



**Convention on
Biological Diversity**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/INF/17
4 March 2010

ENGLISH ONLY

**SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL
AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE**

Fourteenth meeting
Nairobi, 10-21 May 2010
Items 3.3 of the provisional agenda*

**GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR PLANT CONSERVATION - REGIONAL WORKSHOP
FOR THE AMERICAS**

Note by the Executive Secretary

1. The Executive Secretary is circulating herewith, for the information of participants in the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, a report of the regional workshop for the Americas on the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, held at Chicago Botanic Garden from 30 September to 1 October 2009.
2. This workshop was organized by Botanic Gardens Conservation International (BGCI) to provide input into the process of developing a consolidated update of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC) for the period 2011-2020.
3. The document is circulated in the form and language in which it was received by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

* UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/1.

**Global Strategy for Plant Conservation
Regional workshop for the Americas
Chicago Botanic Garden
Sept 30 – Oct 01 2009**

Workshop report



Supported by the Boeing Company



Introduction

This regional workshop for the Americas was one of a series of meetings organized by Botanic Gardens Conservation International (BGCI), with the support of the Boeing Company, to provide input into the process of developing a revised Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC) for the period 2011-2020. The recommendations of the workshops will be synthesized and provided to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) for consideration during the development of a final draft revised GSPC. The revised GSPC document will be presented to the CBD's Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) at its next meeting in May 2010.

This is a shortened version of the full report. The full report, including the annexes referred to in this document, is available on the website of the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation (www.plants2010.org).

Background

The GSPC, which includes 16 outcome-oriented targets to be achieved by 2010, was adopted by the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the CBD in 2002. In the years since then considerable progress has been made in achieving at least some of the targets. Moreover, the GSPC has provided a model for target setting at the global level within the CBD and has achieved notable success in stimulating the engagement of the botanical and plant conservation communities in the work of the CBD.

At their 9th meeting in 2008, the Parties to the CBD decided to consider the further development and implementation of the Strategy beyond 2010, including an update of the current targets. In response to this request, an on-line consultation on the future of the GSPC was held in early 2009 and the inputs received were discussed during a Liaison Group meeting, which was organized by the CBD Secretariat and the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation in May 2009. This meeting resulted in the development of a draft GSPC for the period 2011-2020. This document was made available on-line for peer review and further discussions are being held at a series of regional meetings organized by BGCI (Europe, Americas and Africa). This report records the discussions held during the American regional workshop.

Participants

The meeting included 36 participants with 5 countries across the Americas being represented: Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico and USA. Participants came from a wide range of organizations and disciplines, including botanic gardens, universities, government agencies, environmental NGOs and agricultural and forestry organizations. The participants from Brazil, Colombia and Mexico represented their country's GSPC focal points,

and the Latin American Plant Science Network and the Caribbean and Latin American Association of Botanical Gardens were also represented. A full participants list is provided in Annex 1.

Workshop Day 1

The first day of the workshop included an introduction to the GSPC and the updating process, as well as presentations on national GSPC implementation in Colombia, Mexico and Brazil. Information was also provided on regional programmes in Central America that contribute to GSPC implementation and how the USA Plant Conservation Alliance's National Framework can be aligned with the GSPC.

Introduction to the GSPC – including review process and updating targets

Stella Simiyu, BGCI/SCBD GSPC Programme Officer.

This presentation provided an overview of the process for the development of a revised GSPC including:

- Outcomes of the in-depth review of the GSPC carried out in 2007-8;
- The results of the initial on-line consultation on the revision of the GSPC, carried out in April 2009 and the key messages resulting from this consultation;
- The development of a revised draft GSPC during the GSPC Liaison Group meeting in May 2009
- Process for finalizing the revised GSPC, including the in-puts from the regional workshops
- Linkages between the GSPC and the development of a new strategic plan for the CBD

A copy of the full presentation is provided in Annex 2.

Implementing the GSPC in Colombia

Alberto Gomez-Meijer, Red Nacional de Jardines Botánicos de Colombia

Colombia is believed to be home to approximately 26,500 higher plant species, equivalent to 12% of the world's total flora diversity. However, 300,000 hectares of Colombia's forests are lost each year as land is cleared for agriculture and development. Coca production is a particular threat; for each hectare of coca planted, three hectares are slashed and burnt. The consumption of 1 gram of cocaine requires the destruction of 4m² of Colombian forest. Around one third of all Colombian plant species are believed to be at risk of extinction. Loss of biodiversity and poverty are closely linked in Colombia, and measures to protect the environment must also address social needs.

Colombia was the first country to have its own National Strategy for Plant Conservation, but implementation has been slow, mainly because the focal point for the GSPC was assigned to the Colombian Consulate in Montreal, Canada. Finally in 2008, the Colombian Botanic Gardens Network was designated as the focal point.

Monitoring implementation of the GSPC in Colombia falls under the responsibility of the Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute, which coordinates the National Biodiversity Information System. A national plant conservation strategy web portal is being developed to provide information on 'who is doing what'. Priorities are being developed on a regional basis and particular attention is being given to Red Listing in order to identify conservation needs.

A copy of the full presentation is provided in Annex 3.

Mexican implementation of the GSPC

Yolanda Barrios, CONABIO - National Commission for the Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity, Mexico

The Mexican flora includes over 23,000 plant species, around half of which are endemic. There is as yet, no complete flora of Mexico. 314 Mexican plant species are included in the IUCN global Red List, 253 plant species are listed in CITES Appendix 1 and 1,445 in Appendix 2.

The Mexican Association of Botanic Gardens developed a Conservation Strategy for Mexican Botanic Gardens in 2000 and CONABIO was designated as focal point in Mexico for the GSPC in 2004. In 2006, the North American Botanic Gardens Strategy for Plant Conservation was developed, including Mexican Botanic Gardens. Subsequently, CONABIO met with the Mexican Association of Botanic Gardens, and agreed to organize a National Committee to develop and promote the Mexican Strategy for Plant Conservation.

The Coordinating Committee was established in 2007 and consists of 16 representatives from different sectors involved in the conservation and sustainable use of plant diversity. The Committee started by identifying national goals and recording achievements and strengths for each goal of the GSPC. Although only 5 government agencies are included in the Coordinating Committee, meetings are held with other agencies to involve them in the development of the Mexican strategy and in its future implementation.

The mission, vision, objectives and goals of the Mexican Plant Conservation Strategy were published in May 2008 and presented at COP 9 in Bonn, Germany. Following this, in September 2008, the Coordinating Committee

met in order to organize the Strategy into a logical framework and to identify work programmes, projects and indicators of achievement. The Mexican Strategy now has 6 Objectives, which are divided into 9 Programmes or initiatives and 33 Projects or activities each with goals for 2030, indicators and means of verification. The remaining activities include:

- Establishing a specific webpage for the Mexican Strategy
- Final revision by the Coordinating Committee
- Public consultation with different sectors for comments on the final version
- Identification of actors for the different projects and activities
- Official presentation of the strategy by the Minister of Environment

A copy of the full presentation is provided in Annex 4.

GSPC implementation in Brazil

Gustavo Martinelli and Miguel de Moraes, Rio de Janeiro Botanic Garden

A National Centre for Flora Conservation (CNCFlora) has been established at the Rio de Janeiro Botanic Garden (JBRJ) as part of the GEF-funded National Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Institutional Consolidation Project. CNCFlora started operating in 2009 and amongst its activities is the development of a National Strategy for Plant Conservation. CNCFlora is also responsible for the implementation of several GSPC targets, notably Targets 1, 2, 3, 8, 15 and 16.

CNCFlora is presently working on a Checklist of the Brazilian Flora with some 42,232 species now listed. This is based on the contributions of 370 taxonomists, and is expected to be available on-line in December 2009.

The Brazilian Official List of Endangered Species includes 472 species, 92 of which are in the *ex situ* collections of JBRJ. Revision and re-assessment of the Red List is ongoing and the Red Data Book of Endangered Species of Flora is expected to be published in 2010.

The major challenges facing CNCFlora include:

- Megadiversity in Brazil
- Data quality
- Coordination strategies
- Capacities and resources

A copy of the full presentation is provided in Annex 5.

Working towards the GSPC in the United States – Experiences from the U.S. National Framework for Progress

Peggy Olwell, Bureau of Land management, USA

The National Framework for Progress was developed by the Plant Conservation Alliance in 1995. This provides a framework for action for the conservation of native plant species in the USA. It includes a series of goals divided into 5 strategic areas. This presentation examined how the 16 GSPC targets relate to the 5 strategies of the National Framework and provided an update on the progress that has been made towards achieving the GSPC in the USA.

A copy of the full presentation is provided in Annex 6.

Group discussion

Following the presentations outlined above, a general discussion was held and the following points were noted:

- It is essential to raise greater awareness of plant conservation needs and to make clear linkages between plant conservation and climate change – both with respect to mitigation and adaptation responses.
- The scale of the problem is large given the high levels of plant diversity in the region, and it is important to set realistic targets and goals.
- There is a particular need to conserve agro-biodiversity and plants of socio-economic importance.
- It is important to demonstrate linkages and show how national actions contribute to global issues.
- There is a desire to work together at the regional level and share resources and expertise.
- Funding is an issue, but there is a need to be ‘creative’ in looking for funds, and donors such as the Organization of American States (OAS) have already demonstrated interest.
- The GSPC has been successful in bringing people together – for example in the Latin American Plant Science Network. This is a clear contribution to Target 16.
- Good progress has been made on some targets in the region. For example:
 - In Mexico 50% of known threatened species are in *ex situ* collections (Target 8);
 - In Central America, Target 1 is 70% achieved, and in some countries, such as Nicaragua, it is complete;
 - Targets 1 and 2 have been achieved in the USA
 - Networks in the USA (such as the Centre for Plant Conservation, American Public Gardens Association and the Plant Conservation Alliance) are making good progress on Target 8.

- We need to celebrate our successes.

Workshop Day 2

The workshop participants split into 5 working groups on Day 2 to discuss in detail individual targets and provide comments on the proposed revisions to these targets for the 2011-2020 period.

The Workshops were divided as follows:

- Workshop 1 – Targets 1, 2, 8 and 9
- Workshop 2 – Targets 4, 5, 7, 10
- Workshop 3 – Targets 6, 11, 12, 13
- Workshop 4 – Targets 3, 14, 15, 16
- Workshop 5 – Introductory text to the GSPC

Each working group was asked to examine the proposed new GSPC targets using the following criteria:

- Clarity
- Scope
- SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound)
- Milestones and indicators
- Linked initiatives and resources
- Gaps

The results of the discussions of workshops 1 - 4 are presented in Table 1 below and the revised introductory GSPC text is provided in Annex 7.

Table 1: Results of Workshop discussions – comments on the 16 proposed new GSPC targets

Target	Clarity and Scope	Milestones and indicators	Rationale	Comments / gaps
1. A widely accessible list of known plant species	Fine, but rationale should include reference to the broader goal of developing a world flora.	The following milestones are suggested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checklist completed and publicly accessible by xxx • xx% synonymy completed by xxx • xx% of geographic distribution information available by xxxx 	It is not clear what 'widely accessible' means. This should be explained	
2. An assessment of the conservation status of all known plant species to guide conservation action at national, regional, and international levels	Is the 2 nd part of the target (after 'to...') necessary? Target could be re-phrased as: 'Assess the conservation status of all known plant species'	Milestone a) needs clarification as to what information is included in the working list. The second part of Milestone a) should be a new milestone – with clarity as to what will be available by when. Milestone b) How is the published list different from the working list and why is three years needed? Milestone c) Does this reflect the Sample Red List Index Project? More details required.	Include the threats of climate change prominently in the rationale. The progress statement is confusing to non-IUCN specialists	If the list does not include multi-level assessment (e.g. critically endangered) it will be impossible to meet some of the milestones in other Targets (e.g. Target 8). The mention of RapidList is confusing – is this going to be used or not? If not, it should be removed from the rationale text.
3. Development and effective sharing of advice and guidance for plant conservation and sustainable use, based on research and practical experience	Suggested revision: 'Development of models with protocols and effective sharing of advice and guidance for plant conservation and sustainable use, based on research and practical experience'			A steering group (drawn from appropriate institutions) should be set up to establish a base-line study of the models and protocols in existence in order to identify gaps and set future targets

Table 1 – contd...

Target	Clarity and scope	Milestones and indicators	Rationale	Comments/gaps
4. Ecosystem services secured through effective management of at least 10% of major ecological regions	Proposed re-wording the target as: 'At least 10% of major ecosystem regions effectively managed to guarantee the plant diversity needed to ensure delivery of ecosystem services'	Dates are required for the milestones.	The term 'ecosystem services' could be elaborated here, not in the Target. Does there need to be some mention that 'minor' ecological regions can also be critically important? In p6 line 44 – the term 'network' should be clarified. This does not refer to human interactions but ecological area networks.	The term 'ecosystem services' confuses the focus of the target.
5. Protection of at least 50 % of the most important areas for plant diversity assured with effective management for conserving plant diversity in place			P.8, line 14. There is a concern that the 'largest and most resilient' populations' may not have the genetic makeup that best adapts them to changing climate conditions whereas smaller populations on the edges of distributions may be better adapted. This sentence could be changed to "Well managed protected areas will contain the most resilient populations of species from across their range."	It would be useful to mention published or online resources that provide recommendations for how threats can be addressed in management designs.
6. At least 30 % of production lands in each sector managed sustainably for plants and consistent with the conservation of plant diversity	The target of 30% is thought to be too low and it was suggested to increase this to 50%. Suggest the use of 'landscape' rather than 'land'.	The milestones need to be better defined. One milestone could be to identify the key sectors to engage at national level	The term 'sustainably' has been added to the target – but this term needs to be explained. Similarly the term 'sector' may not be clear.	Standards relevant to the target should be defined and the academic/business community could be engaged to develop practices and guidelines. For example linking with organic food production – e.g. Starbucks and sustainable sourcing. A gap in this target is in relation to amenity planting, private gardens etc.

Table 1 – contd...

Target	Clarity and Scope	Milestones and indicators	Rationale	Comments / gaps
7. At least 60% of threatened species conserved <i>in situ</i>		<p>Milestone a) insert the text 'or managed outside the protected area network' after 'systems'.</p> <p>Milestone c) needs a measurable indicator and 'or' should be replaced with 'and/or'</p> <p>Milestones need timelines. .</p>		In some countries the reported number of threatened plants is vastly different from the actual number.
8. At least 60% of threatened plant species in <i>ex situ</i> collections, and at least 10% in recovery and restoration programmes	<p>There are concerns over measurability of this target.</p> <p>'Recovery and restoration' should be replaced by 'reintroduction'</p>	<p>Milestone a) should include mention of 90% of critically endangered species – as is written in the rationale (p 10, line 32).</p> <p>Milestone b) might be difficult to achieve with the level of data required –e.g. genetic representation.</p> <p>Possible milestone: Countries with capacity consider banking non-threatened species focusing on areas most threatened by climate change. (restoration and insurance, given that what is threatened is rapidly changing).</p>	<p>First sentence of the Rationale should be replaced with 'ex situ collections should be accessible, backed up, genetically representative, and preferably in the country of origin'</p> <p>There should be a much stronger emphasis on the fact that <i>ex situ</i> conservation (esp. seed banks) is the easiest and most rapid response to climate change we can take right now;</p>	The toolkit protocols for management of <i>ex situ</i> collections are already available. This should be recognized and then stated that they should be more widely disseminated.

Table 1 – contd...

Target	Clarity and Scope	Milestones and indicators	Rationale	Comments / gaps
9. 70% of the genetic diversity of crops and other socio-economically valuable plant species conserved, and associated indigenous and local knowledge maintained	Target is clear	Milestone a) requires a date.	Suggest to start Terms and Rationale with a definition of socio-economically valuable plants and why their conservation is so critical in view of climate change.	How will 70% genetic representation be measured? Is there a reference that can be cited?
10. Effective management plans in place to address biological invasions for 50% of important areas for plants that are invaded		Milestone c). Suggest change to: 'Establish global principles for developing management plans <i>with partners</i> to recognize organisms. . .' Timeline for Milestone a) could be 2015.		Revise to indicate that plans should consider impact of invasive species on areas that may become important areas (because of climate change). Or this explanation could be added to the rationale.
11. No species of wild flora endangered by international trade	Is there a need to include the national movement of plants in the target as well as international?			This target does not address the issue of genetic contamination of native species due to the intentional /unintentional introduction of related species at both national and international level
12. A continuous increase in the percentage of plant-based products derived from naturally occurring sources that are sustainably managed, based on progressive inventory and assessment	To be consistent with the CBD, the goal should be 100%	A milestone might be to achieve a baseline and the target could then be set on this basis.	Aim of the target is not clear, does this include food/agricultural crops – or just wild-sourced plants? Agriculture and forestry is covered by the new Target 6. It is recommended that this target be limited to non-intensively produced crops (wild –harvested).	There is a need for greater linkage with and clarity between this target and Target 6. Target 6 focuses on land area and Target 12 on products.

Table 1 – contd...

Target	Clarity and Scope	Milestones and indicators	Rationale	Comments / gaps
13. The decline of plant resources, and associated indigenous and local knowledge innovations and practices, that support sustainable livelihoods, local food security and health care, halted	The wording is not clear. The scope of the target is very broad. It is recommended that the focus of the target should be on indigenous knowledge. Plant conservation is covered by other targets.	A proposed milestone could be: xx% of indigenous knowledge measured/ recorded by xxx.		There needs to be more inclusion and involvement of indigenous people in the GSPC process. There is a need for formal assessment of presently existing indigenous knowledge
14 The importance of plant diversity and the need for its conservation incorporated into communication, education and public awareness programmes	Suggested revision: 'importance of plant diversity, <i>its relevance to climate change</i> and the need...'	Another milestone could be created related to the creation of communications and marketing strategy for Target 14 itself.	Make clear link with climate change in the rationale	Individual regions should strive to develop SMART objectives in relation to Target 14 and a milestone for this should be created
15. The number of trained people working with appropriate facilities in plant conservation increased, according to national needs, to achieve the targets of this Strategy	Does this target address the current issues associated with the building of plant conservation capacity adequately enough?	A milestone could relate to a specific percentage of national needs being assessed by specific deadlines, e.g: 30% by 2101 60% by 2015 100% by 2020.		The target should specifically address the fact that the numbers of trained personnel are decreasing along with plant science infrastructure, e.g. herbaria, and botany departments at universities
16. Networks for plant conservation activities established or strengthened at national, regional and international levels	Possible milestones are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The membership of the GPPC expanded. • Dissemination of the information on the progress of GSPC implementation by the GPPC expanded and increased • .A 'network directory' containing the variety of sectoral, national, regional and international networks established. • The desired increase in cross-sectoral partnerships to include academia. 			

Final discussion – communicating success

A final discussion was held on ways and means to communicate the GSPC and especially how to celebrate the successes achieved. A summary of the key points is provided below:

- 2010 is the International Year of Biodiversity – so provides a good ‘hook’ for plant conservation stories;
- The website www.plants2010.org (the website of the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation) could provide a ‘platform’ for sharing information and success stories;
- A fact sheet or summary of achievements could be useful – and could be used as a basis for press releases;
- The website of the US Forest Service provides success stories on the conservation of rare species (www.fs.fed.us/wildflowers);
- It would be important to highlight the GSPC at the next COP in Nagoya, Japan (October 2010);
- Plant Conservation Day is on May 18th – which is during the next SBSTTA meeting. This could provide an opportunity for awareness raising.
- Upcoming congresses where the GSPC could be promoted include the Latin American Botanical Congress, Chile, October 2010 and the International Botanical Congress in Melbourne in 2011.
- Efforts should be made to engage the private sector in supporting the GSPC, with a focus on the timber, petroleum and mining industries.
- Would it be possible to get support from the private sector or from donors for a high-level public awareness campaign?

It was agreed that BGCI, as well as members of the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation, would continue to look for support for the GSPC wherever possible.

The meeting concluded with a vote of thanks to the Boeing Company for providing support for the meeting and to the Chicago Botanic Garden for hosting the meeting and providing excellent logistical support.