Protecting the global ocean for biodiversity, food and climate. *Nature*, 592(7854), 397-402. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03496-1>

Saura, S. et al. (2018). Protected area connectivity: Shortfalls in global targets and country-level priorities. *Biological Conservation*, 219, 53-67.

Saura, S. et al (2017). Protected areas in the world's ecoregions: How well connected are they? *Ecological Indicators*, 76, 144-158.

Spalding, M.D., et al. (2012). Pelagic provinces of the world: a biogeographic classification of the world's surface pelagic waters. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 60, 19–30.

Spalding, M.D., et al. (2007). Marine ecoregions of the world: a bioregionalization of coastal and shelf areas. *BioScience* 57(7): 573–583.

Spawn, S.A., Sullivan, C.C., Lark, T.J., Gibbs, H.K., (2020). Harmonized global maps of above and belowground biomass carbon density in the year 2010. *Scientific Data* 7, 112. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-0444-4>

Stolton, S. et al. (2014). *The Futures of Privately Protected Areas*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

UNEP-WCMC and IUCN (2021) *Protected Planet Report 2020*. UNEP-WCMC and IUCN: Cambridge UK; Gland, Switzerland.

UNEP-WCMC and IUCN (2021), *Protected Planet: The Global Database on Protected Area Management Effectiveness (GD-PAME)* [On-line], [May/2021], Cambridge, UK: UNEP-WCMC and IUCN. Available at: www.protectedplanet.net.

UNEP-WCMC and IUCN (2021), *Protected Planet: The World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA)* [On-line], [May/2021], Cambridge, UK: UNEP-WCMC and IUCN. Available at: www.protectedplanet.net.

UNEP-WCMC and IUCN (2021), *Protected Planet: The World Database on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (WD-OECM)* [On-line], [May/2021], Cambridge, UK: UNEP-WCMC and IUCN. Available at: www.protectedplanet.net.

UN Ocean Conference Voluntary Commitments, available at: <https://oceanconference.un.org/commitments/>

Williams, B.A., Venter, O., Allan, J.R., Atkinson, S.C., Rehbein, J.A., Ward, M., Marco, M.D., Grantham, H.S., Ervin, J., Goetz, S.J., Hansen, A.J., Jantz, P., Pillay, R., Rodríguez-Buriticá, S., Supples, C., Virnig, A.L.S., Watson, J.E.M., (2020). Change in Terrestrial Human Footprint Drives Continued Loss of Intact Ecosystems. *One Earth* 3, 371–382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.08.009>

This document was created using the knitr package with R version 4.0.5.

For any questions please contact support@unbiodiveristylab.org.

