



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/12/22
15 August 2014

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Twelfth meeting

Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, 6-17 October 2014

Item 26 of the provisional agenda*

ECOSYSTEM CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION

Note by the Executive Secretary

INTRODUCTION

1. Aichi Biodiversity Targets 5 (to halve the rate of loss of natural habitats), 11 (to protect at least 17 per cent of terrestrial areas and inland waters and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas as part of improved protected area networks with connectivity across the landscape) and 15 (to restore at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems and enhance ecosystem resilience) establish global quantitative targets for the conservation, sustainable use and restoration of biodiversity on a wide scale.
2. In support of the achievement of Aichi Target 11, the Conference of Parties, in decision XI/24, requested the Executive Secretary to continue to support implementation of national action plans for the programme of work on protected areas and achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 through, for example, subregional workshops, online course rooms, and tools and guidance.
3. The Conference of the Parties, in support of Aichi Targets 5 and 15, requested the Executive Secretary, in paragraph 5 of decision XI/16, to support countries to implement ecosystem restoration including through capacity-building workshops, compilation of information and the further development of tools and guidance.
4. In supporting Parties to achieve Aichi Targets 5, 11 and 15, and in response to the above decisions, the Secretariat carried out several capacity-building activities, namely subregional capacity-building workshops, commissioning of global studies on ecosystem degradation, and promoting regional and global support for Parties. The Secretariat's activities strongly promoted an integrated landscape-wide approach to stimulate activities, including policy, planning and economic tools and monitoring and evaluation systems that are common and complementary in meeting all three targets.
5. While the Secretariat was able to successfully carry out some of the activities requested by decisions XI/24 and XI/16 (e.g. capacity-building workshops, technical studies), it was not able to undertake other activities such as a web portal on ecosystem restoration and an issue-based module on ecosystem restoration. This was mainly because of limited financial resources. Due to the fact that many Parties are in the process of revising and updating their national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), the Secretariat prioritized capacity-building activities in order to assist countries to develop targets and actions related to Aichi Targets 5, 11, and 15 and to integrate them into their NBSAPs. The

* UNEP/CBD/COP/12/1/Rev.1.

Secretariat intends to continue to implement the requests of the Conference of the Parties contained in decisions XI/16 and XI/24 in the next biennium (2015–2016).

6. The Executive Secretary prepared a progress report for the eighteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/14) which, among other things, provided an overview of progress made in providing support to Parties to achieve Aichi Targets 5, 11 and 15 in an integrated manner. That report contained an overview of capacity-building workshops organized between November 2013 and June 2014, including objectives and outcomes of the workshops, global and regional partners involved in the workshops, and lessons learned from the workshops and related case studies. It also provided an overview of the global studies commissioned by the Secretariat and their early findings.

7. The present note is an update of the progress report presented to the eighteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific Technical and Technological Advice (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/14). Section I provides an update on the subregional capacity-building activities and section II provides some examples of regional and global support.

8. The eighteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific Technical and Technological Advice prepared recommendation XVIII/11 on ecosystem conservation and restoration, containing a draft decision for the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/12/1/Add.2).

I. UPDATES ON CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTIVITIES

A. *Regional and subregional capacity-building workshops*

9. In response to paragraph 5 of decision XI/16 and paragraph 10 of decision XI/24, a series of regional and subregional capacity-building workshops on ecosystem conservation and restoration have been organized by the Secretariat in collaboration with global and regional partners, including the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the World Resources Institute (WRI), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), BirdLife International and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD).

10. The workshops were supported through the financial and in-kind support of the European Commission and the Governments of Canada, Germany, Japan (through the Japan Biodiversity Fund), Republic of Korea, and the Governments of the countries in which the workshops were held. Annex I below contains an updated list of regional and subregional workshops on ecosystem conservation and restoration.

11. The regional and subregional workshops on conservation and restoration yielded rich lessons from subnational, national and regional level experiences in integrated landscape-wide efforts to conserve and restore biodiversity. The progress report to the eighteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific Technical and Technological Advice (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/14) listed some emerging lessons from the workshop series and also highlighted key points from individual workshops. Key points from the two workshops held subsequently are provided in annex II below. More detailed information on lessons learned, including case studies, and information on spatial tools, policy and legal tools and economic tools is being made available as an information document (UNEP/CBD/COP/12/INF/16).

B. *Global study on leveraging public programmes*

12. The Secretariat of the Convention initiated, in 2013, a global study on the potential of public programmes with socioeconomic and development objectives to contribute to large-scale biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and ecosystem restoration, and how biodiversity conservation and ecosystem restoration can contribute to poverty alleviation and development. The study was funded by the Governments of Germany, the Republic of Korea and South Africa.

13. The global study is made up of two major components: (i) a review of the literature on public programmes that have been used for biodiversity conservation and ecosystem restoration; and (ii) three in-depth country case studies, based on the experiences of Brazil, the Republic of Korea and South Africa.

14. A summary of the key findings of the South African and Korean country case studies was made available in the document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/14. Both identified strong political will, integration with the country's poverty reduction and economic growth plans and communication and public awareness as key factors for success. The key findings of the Brazilian case study are as follows:

(a) In order for public programmes to be successful, there is a need for strong legal and institutional frameworks;

(b) Inter-institutional collaboration is important for the success of public programmes;

(c) Public programmes have the potential to promote and deepen integration among different sectors and policies; and

(d) Actions targeting the most remote, poor and marginalized sectors of society are often difficult to implement and require innovation on the part of the government.

15. The global study found that, while each region and country has its own issues and has very distinct characteristics, including ecosystem dynamics, there are some lessons that can be learned from existing successful public programmes. Most successful public programmes have efficient stakeholder networks that support their implementation. The study found, in some examples, that the involvement of non-government actors has been beneficial for the implementation of these public programmes. It also found that the most successful public programmes utilized adaptive management to get the best results. In addition, the study found that programmes that had clear aims and ensured tangible and balanced benefits were the most successful. The study underlined the importance of long-term planning when implementing these public programmes because the benefits of such programmes usually only accrue over long time periods.

16. In general, the study found that the following are common elements among the socioeconomic and development oriented public programmes that have had tangible environment benefits:

(a) Strong political leadership;

(b) Strong legal, policy and institutional frameworks;

(c) Integration of environmental activities into national poverty relief and economic development programmes;

(d) Strong stakeholder engagement;

(e) Good intersectoral coordination;

(f) Effective communication, education and public awareness programmes.

17. The study will be published in CBD Technical Series No. 80. A working draft version will be made available as information document UNEP/CBD/COP/12/INF/17.

C. Global study on restoration potential

18. In response to paragraph 5 of decision XI/16, the Executive Secretary commissioned a global study, in 2013, to provide information on ecosystem degradation and the potential for restoration. The outcome is a technical report on the review of global assessments of land and ecosystem degradation and their relevance in achieving the land-based Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

19. The report provides a conceptual framework for identifying and quantifying expected benefits of restoration based on reviews of global and selected sub-global estimates and assessments for areas of degradation and of restoration potential. Globally, the report indicates that the extent of degraded lands

with opportunities for restoration and rehabilitation are substantial. However, land degradation and restoration potentials are context and scale specific, and value-laden, as they involve different stakeholder needs and perspectives. The study will be published in the CBD Technical Series. An advance version will be made available as information document UNEP/CBD/COP/12/INF/18.

II. REGIONAL AND GLOBAL SUPPORT

A. *Initiative of the Republic of Korea on forest and ecosystem restoration*

20. The Government of the Republic of Korea, through the Korea Forest Service, in response to decision XI/16, is proposing the establishment of an initiative on forest ecosystem restoration to support Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to achieve Aichi Targets 5, 11 and 15 in an integrated manner.

21. The twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties will undertake a mid-term review of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The meeting is expected to agree on the Pyeongchang Roadmap for the enhanced implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The initiative on forest ecosystem restoration would be part of the contribution of the Government of the Republic of Korea to assist countries to implement decision XI/16 and the expected Pyeongchang Roadmap for the enhanced implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

22. The initiative would support developing country Parties as they operationalize national targets and plans for ecosystem conservation and restoration within the framework of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 5, 11 and 15. These targets should emanate from or be integrated into updated NBSAPs, and should be mainstreamed into broader national policies, plans and programmes.

23. The Republic of Korea has had substantial practical experience in the field of forest restoration, and the initiative can be seen as a collaborative partnership to share this experience. As such, it would draw upon on the complementary strengths and advantages of each of its partners. Key partners could include, for example, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), other members of the Global Partnership on Forest and Landscape Restoration (GPFLR), and the Society for Ecological Restoration (SER). With its global convening power, the Secretariat of the Convention can help to bring these partners together for the implementation of the initiative.

24. The initiative on forest and ecosystem restoration is composed of the following four interrelated components: capacity-building, implementation support, technical support networks and expert processes.

25. More information on the initiative is available in information document UNEP/CBD/COP/12/INF/19.

B. *FAO's Forest and Landscape Restoration Mechanism*

26. FAO has proposed the establishment of the Forest and Landscape Restoration Mechanism (FLR Mechanism) to help countries achieve their commitments towards the Bonn Challenge and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, catalysing the work of FAO in close collaboration with key partners of the GPFLR.¹ The FLR Mechanism will operate globally and its initial phase will span a seven-year period from 2014 to 2020. Its focus at the country level aims to support implementation as well as monitoring and reporting of forest and landscape restoration by facilitating a multi-stakeholder process; developing, compiling and disseminating tools and best practices related to FLR; supporting the establishment of pilot projects and helping broker new large-scale projects and programmes; and supporting adequate quality control of well-established FLR efforts, to ensure compliance with accepted guidelines, norms and standards.

¹ <http://www.fao.org/3/a-mk173e.pdf>.

27. At the Twenty-Second Session of the Committee on Forestry (COFO), held from 23 to 27 June 2014, the Committee recommended that FAO support country efforts to plan and implement forest landscape restoration, through activities of the Forest and Landscape Restoration Mechanism, and to engage in more cross-cutting and interdepartmental work under the new Strategic Framework, to support integrated approaches across the landscape.² The Committee further invited countries to work with FAO for the formulation of a global capacity development programme on sustainable management and restoration of dryland forests and agro-silvopastoral systems. Countries were also invited to support the forest initiative that will be launched in September 2014 at the United Nations Climate Summit 2014, including through indications of commitments for reducing deforestation and forest degradation and for increasing forest restoration, as consistent with the Bonn Challenge and with the Convention on Biological Diversity's Aichi Biodiversity Target 15.

C. Other support networks and organizations

28. The workshops presented Parties with information on existing networks and organizations that are available to assist them in planning and implementing ecosystem and conservation at national level. These include, but are not limited to, regional organizations such as the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), the Secretariat of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and the *Commission des Forêts d'Afrique Centrale* (COMIFAC).

29. There are also global networks and organizations that work to support countries to plan and implement ecosystem restoration programmes. The Global Partnership on Forest and Landscape Restoration is a network of organizations working on promoting landscape restoration.

30. The Secretariat will continue to work with these networks, organizations and initiatives to support countries to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Targets 5, 11 and 15.

² <http://www.fao.org/3/contents/SUBMITTED/b5543e0b-83f4-4ec2-a1c5-d3073b9b8ffa/>.

*Annex I***TIMETABLE FOR THE REGIONAL AND SUBREGIONAL WORKSHOPS ON ECOSYSTEM CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION**

Subregion	City, host country, dates	Participating countries
Pacific	Suva, Fiji 25 to 29 November 2013	Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Niue, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu
West Asia and North Africa	Amman, Jordan 1 to 5 February 2014	Algeria, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen
South America	Linhares, Brazil 24 to 28 March 2014	Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay
Southeast Asia	Jambi, Indonesia 28 April to 2 May 2014	Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam
Caribbean	Belize City, Belize 28 April to 2 May 2014	Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago
Eastern and Southern Africa	Livingstone, Zambia 12 to 16 May 2014	Botswana, Eritrea, Kenya, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Rwanda, Seychelles, Somalia, South Africa, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe
Europe	Isle of Vilm, Germany 2 to 6 June 2014	Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Georgia, Germany, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Central Africa	Douala, Cameroon 8 to 11 July 2014	Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, São Tomé and Príncipe
Central, South, and East Asia	Jeju, Republic of Korea 14 to 18 July 2014	Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Kazakhstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan
Central America	San Jose, Costa Rica 25 to 28 August 2014	Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua
West Africa	TBD	(invited) Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo

*Annex II***HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE SUBREGIONAL CAPACITY-BUILDING WORKSHOPS ON ECOSYSTEM CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION HELD IN JULY 2014****Subregional workshop for Central Africa³**

- The challenge of data gaps can be partially addressed through open access data systems, data analysis capacity-building, cooperation mechanisms with data-holding centres, the building of institutional capacity to develop respective maps, and coordination among stakeholders for monitoring and evaluation.
- Mainstreaming biodiversity into relevant sectors, policies, projects and programmes is important and could benefit from spatial planning tools to identify data gaps, to strengthen commonalities and minimize overlaps, and to develop multi-resource inventories for various ecoregions and Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
- Several restoration projects have been carried out in the subregion. Lessons from past experiences are important in defining suitable actions and identifying success factors and benefits from restoration. The Rapid Restoration Diagnostic Tool provides a reference.
- Learning from the experience of other countries and regions is valuable. Lessons learned from other workshops, in particular South America, were useful.
- In the redesign and implementation of NBSAPs, REDD+⁴ activities can be referenced and complemented.
- Potential synergies between REDD+ and NBSAP implementation were identified and could be reinforced through spatial data analysis of biodiversity and ecosystem services in production forests, in restoration activities, and policies to conserve existing forests through improvement in the management of protected area systems.
- Agriculture was noted as the main cause of forest loss within many central African countries, due to unsustainable practices.
 - Intensification of agro-ecosystems can reduce pressures on natural systems as part of a mix of policies, incentives, education and training, and land planning.
 - An enabling legal and policy environment that guarantees rights and ownership of forest and tree resources to farmers is critical for effective sustainable management of forest ecosystems.
- There are multiple economic tools for the management of natural resources that can aid in the redesign and implementation of NBSAPs and the mobilization of resources.
- The joint initiative between the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for the conservation and sustainable use of tropical forests (Joint ITTO-CBD Collaborative Initiative for Tropical Forest Biodiversity) provides funding for project implementation, which countries can apply for through ITTO.

³ This workshop was held jointly with UNEP-WCMC and was titled “Workshop on synergies between REDD+ and ecosystem conservation and restoration in National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans”.

⁴ REDD+ is used as a shorthand for “reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries”, consistent with paragraph 70 of decision 1/CP.16 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The acronym REDD+ is used for convenience only, without any attempt to pre-empt ongoing or future negotiations under the UNFCCC.

- Employing REDD+ actions can mitigate the loss of forest cover, but creating synergistic actions for REDD+ and the relevant Aichi Biodiversity Targets can move countries towards sustainable development.

Subregional workshop for Central, South and East Asia

- It is very important to secure high-level political commitment and support for ecosystem conservation and restoration programmes.
 - Policies, strategies and the country programming framework for sustained financing for sustainable ecosystem management should be developed to emphasize and promote the substantial contributions to greening the economy, predominantly food security.
 - Restoration has to become an economically viable land use and it has to integrate conservation and development programmes.
 - Alternative sources of funding for conservation and restoration should be secured. These include national budgets, bilateral, and multilateral sources; as well as payments from ecosystem services (from water and carbon), crops produced in agro-successional schemes, non-timber forest products, and access and benefit-sharing.
 - From the economic sessions:
 - Whichever mechanism we choose to finance conservation and restoration, we have to ensure that monetary and non-monetary benefits go back to communities.
 - National policies are fundamental for resource mobilization as they define priorities and mechanisms that allow for diversification of funding sources.
 - Link conservation and restoration actions with climate change mitigation and adaptation activities to take advantage of climate change funding for biodiversity activities.
 - Integrated ecosystem conservation and restoration at landscape scale can benefit from existing initiatives such as the Bonn Challenge.
 - In implementing conservation and restoration, it is important to pay attention to alternative or sustainable livelihoods to increase beneficiaries' income while at the same time of reducing their dependence on the biodiversity, in order to enhance the protection of ecosystems and biodiversity conservation.
-