

UHI Research Database pdf download summary

Introducing UNESCO Biosphere Reserves

reed, maureen; Price, Martin Francis

Published in:
UNESCO Biosphere Reserves

Publication date:
2019

The Document Version you have downloaded here is:
Peer reviewed version

[Link to author version on UHI Research Database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
reed, M., & Price, M. F. (2019). Introducing UNESCO Biosphere Reserves. In M. reed, & M. price (Eds.), *UNESCO Biosphere Reserves: Supporting Biocultural Diversity, Sustainability, and Society* Routledge.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UHI Research Database are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights:

- 1) Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the UHI Research Database for the purpose of private study or research.
- 2) You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- 3) You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the UHI Research Database

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at RO@uhi.ac.uk providing details; we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Introducing UNESCO Biosphere Reserves

Maureen G. Reed and Martin F. Price

- A world network of 686 sites across 122 countries (UNESCO 2019)
- Living laboratories for sustainable development (Starger 2019)
- Learning sites for sustainable development (Schultz et al. 2018)
- Model regions for sustainability transitions (Kratzer 2018)
- Vehicles for “operationalizing and mainstreaming sustainability science” (UNESCO 2015)

These are a few of the multiple ways that biosphere reserves (BRs) designated by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) have been described by academics, practitioners, and governing authorities. And yet, surprisingly, despite being part of an active, longstanding and growing global network of sites for research and action dedicated to biological and cultural conservation, and sustainable development (from 24 sites in 1974 to 686 sites in early 2019), BRs are still relatively unknown or misunderstood. It is 35 years since the publication of the last books which featured the life and work of BRs internationally (di Castri et al. 1984a; 1984b). Since then, a few UNESCO reports document the purpose of BRs and provide some case studies (e.g., UNESCO 2000; Garnier 2008); while some popular books have been published about BRs at a national level (e.g., Anon, 2006; German MAB National

committee 2005; Moreira-Muñoz and Borsdorf 2014; Reed et al. 2016). Hence, there is much scope to learn from an international network that provides platforms for interdisciplinary, longitudinal, and comparative research to better understand human-environment relations at multiple scales (Liu et al. 2007; Schultz et al. 2011).

<Insert Figure 1.1 about here>

Figure 1.1 World Network of Biosphere Reserves

Additionally, while sustainability scientists claim to have a strong focus on “transdisciplinarity” (e.g., Lang et al. 2012; Steelman et al. 2018) – where research questions and research strategies are developed in collaboration with communities outside of academia – these scientists give most attention to large modeling exercises or individual case studies (Rokaya et al. 2018). There has been no effort by sustainability scientists to establish a global network of research platforms from which lessons can be learned, although there have been some initiatives for specific types of environment, such as mountains (e.g., <https://mountainsentinel.org/mountain-research/>). These gaps suggest that there is much to be gained from documenting the successes and challenges within the World Network of BRs (WNBR). Such documentation can explain how practical lessons learned about conservation and sustainability can be shared and taken up across sites and scales, and may raise key questions about how best to translate sustainability science concepts into actions on the ground. To date, no compilation offers a global perspective through a common conceptual lens or an international platform of practice.

BRs share a set of common objectives: to be ‘sites of excellence’ that support biodiversity conservation, sustainable development, and capacity building for research, education, and learning at regional scales. They are designated by UNESCO in geographic regions of global social-ecological significance. Local organizations in each region offer opportunities to “translate” high-level goals and multi-lateral environmental agreements (e.g., United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Convention on Biological Diversity, and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) into concrete strategies for application. BRs represent the most longstanding, organized, international and intergovernmental network to support the aims of sustainability science, pursuing these aims using different approaches to implementation. It is important to underline that, unlike the worldwide collections of sites designated under the Ramsar and World Heritage Conventions, BRs are designated under ‘soft’ legislation and are explicitly considered as a global network of sites (the WNBR). This global network is further organized by themes (e.g., mountains, tropical forests) and by global regions. However, the concept, and implementation, of BRs has not always been well understood by scientists, governments, or even local residents where BRs have been established.

Objectives and Structure of the Book

Hence, this book has three objectives. First, to document the evolution of BRs in countries in different parts of the world, demonstrating the great variety in how conservation, sustainable development, and scientific research and capacity building have been interpreted “on the ground” as the concept of BRs has itself evolved. Second, to shed light on how UNESCO’s Man and Biosphere (MAB) Programme and its key tool for implementation – the WNBR – have sought to make operational the foundational concepts of sustainability science. Third, to describe key themes related to sustainability science (e.g., transdisciplinarity, governance, learning) and provide lessons from BR practices that describe opportunities for, and barriers to translating sustainability science into sustainability in practice.

To meet these objectives, we have structured the book in three parts:

1. Conceptual and Practical Foundations of the MAB Programme;
2. Translation and Transitions: The Changing Practices of Biosphere Reserves; and
3. Lessons for Sustainability Science and Sustainability in Practice.

In Part 1, two chapters set the stage for the examples that follow. Maureen Reed examines the antecedents of BRs and explains how they informed the ‘first generation’ of BRs, those designated between 1974 and 1995. Meriem Bouamrane, Peter Dogse, and Martin Price pick up the story, describing on-going efforts to strengthen the global network and to ensure that BRs

become strategic players in addressing pressing global issues – biodiversity loss, climate change, and sustainable development.

In Part 2, 15 short chapters articulate the experiences of implementation in countries across the WNBR. These chapters highlight how transitions in the global programme were interpreted and implemented in their national contexts. Contributors to this section include academics and practitioners, addressing questions such as: Within your national context, how has the understanding of BRs and their application changed over time?; How have BRs in your country connected with international MAB priorities, global action plans for BRs, and other BRs in the global network?; and What challenges continue to face BRs in your country as they seek to fulfil UNESCO criteria?

UNESCO divides the world into five regions: Latin America and the Caribbean; Europe and North America; Arab States; Africa; and Asia and the Pacific. This section includes at least two chapters from each region, with more emphasis placed in regions where there are more BRs. Among the contributions are chapters that describe experiences where BRs have been established since the 1970s (e.g., Ding and Qunli – China; Guevara Sada – Mexico; Mathevet and Cibien – France; Shaw et al. – Canada; Tesitel and Kusova – Czech Republic) and where they were established more recently (e.g., Chu et al. – Viet Nam; Matar and Anthony – Lebanon; Gole et al. – Ethiopia; Pool-Stanvliet and Coetzer – South Africa). In some cases, countries with

a longstanding involvement in the MAB Programme have reconfigured their national network as the requirements of the programme became refined (e.g., Price – UK; Bridgewater – Australia). Experiences documented in the national chapters demonstrate diverse strategies by which individual countries have contributed to an evolving global concept and tailored the concept according to the realities of their national contexts. Many chapters are co-authored by academic researchers and BR practitioners, providing both conceptual and practical insights into the application of the MAB Programme around the world.

To present this diversity, we circumnavigate the globe, beginning with BRs from Latin America and the Caribbean region where some of the first biosphere reserves were established. Sergio Guevara Sada from Mexico explains how governments, communities, scientists and non-governmental organizations have worked together to support biological and cultural diversity and the wellbeing of local people. Next, Andrés Moreira-Muñoz, Francisca Carvajal, Sergio Elórtégui and Ricardo Rozzi describe the challenges to create a national network of BRs in Chile, indicating that, if strong partnerships can be forged with government and non-governmental organizations, the ideals for BRs set out by UNESCO may come closer to reality.

Moving north, and into the Europe and North America region, we turn to experiences in Canada where Pamela Shaw, Monica Shore, Eleanor Haine-Bennett and Maureen Reed describe the history of local and governmental initiatives in relation to BRs. In particular, they highlight

Canada's recent efforts to meaningfully include Indigenous peoples in the governance of the program and in initiatives undertaken at the local level. Martin Price then explains how the United Kingdom's BRs evolved, pointing out that the transition from "first generation" to "second generation" expectations for BRs provided an opportunity for serious reflection, withdrawal, and reconfiguration of BRs in the UK. As we move across Europe, we learn from Tomas Kjellqvist, Romina Rodela and Kari Lehtilä how different forms of knowledge have been used to justify the creation of new BRs in Sweden. From France, Raphaël Mathevet and Catherine Cibien write from the perspective of a country where national and local public authorities have had a strong role to play in establishing and implementing BRs. They trace this history, suggesting that more work can be done by using a participatory approach that brings together public action and local collective actions. The situation is different in the Czech Republic, where Jan Tesitel and Drahomira Kusova explain how different governance models emerged over different time periods, posing challenges as BRs compete in a multi-jurisdictional landscape of competing designations.

Moving to the Arab States, Diane Matar and Brandon Anthony describe the challenges and contributions of BRs in war-torn Lebanon, emphasizing the importance of establishing partnerships beyond the Arab states and reviving traditional land management practices. From Egypt, we learn from Boshra Salem and Caroline King the value of transdisciplinary research, as they explain how scientific research has been combined with participatory planning to advance the aims of BRs in Egypt. From the vantage point of Ethiopia, Tadesse Woldemariam Gole,

Svane Bender, Rolf D. Sprung, Solomon Kebede, Teowdroes Kassahun, Alemayehu Negussie, Kerya Yasin, Motuma Tafa, and Hailu Merga explain the value of external donors and agencies for BRs located in a country without large means. Despite having very high conservation values, the external support of NGOs and development partners is still required because BRs are not part of the structure of government institutions. From South Africa, Ruida Pool-Stanvliet and Kaera Coetzer-Hanack tell us how BRs have been introduced in the last 20 years. Although there is strong national support for the MAB Programme, they describe uneven implementation across BRs. Yet, despite the limitations, BRs continue to support sustainable land management in South Africa.

Turning to Asia and the Pacific, we learn from Japan, Viet Nam and China. Hiroyuki Matsuda, Shinsuke Nakamura, and Tetsu Sato write about the ebb and flow of the MAB Programme in Japan and describe the conditions that helped revitalize its BRs in the past decade. From Viet Nam, Van Cuong Chu, Peter Dart, Nguyen Manh Ha, Vo Thi Minh Le, and Marc Hockings explain the challenges in introducing BRs in a country where top-down state management of protected areas has limited opportunities for cross-sectoral and local participation. China's contribution to the WNBR has been longstanding. As described by Wang Ding and Han Qunli, China has been part of the MAB Programme since 1978, and one of its BRs was recognized by UNESCO in 2016 for its contributions to conservation and working with local communities for sustainable development. The last contribution in this section, by Peter Bridgewater, describes the Australian experience in

four stages. As in the UK, new requirements introduced by the Statutory Framework in 1995 were viewed as an opportunity for renewal, resulting in withdrawals, reconfigurations and new BRs.

In Part 3, six chapters focus on thematic lessons from practices in BRs for understanding the challenges and opportunities associated with sustainability science. Sustainability science has coalesced as a distinct field of inter- and transdisciplinary scholarship since the early 2000s (Kates 2011; Betancur and Kaur 2011). Indeed, the MAB Strategy 2015-25 sets out facilitation of sustainability science as a key element of one of its four strategic objectives. Defining sustainability science as “an integrated, problem-solving approach that draws on the full range of scientific, traditional and [I]ndigenous knowledge in a transdisciplinary way to identify, understand and address present and future economic, environmental, ethical and societal challenges related to sustainable development”, the Strategy declares that “BRs, particularly through their coordinators, managers and scientists, have key roles to play in operationalizing and mainstreaming sustainability science” (UNESCO 2017: 19).

Contributors to Part 3 reflect themes arising from this definition. Knowledge co-production and respectful ‘integration’ from different cultural traditions is a key feature of these reflections.

Marc Hockings and Ian Lilley, Diane Matar, Nigel Dudley, and Rob Markham consider processes of knowledge co-creation and cultural respect, describing strategies used in BRs to bring western scientific knowledge and local and Indigenous knowledge together to advance

sustainability objectives in Lebanon, Croatia, Viet Nam, and Australia. Eduard Müller and Tania Moreno turn to similar issues from the experiences of their work in Latin America. They encourage us to think beyond “sustainable development” and to consider how BRs might support regenerative development in regions where ecological and cultural integrity have been challenging to maintain. Miren Onaindia, Cristina Herero, Alberto Hernández, José Vicente de Lucio, Antonio Pou, Juana Barber, Tomás Rueda, Bernardo Varela, Benedicta Rodríguez, and Aquilino Miguélez discuss how similar processes of knowledge co-creation have been established with local communities across Spanish BRs. The transfer of knowledge into action is explained in relation to diverse BRs in the Mediterranean Basin by Mario Torralba, María García-Martín, Cristina Quintas-Soriano, Franziska Wolpert, and Tobias Plieninger. Heike Walk, Vera Luthardt, and Benjamin Noelting discuss the critical roles that universities can play as partners with BRs, not just in research programs, but in creating curricula that offers students real-world opportunities to make a difference through learning-by-doing. In the last thematic contribution, Liette Vasseur reminds us that such efforts require time and on-going commitment. Under the umbrella of “ecosystem governance”, she encourages participants from local and Indigenous communities, universities, governments, and private and civil society sectors to “slow down the pace” to ensure meaningful, respectful and mutually-beneficial partnerships for sustainability. Finally, we close by offering some synthesis of the issues and themes raised by the book.

Basic Principles of Biosphere Reserves

For those unfamiliar with BRs, we offer the following introduction. As described in Chapter 2, the MAB Programme was established in 1971, and soon came to include 14 thematic ‘project areas’. BRs were to be designated to support several of these, but came to be most clearly identified with project area 8, ‘Conservation of natural areas and of the genetic material they contain’. This identification would forever “brand” BRs as being tools for biodiversity conservation, despite the efforts to support sustainable use from the outset and the explicit function to support sustainable development that was introduced with the Statutory Framework. The first 24 BRs, in five countries, were designated in 1974.

BRs established up to 1995 are considered “first generation” BRs, as they were created without a Statutory Framework and were charged to support biodiversity conservation and applied scientific research (Chapter 2). BRs established from 1996 onwards are often described as “second generation” as they have been required to address the criteria of the 1996 Statutory Framework and implement Action Plans published in 1996, 2008 and 2017 (Chapter 3). Today, BRs are UNESCO-designated regions, with their associated institutions, which operate at the landscape level to carry out three functions: conserve biological and cultural diversity; advance sustainability; and support scientific research, learning, and public education (UNESCO 1996). An important distinction between first and second-generation BRs are that, in the latter, sustainable development has been a primary function since their designation, in addition to the conservation of biodiversity and logistics (i.e., scientific research and more broadly, local

capacity building). As described in Chapter 3, a decennial periodic review process is implemented to ensure that all BRs implement the functions set out in the Statutory Framework; this has required the spatial expansion and introduction of participatory management for most “first generation” BRs.

The Statutory Framework requires that all BRs contain three types of zones: one or more core areas, protected by legislation; one or more buffer zones where research and uses compatible with ecological protection are allowed; and a transition area where sustainable resource use is practiced (UNESCO, 1996). In some countries, this transition zone is called a zone of cooperation. Once a BR has been designated by UNESCO, “organizational arrangements” must be instituted so that “a suitable range of *inter alia* public authorities, local communities and private interests” implement the functions of a BR (UNESCO, 1996: 17). In some countries (e.g., France; Germany), core funds are provided by government authorities, whether regional or national, and may be leveraged through projects or social enterprises. In other cases, these regional institutions have to obtain funds to implement local or regional conservation or sustainability initiatives, partner with educational institutions to deliver training programs, undertake educational and demonstration projects, and provide logistical support for scientific research. Designation of a BR does not confer any new level of jurisdiction. Hence, the regional institutions do not have regulatory authority or direct management and decision-making powers, but must operate within national and sub-national legislative frameworks. In this context, management may take a number of forms including implementing regulations

introduced by a government authority and/or working with relevant government agencies in cooperative decision-making forums. There is a great diversity of applications, as explored in the chapters in Part 2.

Importantly, since 1994, BRs have not been considered protected areas under IUCN's classification (Dudley, 2008; Stolton et al., 2013). Core areas and, sometimes, buffer zones match some IUCN categories, but transition areas do not. Hence, BRs adopt some of the privileges and criticisms of protected areas. The term 'biosphere reserve' has likely contributed to this confusion. As several chapters describe, the word "reserve" often has a negative connotation, harkening back to the creation of protected areas that excluded local and Indigenous peoples from use. In some countries (e.g., Australia, Austria, Canada, France, Norway, Sweden), the word reserve is being replaced by more general terms such as 'region', 'area', or 'park' or simply, informally, referring to the designations as "biospheres" (e.g., the UK). In other countries, a new terms are used nationally (e.g., 'eco-park' in Japan).

Last, it may be significant that BRs have been established within UNESCO – an organization that was established to build peace internationally through education, science and culture following World War II. BRs support peace keeping in their efforts to provide for the co-flourishing of nature and of people. These efforts are evident in chapters where BRs operate in countries damaged by war (e.g., Lebanon, Vietnam) and where BRs can demonstrate restoration,

regeneration, and reconciliation in relations with the natural environment and with local and Indigenous peoples who have been subject to longstanding social exclusion and cultural marginalization (e.g., Australia, Canada, Costa Rica). In this context, it is worth noting that there are currently 20 transboundary BRs shared between two or more countries, often in parts of the world characterised by past conflict, for instance along the former 'Iron curtain' and in Latin America (Fall 2005). Building peace makes BRs unique model regions in a world with multiple types of protected areas and sustainability initiatives and demonstrates their contribution to "just" conservation and sustainability.

We offer this compilation to a broad readership. We anticipate that scholars, government and policy representatives, professionals within the UN family or cognate organizations, practitioners, local and Indigenous communities, and the general public may find lessons for translating broad concepts into grounded strategies for advancing biocultural diversity and sustainability in BRs and beyond. The value of this compilation lies in its explanation of the shared vision that characterizes this global network and in the varied mechanisms by which such vision has been adapted to local contexts. We invite you to learn from these experiences.

References

Anon (2006) *La red de reservas de la Biosfera, Españolas*. Lunweg, Barcelona

Bettencourt, L.M.A. and Kaur, J. (2011) 'Evolution and structure of sustainability science',
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol 108,pp19540-19545

Di Castri F, Baker FWG, Hadley M (1984a) *Ecology in Practice, Part 1: Ecosystem Management*.
UNESCO, Paris

Di Castri F, Baker FWG, Hadley M (1984b) *Ecology in Practice, Part 2: The Social Response*.
UNESCO, Paris

Dudley, N. (Editor) (2008) *Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories*.
Gland, Switzerland, IUCN

Fall, J. (2005) *Drawing the Line: Nature, Hybridity and Politics in Transboundary Spaces*. Surrey,
UK, Ashgate

Garnier, L. (2008) *Man and Nature – Making the Relationship Last*. UNESCO, Paris

German MAB National Committee (Editor) (2005) *Full of Life: UNESCO Biosphere Reserves-
Model Regions for Sustainable Development*. Bonn, Springer-Verlag

Ishwaran, N., Persic, A. and Tri, N.H. (2008) Concept and practice: the case of UNESCO
biosphere reserves. *International Journal of Environment and Sustainable Development*, vol
7, pp118-131

Kates, R.W. (2011) What kind of a science is sustainability science? *PNAS* vol. 108, pp19449-
19450

Kratzer, A. (2018) Biosphere reserves as model regions for sustainability transitions? Insights
into the peripheral mountain area Grosses Walsertal (Austria), *Applied Geography*, vol
90, pp321-330

Lang, D.J., Weik, A. and von Wehrden, H. (2017) Bridging divides in sustainability science.
Sustainability Science vol 12, 875–879

Lang, D.J., Wiek, A., Bergmann, M., Stauffacher, M., Martens, P., Moll, P., Swilling, M., and Thomas, C.J. (2012) Transdisciplinary research in sustainability science: practice, principles, and challenges. *Sustainability Science* 7, supp, pp25-43

Liu, J., Dietz, T., Carpenter, S.R., Alberti, M., Folke, C., Moran, E., Pell, A.N., Deadman, P., Kratz, T., Lubchenco, J., Ostrom, E., Ouyang, Z., Provencher, W., Redman, C.L., Schneider, S., & Taylor, W.W. (2007) Complexity of coupled human and natural *systems Science*, 317, pp1513-1516

Moreira-Muñoz, A, Borsdorf, A (Editors) (2014) *Reservas de la Biosfera de Chile – Laboratorios para la Sostenibilidad*. Austrian Academy of Science and Pontificia Universidad de Chile, Innsbruck and Santiago de Chile

Reed, M.G. (with Drebert, Y. and Kingsmill, P.) 2016. *Sustaining Home: Canadian Biosphere Reserves in Action*. Available from the iBOOKstore.

Rokaya P., Sheikholeslami R., Kurkute S., Nazarbakhsh M., Zhang F., and Reed M.G., (2017) Multiple Factors that Shaped Sustainability Science Journal: A 10-year Review. *Sustainability Science*, vol 12, 855-868

Schultz, L., Duit, A., and Folke, C. (2011) Participation, Adaptive Co-management, and Management Performance in the World Network of Biosphere Reserves. *World Development* 39(4), 662–671

Schultz, L, West, S., Bourke, A.J., d’Armengol, L., Torrents, P., Hardardottir, H., Jansson, A., and Roldán, A.M. (2018) Learning to live with social-ecological complexity: An interpretive analysis of learning in 11 UNESCO Biosphere Reserves. *Global Environmental Change* 50, pp. 75-87

Starger, C. (2019) ‘Biosphere Reserves as Living Laboratories for Sustainable Development’, <http://www.futureearth.org/blog/2016-apr-25/biosphere-reserves-living-laboratories-sustainable-development>, accessed 12 March 2019

Steelman, T.A., Andrews, E., Baines, S., Bharadwaj, L., Bjornson, E.R., Bradford, L., Cardinal, K.L., Carriere, G., Fresque-Baxter, J., Jardine, T., MacColl, I., Macmillan, S., Marten, J., Orosz, C., Reed, M.G., Rose, I., Shmon, K., Shantz, S., Staples, K., Strickert, G., and Voyageur M. (2019) Identifying transformational space for transdisciplinarity: using art to access the hidden third. *Sustainability Science* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-018-0644-4>

Stolton, S., Shadie, P., and Dudley, N. (2013) *IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidance on Recognising Protected Areas and Assigning Management Categories and Governance Types*, Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 21, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland

UNESCO. (2019) 'Biosphere Reserves: Learning Sites for Sustainable Development', <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/environment/ecological-sciences/biosphere-reserves/>

UNESCO. (2017) *A New Roadmap for the Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme and its World Network of Biosphere Reserves*, UNESCO Paris, <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000247418>

UNESCO. (2000) *Solving the Puzzle: The Ecosystem Approach and Biosphere Reserves*. UNESCO, Paris

UNESCO (1996) *Biosphere reserves: The Seville Strategy and the Statutory Framework of the World Network*. UNESCO, Paris. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001038/>

