

This final section presents 12 case studies from around the world. Each has been chosen to illustrate a range of the best practices presented in this document. The main focus for each was illustrated in Table 1 and is reiterated in the opening paragraph of each study. We encourage all those interested in PPAs to read all of the case studies as together they represent the diversity of global PPAs.

Case Study 1 Australia's National Reserve System of public, private and indigenous protected areas

James A. Fitzsimons, The Nature Conservancy and Deakin University

The extent to which PPAs are integrated into national networks of protected areas varies around the world, and even within countries. Australia is provided as an example where PPAs are recognised as important to the national system (see Part B, Section 6), where active encouragement for inclusion has occurred but where some further integration of the variety of different types of PPAs is still required.

Overview

Australia is a federal nation with responsibility for land management, including public protected areas, remaining mostly with the six state and two mainland territories. Up until the mid-1990s, each state and territory developed their own protected area estates, mostly from public land, with little coordination in approaches. Upon ratifying the Convention on Biological Diversity, the national Australian government and the states and territories agreed to work together to create a science-based National Reserve System using the principles of comprehensiveness, adequacy and representativeness (CAR). This sought to ensure that representative samples of ecosystems in each of Australia's more than 80 bioregions were reserved in protected areas.

However, it was recognised that this could not be achieved through increasing the public protected area estate alone and that encouragement of the incorporation of protective arrangements on private and indigenous land would enhance the system. Beyond recognition in policy (e.g. JANIS, 1997; NRMMC, 2005, 2009), the Australian Government provided funding through two programmes, the National Reserve System Program (NRSP) which provided up to two-thirds of the purchase price for strategic land acquisitions of private land by NGOs and state governments and the Indigenous Protected Areas Program to facilitate the incorporation of these tenures into the reserve system. For land purchases under the National Reserve System Program, a key criterion for the funding was that the land improved the representation of the reserve system (focusing on under-represented biogeographic regions and ecosystems).



A common brush-tail possum (*Trichosurus vulpecula*) in a nest box at Creighton Hills conservation covenant

Incorporating PPAs into the National Reserve System

From 1996 to 2013, the Australian Government's NRSP offered up to two-thirds of the purchase price for private land that was acquired by state governments or land trusts/community groups for new public protected areas or PPAs, respectively. The funding agreement between the Australian Government and the purchaser of land expressly states the land is purchased for inclusion in the National Reserve System (NRS) (Fitzsimons, 2006). The remaining one-third of the purchase price needed to be sourced from elsewhere, and for land trusts this was mostly from philanthropic sources, who were often stimulated by the leverage inherent in this model (Humann, 2012). Private land purchased through the NRSP required agreements to be binding on the title of that land and carry over to future owners in perpetuity, or 99-year agreements were specified as a minimum time for qualification (NRMMC, 2005; Fitzsimons, 2006).



Smoking ceremony; part of repatriating Budjiti artefacts to Bush Heritage Australia's Naree Station Reserve, New South Wales, April 2018 © Sarah Eccles

Incorporation of PPAs in Australia's NRS has resulted in an increase in representation of bioregions and ecosystems (Taylor et al., 2014). Land trusts were encouraged to discuss potential purchases with the Australian Government beforehand to ensure the property was likely to qualify for funding before an application was made.

In the state of Tasmania, the Australian Government also provided AU\$ 30 million (approx. US\$ 22 million) for a targeted approach to sign conservation covenants on private land, again focusing on under-represented ecosystems. Landholders were offered an up-front payment and management assistance for conserving forest on their properties, with a clear understanding (Best Practice 7.1.2) that they were formally contributing to the NRS (Gilligan & Syneca Consulting Pty Ltd, 2007).

Challenges

The majority of conservation covenants have not been established for the explicit purpose of contributing to or incorporation into the National Reserve System nor have the majority of landholders expressly permitted their properties to be included. Nonetheless, some Australian states have included all of their conservation covenants in the Collaborative Australian Protected Areas Database (Fitzsimons, 2015), which is a *de facto* representation of the NRS, without having explicitly sought their permission for inclusion in the NRS (Best Practice 7.1.2). To comply with the IUCN resolution regarding PPA owners giving permission for inclusion in national and international databases, this needs to be resolved.

Summary

- Strong science and policy guidance helped guide priorities for future protected area expansion, including PPAs established through the NRSP (Best Practice 1.2.1).
- A dedicated land acquisition budget over multiple years allowed confidence in the land acquisition process, which often spanned over multiple years of negotiation (Principle 1.4 and Best Practice 1.2.1).
- Potential new PPAs were only funded if they met national targets for increasing reservation levels for under-represented bioregions or ecosystems (Best Practice 1.2.1).
- Most conservation covenants, established through covenanting programmes, while qualifying as PPAs, have not been explicitly established for incorporation into the national protected area system. Further work is required to formally seek approval from the landholders for their inclusion into this network (Best Practices 6.1.1 and 6.2.7).



A koala (*Phascolarctos cinereus*) in Creighton Hills conservation covenant © James Fitzsimons