



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/10/21
18 August 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Tenth meeting

Nagoya, Japan 18-29 October 2010

Items 4.6, 5.5 6.5, 6.6, 6.8 of the provisional agenda *

PROGRESS REPORT ON CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The present note has been prepared to assist the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting in its consideration of item 6 of the provisional agenda: progress reports on the implementation of the cross cutting issues and consideration of proposals for future action: technology transfer and cooperation (section II), sustainable use (section III) invasive alien species (section IV), global taxonomy initiative (section V), and incentive measures (section VI). It covers activities implemented in the period between the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in May 2008, and the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties with a focus on most recent developments.

2. Additional information on progress during this period for these cross-cutting issues was reported to the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-14):

(a) Incentive measures (Article 11): Information and good-practice cases from different regions on the identification and removal or mitigation of perverse, and the promotion of positive, incentive measures (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/17);

(b) Global Taxonomy Initiative: Results and lessons learned from regional taxonomic needs assessments and identification of priorities (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/15);

(c) Further work on gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework on invasive alien species, particularly species introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, as live bait and live food, and best practices for addressing the risks associated with their introduction (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/15 and UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/16/Rev.1).

* UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1.

/...

3. Progress for the intersessional period for the other cross-cutting issues was reported to the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice as follows:

(a) In-depth review of the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/5 and Add.1);

(b) In-depth review of the programme of work on biodiversity and climate change (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/6 and Add1 and 2);

(c) Review of implementation of Article 10 of the Convention (sustainable use of biodiversity) and application of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/7);

(d) Third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook: implications for the future implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/8);

(e) Proposals for a consolidated update of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/9);

(f) Examination of the outcome-oriented goals and targets (and associated indicators) and consideration of their possible adjustment for the period beyond 2010 (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/10).

4. The cross-cutting issues on the ecosystem approach and Environmental Impact Assessments/Strategic Environmental Impact Assessments are not included in this or any other document before COP as there is no relevant items or activities to report on.

II. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND COOPERATION

5. In accordance with decision IX/14 on technology transfer and cooperation, the Executive Secretary continued cooperation and exchange of information with relevant processes in other conventions and international organizations, including through the Joint Liaison Groups of the three Rio conventions and the biodiversity-related conventions, the United Nations coordinating group on biotechnology (UN-Biotech), as well as with the International Environmental Technology Centre of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP/IETC).

6. Decision IX/14 specifically requested the Executive Secretary to cooperate with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-Building with a view to identify possible collaborative activities and options for synergies (paragraph 14 (d)). Cooperation was established accordingly and activities initiated or completed include: (i) the identification of UNEP's activities under the Bali Strategic Plan that are of relevance to the programme of work on technology transfer under the Convention on Biological Diversity; (ii) the preparation of a policy document reviewing the state of the work on technology transfer, showcasing pertinent UNEP activities, and recommending critical activities to advance the issue;¹ and (iii) the identification of relevant technologies and dissemination of pertinent information.

7. The last activity also responded to the request expressed in decision IX/14 to continue the work in enhancing the clearing-house mechanism and to facilitate information exchange at all levels (paragraphs 12 and 14 (a)). Under this activity, UNEP identified, building on the compilation of available technologies in the technology transfer database of the clearing-house mechanism,² a number of technologies that are relevant for the Convention. Those are presented online on a daily basis, as a 'technology of the day' feature, as part of UNEP's outreach activities for the International Year on Biodiversity.³ At the time of

¹ <http://www.unep.org/dec/PDF/TechnicalTransferCBD.pdf>

² <http://www.cbd.int/programmes/cross-cutting/technology/search.aspx>.

³ See <http://www.unep.org/iyb/technology.asp>

preparation of this report, work is under way to integrate these technologies into the online database of available technologies and to prepare offline dissemination.

8. As one concrete activity towards enhancing the clearing-house mechanism, decision IX/14 requested the Executive Secretary to compile and analyse information and good practices on the process of identifying modes of cooperation on science, technology and innovation, technologies, technology needs assessments and existing technology transfer agreements (paragraph 4). This work has been initiated and is being pursued on an ongoing basis.

9. In addition to recommendation 3/11 of the third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, addressing the further consideration of the biodiversity technology initiative pursuant to paragraphs 5 to 7 of decision IX/14, the Conference of the Parties may wish to welcome the support provided by UNEP and its Bali Strategic Plan, and may wish to invite UNEP to continue its cooperation with the Executive Secretary in providing support to the implementation of the programme of work on technology transfer and cooperation.

III. SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIODIVERSITY

10. At its fourteenth meeting, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, based on document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/7, discussed a recommendation to the Conference of Parties to convene an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Agriculture and Forestry, including Non-Timber Forest Products. Discussion on this item was inconclusive, and the recommendation as well as draft terms of reference were placed in square brackets (recommendation XIV/6).

11. SBSTTA-14 requested the Executive Secretary to solicit views from Parties and relevant international organizations on the draft terms of reference for the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group, and to submit revised terms of reference to the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting, based on the views received. Given the range and sometimes contradictory nature of received comments, the Executive Secretary has prepared the following section to outline the background and rationale behind the creation of an expert group based on the in-depth review (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/7); give a summary of comments received from Parties and relevant international organizations on the draft terms of reference; and, based on these comments, propose general elements of terms of reference for an expert group, for consideration by the Parties.

A. *Background and rationale for an expert group on sustainable use of biodiversity in agriculture and forestry*

12. The in-depth review of activities on sustainable use of biodiversity and Article 10 (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/7), scheduled for the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, analyzed four main sectors which use and impact biodiversity: agriculture, fisheries/aquaculture, forestry and hunting. This approach was supported by the majority of fourth national reports, which specifically referred to these four sectors when reporting on the implementation of goal 4 of the 2010 Strategic Plan (promotion of sustainable use and consumption). The review found that unsustainable use in these sectors remains a major cause of biodiversity loss, and that the lack of integration of biodiversity concerns into sectoral policies and practice (such as the lack of standards and policies, and criteria and indicators to assess implementation) is a major obstacle to achieving the objectives of the Convention. In particular,

agricultural expansion (as the major cause of biodiversity loss in tropical forest) and capture fisheries⁴ are of key concern. The review also concluded that the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines, as the main guidance on sustainable use of biodiversity produced by the Convention, has not had relevant impact on the sustainable use practices and policies of the above mentioned sectors (with the exception of hunting).

13. SBSTTA-14 focused its discussions with regard to a possible expert group on forestry and agriculture, given that a possible expert group on fisheries was being discussed separately under agenda item 3.1.3 (in-depth review of the programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity). Forest and agricultural ecosystems together cover around 64 per cent of all land area, with forests covering 31 per cent and agriculture covering 33 per cent. Forests alone are home to an estimated 50-90 per cent of all terrestrial species.

14. Several targets of the draft post-2010 Strategic Plan refer to sustainable use of biodiversity, while target 7 explicitly states that by 2020, all areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed according to sustainability criteria. The use of sustainability criteria and indicators in the relevant sectors will thus be important for measuring progress towards the post-2010 Strategic Plan, and implementation of the Strategic Plan will require strong participation and ownership from the relevant sectors.

15. The main goal of establishing an expert group (as an AHTEG or in a different format) is to engage the main economic sectors, and their fora and actors at global and regional level, in a constructive dialogue with the Convention on Biological Diversity, leading to greater integration of biodiversity concerns into sustainable use policies and practice. This would entail working with main sectoral actors, such as the FAO Committees on Agriculture (COAG), Fisheries (COFI), and Forestry (COFO), as well as key private sector associations. It is expected that this debate would result in improvements in sectoral policies, as well as in the identification of relevant criteria and indicators (possibly based on already existing ones) for measuring the achievement of target 7 of the draft post-2010 Strategic Plan of the Convention. The magnitude and complexity of the agriculture, forestry, and fisheries/aquaculture sectors, justify an expert group that specifically addresses indicators related to these sectors for target 7, in addition to other possible indicators that might be identified for the post-2010 Strategic Plan.

B. Comments from Parties and relevant organizations on the draft AHTEG Terms of Reference

16. Notification 2010-115 was posted on 9 June 2010, requesting Parties and relevant organizations to provide comments on the draft Terms of Reference in SBSTTA recommendation XIV/6, by 15 July 2010. Comments were received from 6 parties⁵ (including the European Union on behalf of its 27 member States) and 12 international organizations.⁶

17. Several submissions suggested explicitly including specific global networks, organizations, and databases in the effort, including indigenous and local communities, the CBD Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, the CBD Liaison Group on Bushmeat, the African Forest Forum, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators

⁴ UNGA resolution 59/24 established an Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group to study issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction.

⁵ Argentina, Australia, Canada, European Union, Morocco, and Switzerland.

⁶ CITES, CGIAR, ELN-FAB, IUCN, IRTA (Research and Technology, Food and Agriculture), ITTO, TRAFFIC, UNEP-WCMC, UNFF, WWF, the University of Bristol Water and Environmental Management Research Centre, and BioNET-NAFRINET.

Partnership, and the World Agroforestry Centre. Involvement of specific global networks and policy fora might need to be weighed against the need for effectiveness and efficiency.

18. Several Parties and organizations stressed the importance of ensuring a wide ranging consultation process that includes relevant agencies and processes. The establishment of a joint AHTEG with the relevant Committees and bodies of FAO, and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources (ITPGRFA) and the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA) was proposed. In addition, global research networks such as CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research) should be involved.

19. Several submitters emphasized the importance of not duplicating existing efforts, but rather considering and building upon findings of previous and ongoing work, and to start the work of the group by identifying any gaps in existing policies.

20. A series of suggestions to alter or broaden the scope of the AHTEG were submitted, and these include focusing on: (i) the fisheries sector, in addition to forestry and agriculture sectors; (ii) the impacts of industrial expansion (e.g. oil, gas, mining, and large infrastructure projects) and population growth (encroachment onto natural habitats) on agricultural and forested lands; (iii) identifying ways and means to promote sustainable use in degraded areas where biological diversity and ecosystem services have been reduced; (iv) developing recommendations for the improvement of benefit-sharing systems for local communities and the protection of indigenous and local community rights, within national biodiversity and social strategies and policies; (v) providing guidance and case-studies of how the Recommendations towards a more sustainable use of bushmeat from the CBD Liaison Group on Bushmeat can be implemented at the national and regional international level by Parties to the Convention; (vi) the links between ecosystem functions and ecosystem services across agricultural and forestry landscapes.

21. However, the in-depth review found that efforts to improve integration of biodiversity concerns into economic sectors are only successful if they are highly targeted and fully engage key actors, which would favor a focused approach as outlined below.

C. Proposed elements of an expert group

22. Based on the views and comments received, and with a view to keep the work of an expert group (i) efficient and manageable, taking into account the limit of an AHTEG to 30 experts, and (ii) effective, taking into account the need to fully engage with key fora for the economic sectors, notably the FAO Committees, and (iii) sufficiently focused to produce a meaningful outcome, it is proposed that revised terms of reference could include the following elements.

Phased approach – reporting and timeframe

23. The expert group would report to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties on its findings related to agriculture and to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties on its findings related to forestry. This stepwise approach would ensure that (i) different experts could be invited to cover agriculture or forestry aspects (while there may be some overlap in experts), and (ii) that the workload for the Secretariat and key partners, notably FAO, remains manageable. Findings should also be presented at relevant sectoral meetings, in particular FAO COFO and COAG sessions.

Goal

24. An overall goal of the expert group for forests could be to review relevant criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management (SFM), including in the context of recent policy developments such as the discussions on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, as well as other guidance

/...

at the international and regional levels, and identify any gaps in terms of meeting target 7 of the draft post-2010 Strategic Plan. This work should build on the work of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) and its members. An overall goal of the expert group for agriculture could be to review relevant criteria and indicators, including relevant socio-economic indicators linked to biodiversity, for sustainable agriculture (with a focus on good agricultural practice), and identify any gaps in terms of meeting target 7 of the draft post-2010 Strategic Plan.

Participation

25. The added value of the expert group would lie in engaging key actors at the global level, such as COFO and COAG and others. The Conference of the Parties might consider to request the Executive Secretary to explore options to convene the expert group jointly with FAO and its relevant Committees and bodies, notably COFO and COAG, also taking into account relevant international treaties in this context including the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources (ITPGR), and also involving the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA).

26. Given the critical role played by industry in agriculture and forestry, the AHTEG could specifically invite significant trade associations to ensure that the resulting guidelines and policy recommendations are supported by relevant stakeholders. Likewise, the full and effective participation of Indigenous Peoples and local community organizations and representatives is essential, to ensure that results produced by the expert group are conform with Article 10(c) and Article 8(j) of the Convention, and related decisions of the Conference of the Parties.

Outputs

27. Outputs of the expert group may include, *inter alia*, CBD Technical Series reports on sustainable use in agriculture and forestry, which would: (i) take stock of existing policy provisions and market mechanisms on sustainable use (e.g. SFM, organic agriculture, certification, etc.), (ii) identify any gaps in relation to provisions under the Convention on Biological Diversity, both in terms of policy and in terms of implementation, and (iii) develop recommendations to international actors and relevant organizations (including the private sector) on how these gaps in policy and implementation could be addressed, i.e. how biodiversity concerns can be better reflected in the policies and actions of the two most relevant sectors, and (iv) identify suitable criteria and indicators for the achievement of sustainable use targets (notably target 7) of the post-2010 Strategic Plan.

IV. INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES

A. *Invasive alien species introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food*

28. In paragraph 17 of decision IX/4 B, the Executive Secretary was requested to develop, in collaboration with the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP) and other relevant organizations, practical tools to facilitate the implementation of the decisions of the Conference of the Parties on invasive alien species and the development and implementation of national invasive alien species strategies, taking into account the Guiding Principles (decision VI/23,⁷ annex) and, where appropriate, making use of, and referencing, the relevant guidance and tools developed through other relevant organizations.

⁷ One representative entered a formal objection during the process leading to the adoption of this decision and underlined that he did not believe that the Conference of the Parties could legitimately adopt a motion or a text with a formal objection in place. A few representatives expressed reservations regarding the procedure leading to the adoption of this decision (see UNEP/CBD/COP/6/20, paras. 294-324).

29. The Executive Secretary in collaboration with GISP and with the kind financial contribution of the Government of Spain, published CBD Technical Series No. 48, “Best practices for addressing the risks associated with the introduction of alien species as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food” taking into account the on-going discussion on the Strategic Plan of the Convention beyond 2010, as a practical tool to facilitate implementation by compiling submissions of best practices from Parties and organizations. This publication also provides information on examples of ways and means to prevent the risks associated with invasive alien species introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, as live bait and live food for the *Ad Hoc* Technical Expert Group established by SBSTTA at its fourteenth meeting (recommendations XIV/13 A.).

B. Collaboration with international agreements and organizations on invasive alien species to address gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework

30. In paragraphs 1 to 6 of decision IX/4 A, the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) were invited to address particular aspects of the gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework.

31. In addition, through paragraph 11-13 of decision IX/4 A, the Executive Secretary was requested to: continue to collaborate with the secretariats of these organizations as well as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO) to address the of the gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework and to collaborate on capacity-building. The Executive Secretary was also requested to explore the extent to which existing international instruments recognize and address threats from invasive alien genotypes.

32. Pursuant to decision IX/4, the Executive Secretary established an inter-agency liaison group on invasive alien species (Liaison Group) in accordance with the modus operandi adopted in decision IV/16 section IV, paragraph 9⁸ in order to address the gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework identified in decision VIII/27. The following international organizations were invited to participate in the liaison group:

- (a) The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC);
- (b) The World Organization for Animal Health (OIE);
- (c) The Committee on Fisheries (COFI), a subsidiary body of the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) Council (COFI);
- (d) The World Trade Organization (WTO);
- (e) The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO);
- (f) The International Maritime Organization (IMO);
- (g) The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES);

⁸ To facilitate the preparation of documentation, and in order to avoid duplication of efforts and ensure the use of available scientific, technical and technological competence available within international and regional organizations, including non-governmental organizations and scientific unions and societies, qualified in fields relating to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, the Executive Secretary may establish, in consultation with the Chairman and the other members of the Bureau of the Subsidiary Body, liaison groups, as appropriate. Such liaison groups will depend on the resources available.

- (h) The Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP);
- (i) The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).
- (j) Other organizations can be invited by the present liaison group listed above. For instance, Ramsar Convention, the World Customs Organization; the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations are considered to be invited taking into account the recommendations of SBSTTA XIV/13.

33. The first meeting of the Liaison Group took place at the headquarters of the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), Paris, on 17-18 June 2010, with participation of the following secretariats: CBD; OIE; IPPC; WTO; COFI-FAO; IMO; CITES; GISP and IUCN.

34. At the first meeting of the Liaison Group, participating Secretariats of the relevant organizations reaffirmed that collaboration would be needed to address the issue of invasive alien species and discussed the possible implementation of decisions IX/4 A and VIII/27 to further address the gaps and inconsistencies in the international framework with specific focus on introduction of invasive alien species. The Liaison Group considered the following issues, taking into account that the risks associated with the introduction of invasive alien species introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, as live bait and live food will be addressed under the Convention on Biological Diversity, drawing upon the experience of relevant international organizations such as the participating secretariats to the Liaison Group (SBSTTA recommendation XIV/13 annex):

- (a) The expansion of the actual coverage for terrestrial and aquatic plant pest by IPPC, with regard to invasive alien species which impact on biodiversity, within the mandate of the IPPC outlines;
- (b) The expansion of the OIE list of pathogens to include a wider range of diseases of animals, including diseases that solely affect wildlife;
- (c) The role that could be played by OIE in addressing species (i.e. invasive animals) that are not considered as causative agents of diseases within the OIE framework and confirmed that, currently, this area of work does not fall within the current mandate of OIE;
- (d) The relationship between the SPS Agreement and national measures taken to address risks from invasive alien species associated with international trade, including gaps in the mandates of the standard-setting organizations referenced in the Agreement;
- (e) The formalization by the FAO Committee on Fisheries of relevant technical guidance developed by the FAO secretariat concerning the introduction, for fisheries and aquaculture, of alien species.

35. The Liaison Group responded to the above 4(a)-(e):

- (a) The IPPC Secretariat is developing a discussion paper on the application of IPPC standards to the aquatic environment, which is being prepared for alternative consideration by the Commission for Phytosanitary Measures in response to paragraph 2 of decision IX/4 A and paragraph 14 and 60 of decision VIII/27;
- (b) In response to paragraph 3 (a) of decision IX/4 A and paragraph 14 of VIII/27, in consultation with interested stakeholders, the OIE might be asked to examine the OIE criteria for disease listing, and the availability of relevant expertise, to consider whether organisms causing diseases in wildlife are adequately considered;
- (c) The OIE will explore options for developing a paper examining the possibility of broadening its mandate to address animals that are potentially invasive where OIE could have a comparative advantage i.e. situations where OIE provides advice to organizations that regulate the

international movement of animals. Both this response and that in (b) above would take into account the “One Health” initiative, in response to paragraph 3 (b) of decision IX/4 A;

(d) Any WTO member could initiate a discussion in the Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures regarding national measures taken to address risks from invasive alien species associated with international trade, or regarding gaps in the mandates of the standard-setting organizations referenced in the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures. Relevant information has been made available to WTO members, in response to paragraph 4 of decision IX/4 A;

(e) In response to the invitation in paragraph 5 of decision IX/4 A and paragraphs 20-24 of VIII/27, the FAO Secretariat could explore bringing this issue to the attention of COFI (February 2011) and its Sub-Committees on Aquaculture and Fish Trade, for consideration and guidance of Members. One option could be to review and update relevant provisions of existing FAO Technical Guidelines under the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF), including the “Precautionary approach to capture fisheries and species introductions”(FAO 1996)⁹ and “Aquaculture Development 3. Genetic resource management” (FAO 2008)¹⁰ and other relevant material, for harmonization and more comprehensive coverage addressing aquatic animal introductions for aquaculture and fisheries, in all environments.

36. In response to paragraph 11 of decision IX/4 A, paragraph 21 of decision IX/4 B and in relevance to paragraphs 25-33 of VIII/27, the IMO Secretariat provided information about the work carried out by IMO to address the issue of bio-fouling of ships, which is identified as a current gap in the international regulatory framework for preventing the transfer of invasive species. The correspondence group established in this respect, will report on its work to the 15th session of the IMO Sub-Committee on Bulk Liquids and Gases that will take place in February 2011 and the first set of Guidelines for the control and management of ships’ bio-fouling to minimize the transfer of invasive aquatic species is expected to be approved by the Marine Environment Committee in July 2011. IMO will continue to collaborate with the Secretariat of the Convention and other interested organizations to address the issue of invasive species in ships’ ballast water and support its Member States in their efforts to implement the existing international regulatory framework.

37. In response to paragraph 11 of IX/4 A, CITES continues its collaboration with the Convention on Biological Diversity to explore additional means to address invasive alien species of relevance to international trade in CITES-listed species, including the: CITES’s legally-binding regulatory scheme for ensuring that trade is legal, sustainable and traceable; CITES trade database; Information and Knowledge Management initiative for assisting States-Parties to multilateral environmental agreements; national policy and legislative support provided to CITES Parties under the Convention; and cooperation within the Biodiversity Liaison Group as well as the Environment Management Group.

38. The threat from invasive alien genotypes was raised at the first meeting of the Liaison Group by Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. However, this issue needs to be further clarified by the members of Liaison Group and if necessary in consultancy with international legal experts.

39. The Liaison Group reiterated the need for capacity development to address the impact of invasive species on biodiversity and agreed to explore the possibility of collaborating to facilitate the implementation of existing international instruments relevant to invasive species issue.

⁹ FAO 1996. Precautionary approach to capture fisheries and species introductions. FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries. No. 2. Rome, FAO. 54p. Also available at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/003/w3592e/w3592e00.htm>

¹⁰ FAO. 2008. Aquaculture development. 3. Genetic resource management. FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries. No. 5, Suppl. 3. Rome, FAO. 125p. Also available at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/i0283e/i0283e00.htm>

D. Invasive alien species and island biodiversity

40. Pursuant to decision IX/4 and IX/21 for island biodiversity, the Executive Secretary in collaboration with the department of conservation of New Zealand, the Global Island Partnership/The Nature Conservancy, the Pacific Invasive Initiative, Global Invasive Species Programme and the International Union for Conservation (IUCN) held a workshop: Helping Islands Adapt: A Workshop on Regional Action to Combat Invasive Alien Species on Islands to Preserve Biodiversity and Adapt to Climate Change, on 11-16 April 2010, in Auckland, New Zealand, with financial contributions from the governments of Australia, France, Germany, Italy, New Zealand, Spain, United Kingdom and the organizations mentioned above. The workshop focussed on four major island regions, the Caribbean, the Coral Triangle, the Indian Ocean and the Pacific.

41. The outcome of the workshop included: (i) lessons from regional collaboration and coordination, (ii) actions to strengthen invasive alien species management, (iii) networks and resources to facilitate learning and implementation, (iv) key steps within international processes to catalyze and support regional efforts. The workshop provided a valuable guidance both to the programmes of work on invasive alien species and island biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/INF/29), in particular to the in-depth review of island biodiversity scheduled for SBSTTA-15 or 16, and the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and will also allow island Parties to review their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans in line with the Strategic Plan of the Convention beyond 2010 and the multi-year programme of work

V. GLOBAL TAXONOMY INITIATIVE

A. Progress on capacity-building to meet with taxonomic needs for the Convention

42. In paragraph 4 (c) of decision IX/22, the Executive Secretary was requested to report on the outcome-oriented deliverables contained in the annex to the same decision, and provision of information as appropriate in local languages including locally used names of species to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and to the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body of Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

43. In response to decision IX/22, the recent progress on outcome oriented deliverables was monitored. Newly identified progress was in the following, in addition to the information provided in the annex to UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/15:

(a) *Output 1.1.2*, National needs assessment was completed in Ghana in collaboration with Natural History Museum in the United Kingdom;

(b) *Output 2.6.2*, BioNET INTERNATIONAL LOOPS supported engagement of taxonomic institutions to the Convention on Biological Diversity, *i.e.* the newly-formed ATUTAX (Association Tunisienne de Taxonomie) has been promoting taxonomy for the Convention in North African sub-region; the Institute of Biology, Mongolia Academy of Sciences (BioNET-Mongolia Coordinating Institute), has launched an e-newsletter on "Biodiversity, taxonomy, science and technology";

(c) *Output 2.6.3.*, Consortium for the Barcode of Life and International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) held a workshop on a DNA barcoding project in Kenya to establish a regional hub for Barcode of Life in Eastern Africa subregion;

(d) *Output 4.13.2.*, Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) and International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (ICTA) evaluated the species occurrence data available through GBIF, and they explored the use of predictive models for plant distribution in response to climate change;

(e) *Output 5.16.1 and Output 5.16.8.*, CABI invasive species compendium was developed

/...

by CAB International in close collaboration with the United States Department of Agriculture. The compendium will be freely accessible on web within 2010;¹¹

(f) *Output 5.19.1*, GBIF, in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC, developed a web interface to search and present species occurrence records on a map for protected areas of the world;

(g) With regard to information in local languages, the Chinese Academy of Sciences has produced a checklist in English and Chinese to add information to the Catalogue of Life and GBIF. Further, GBIF provides its interfaces in multiple languages including Korean, French and Spanish.

B. Coordination mechanism for the Global Taxonomy Initiative

44. In the margins of SBSTTA14, the GTI Coordination Mechanism (CM) and the Secretariat organized a GTI Symposium: “Taking Stock of the Renaissance in Taxonomy: Post 2010 Capacity-Building for the Convention on Biological Diversity” at UNON, Nairobi Kenya.

45. The CM collected information on (i) innovative technologies to facilitate the implementation of the programme of work for the GTI, (ii) progress of regional collaborations in taxonomy, (iii) maximizing the use of outcome oriented deliverables for the GTI and (iv) promotion of biodiversity research in the context of on-going negotiation with the international regime on access and benefit-sharing under the Convention through the symposium, and held ninth meeting of the GTI CM to consider strategies of capacity building in taxonomy beyond 2010.

46. The CM identified a number of information resources of the GTI which can assist reporting on biodiversity in various thematic programmes and cross-cutting issues of the Convention, and submitted information to WGRI-3 on further development and elaboration of goals and targets for the strategic plan beyond 2010 (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/INF/15).

47. In response to IX/22 paragraph 7, the CM suggested that a full day face-to-face meeting of the CM should be organized to produce detailed planned activities and outputs for island biodiversity and protected areas to fully develop the programme of work of the Initiative and this process needs to be done with full participation of the members of CM.

48. The CM strongly recognized that the decrease in taxonomy experts is accelerated in both developed and developing countries. Nonetheless, the required coordination of GTI related projects to facilitate international collaboration and to mobilize funds has been rather slow. The CM suggested that it should strive further to elaborate clear terms of reference, as well as inviting new members and involve more partners to take steps more proactively.

49. The CM considered that the role of Consortium of Science Partnership on Biodiversity (CSP) is highly relevant to GTI and betters the organization of business among the institutions of CSP under the Convention on Biological Diversity. Seeking new and appropriate partners to invite to the CSP and appropriate collaboration between GTI CM and CSP are necessary.

C. Access and benefit-sharing for non-commercial research on biodiversity

50. Pursuant to decision IX/12 on access and benefit sharing, the relevant organizations to GTI submitted information to promote non-commercial research on biodiversity, taking into account the nature of taxonomic work which requires trans-boundary movement of specimens and related materials, in the process of international collaboration to generate information and knowledge on biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/WG-ABS/7/INF/6, UNEP/CBD/WG-ABS/8/INF/6, UNEP/CBD/WG-ABS/9/INF/15)

¹¹ www.cabi.org/default.aspx?site=170&page=1016&pid=2225

51. Further discussion about non-commercial research on biodiversity was organized by CSP and the Secretariat on 22 July 2010, in Paris and recommendations are submitted to the Secretariat as an information document, to ensure that generation of taxonomic knowledge, securing identification and monitoring capacity (Article 7) at the national level for all countries will be achieved.

VI. INCENTIVE MEASURES

52. This section amends document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/24 by covering activities undertaken by partner organizations and initiatives as well as the Executive Secretary pursuant to decision IX/6 and earlier decisions on incentive measures which were not considered by the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

A. *Further work on valuation: activities by partners*

53. In paragraph 8 of decision IX/6, the Conference of the Parties welcomed the initiative launched at the G-8 meeting of environmental ministers in Potsdam, Germany, in March 2007, to develop a study on the economic cost of the global loss of biodiversity, and the work of Germany and the European Commission to implement this activity in form of an international study on ‘The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity’.

54. The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) study, funded by the European Commission, Germany, United Kingdom, Norway, the Netherlands and Sweden, and managed by the United Nations Environment Programme as part of its Green Economy Initiative (GEI),¹² draws attention to the global economic benefits of biodiversity, highlights the growing costs of biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation, and draws together expertise from the fields of science, economics and policy in order to enable practical actions moving forward. Phase II of the TEEB initiative was launched after the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and initiated work on a number of reports geared towards specific audiences. These reports will be finalized in time for the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Summary documents and the full report will be made available at www.teebweb.org as they are released and, unless indicated otherwise, will be published by Earthscan in 2011.

(a) A first version of the TEEB report for policy-makers was released in November 2009 and an updated version will be published by Earthscan in early 2011. The report demonstrates the economic value of ecosystems and biodiversity as underpinning economies, societies and individual well-being. The report identifies two key challenges and associated needs for action: (i) to understand the values of natural capital and better integrate them into decision-making, including by extending national income accounts and other accounting systems to take the value of nature into account and monitor how natural assets depreciate or grow; and (ii) to respond efficiently and equitably by applying existing and emerging policy solutions suitable for wider replication;

(b) The TEEB for Business report was released on 13 July 2010. This report provides practical guidance on the issues and the opportunities arising from including ecosystem- and biodiversity-related considerations into mainstream business practices;

(c) The TEEB for Local and Regional Policy report will be released on 9 September 2010. This report, by giving practical guidance on how to deal with the challenge of biodiversity loss at a local and regional level, is planned to be a useful advisory tool for local and regional policymakers, administrators and managers, and will also be of interest to non-governmental organizations, regulatory bodies, permitting agencies and the judicial system;

¹² <http://www.unep.org/greeneconomy/>.

(d) The TEEB activity for Citizens and Consumers is currently planned to go live from September 2010. This will include a website, video content, social media activity and brochures;

(e) The TEEB Synthesis Report will be launched at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties meeting in Nagoya. This document will draw together key conclusions and recommendations from across the reports delivered in the TEEB study;

(f) These reports are underpinned by a volume on the Ecological and Economic foundations of TEEB, a first version of which is available online and the Earthscan publication of this volume will be released in Nagoya, in October 2010.¹³ Prepared by a group of eminent ecologists as well as environmental and resource economists, this report includes an analysis of the state of the art regarding valuation methodologies, thereby responding to an earlier encouragement of the Conference of the Parties to strengthen research activities including research cooperation and exchange in order to promote a common understanding of valuation techniques among Governments and stakeholders (decision VIII/25, paragraph 7).

55. A regional initiative has been initiated by the United Nations Development Programme in 2008 to highlight the critical role of biodiversity and ecosystems for economic development in Latin America and the Caribbean. Entitled "*Biodiversity and Ecosystems: Why these are important for Sustained Growth and Equity in Latin America and the Caribbean*", the initiative seeks to produce a report which shall inform and engage decision-makers in the region on the need to maintain, and invest in, ecosystems and biodiversity. The report will be released prior to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

56. In decision VIII/25, on valuation tools, the Conference of the Parties encouraged research institutions to strengthen research activities including research cooperation and exchange on, *inter alia*, the integration of the values of biodiversity resources and functions and associated ecosystem services into national accounting and decision-making, taking into account the conceptual framework of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (paragraph 7 (a)). Responding to this encouragement, work was initiated by the European Environmental Agency (EEA) with UNEP to develop a Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services (CICES) as a tool to standardize and translate between the different ecosystem service classifications that are emerging as part of the follow-up process to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, and in particular for the revision of the United Nations System of Integrated Environmental and Economic Accounting (SEEA 2003).¹⁴ Two expert workshops were held in December 2008 and 2009 and an online forum for further exchange of views and development of the draft classification was established.¹⁵ A first version of CICES was sent by EEA to the United Nations Statistics Division for consideration in spring 2010 and then presented by EEA in June 2010 at the United Nations Conference of Economic and Environmental Accounting (UNCEEAA).

B. Further work on valuation: activities by the Executive Secretary

57. The Executive Secretary cooperated closely with the aforementioned organizations and initiatives in undertaking the activities described. In addition, in paragraph 12 of decision IX/6, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to identify options for effectively communicating the results of assessments of biodiversity values, with a view to informing consumer decisions and policy action on incentive measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and/or the removal of perverse incentive measures. Accordingly, the Executive Secretary identified options for pertinent activities, which

¹³ <http://www.teebweb.org/EcologicalandEconomicFoundation/tabid/1018/language/en-US/Default.aspx> .

¹⁴ <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/envaccounting/seea.asp> .

¹⁵ <http://cices.eu/> .

were included in the implementation strategy for the International Year on Biodiversity 2010.¹⁶ Activities undertaken in close cooperation with relevant partner organizations and initiatives include:

(a) Close cooperation in conceptualizing and preparing a miniseries on BBC World News on the economic value of nature. The mini-series, entitled 'Nature Inc.', is currently in its second phase, and has been taken over by a number of other broadcasters. A website has been set up as an additional tool for outreach and awareness-raising;¹⁷

(b) Close coordination with, and support provided to, TEEB with a view to assist in the effective dissemination of TEEB results to the various target audiences, in particular local and national policy-makers; the business community, and citizen/consumers, including the inclusion of TEEB results into relevant documentation for meetings of the Convention on Biological Diversity, whenever relevant, and TEEB representation at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

(c) Cooperation with, and support provided to, the UNDP initiative with a view to ensure that regional focal points are fully aware of this initiative and its expected results.

58. In paragraph 11 of decision IX/6, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary, in cooperation with relevant organizations and initiatives, to examine the international dimension of how monitoring can support the implementation of valuation tools and positive incentive measures. In response to this request, the Executive Secretary initiated cooperation with the World Conservation Monitoring Centre of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP-WCMC) and the examination was included in WCMC's multi-year programme of work to assist in the implementation of the decisions of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The results of the examination are made available as an information document. The document reviews the current work of a number of international initiatives working in the field, including the possible sector-specific application of positive incentive measures.

59. The document also identifies critical areas for further work, such as: (i) the mainstreaming of the methodologies associated with ecosystem service mapping, including issues of governance, into the design and implementation of positive incentive measures; (ii) the development of valuation base maps/datasets for existing benefits streams, as a valuable indication of the relative value of the underlying ecosystems; (iii) horizon scanning in order to identify what novel positive incentive measures are likely to be employed, or to be employed more, in the future, and the underpinning monitoring activities which would be required for their effective implementation, making for instance use of the information provided by Parties in the fifth national report; (iv) further conceptual work on the development of 'linked' positive incentive measures which tackle cross-sectoral and cross-ecosystem issues and foster an appreciation of bundles of ecosystem services, taking into account for instance the work of the World Resources Institute (WRI) on stacking payments for ecosystem services; (v) more work on the linkages between marine and terrestrial ecosystems, in order to analyse for example how certain land-based positive incentive measures might impact linked marine components, and to explore and develop models addressing reflect the complex interlinkages, interdependencies and trade-offs among marine and terrestrial ecosystems, taking into account for instance the ARIES work and the marine extensions planned for the InVEST model of the Natural Capital Project.¹⁸

¹⁶ <http://www.cbd.int/iyb/doc/iyb-implementation-plan-en.pdf> .

¹⁷ <http://www.natureinc.org/home.htm> .

¹⁸ <http://www.naturalcapitalproject.org/InVEST.html> .

C. Further work on positive incentive measures: activities by partners

60. Decision IX/6 invited the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Environment Programme, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and other national, regional, and international organizations and initiatives to undertake further studies on payments for ecosystem services and other positive incentive measures at local, national, regional and international levels, their advantages as well as their potential limitations and risks, their cost-effectiveness, potential implications for biodiversity and indigenous and local communities, and their consistency with other international obligations (paragraph 15).

61. FAO is continuing work on assessing positive incentive measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within and outside agricultural systems. In 2009, FAO published “Seed Trade in Rural Markets: Implications for Crop Diversity and Agricultural Development”¹⁹ that describes the results of five country case-studies assessing how seed supply in local agricultural markets affects the farm level incentives for managing crop genetic diversity. FAO is also continuing work on the potential of payments for ecosystem services to promote positive incentives for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. FAO is currently developing a methodology for the rapid appraisal of PES feasibility in agricultural landscapes that was recently field tested in Bhutan.²⁰ FAO is also preparing a paper for release in October 2010 entitled “The place of PES in promoting sustainable agricultural development” that summarizes the experiences so far with PES in agricultural systems and assesses the extent to which this instrument could be an important lever for promoting sustainable agricultural systems. The paper provides an analysis of the potential role of this policy instrument in promoting sustainable agricultural production systems, placing PES within the overall menu of policy options to promote sustainable agricultural system

62. The Biotrade Initiative of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development initiated work analyzing incentive measures in the context of regional or national biotrade programmes. A workshop held on 24-25 November 2009 in Geneva convened experts from relevant international organizations and representatives from national or regional trade programmes. The meeting reviewed a number of case-studies on regional or national biotrade programmes and associated incentive measures, commissioned by UNCTAD (in Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Malawi, and Namibia), and also addressed, as requested by decision IX/6, the interrelationship between incentive measures provided under Biotrade programmes and relevant provisions of the World Trade Organization. At the time of preparation of this report, a compilation of case-studies on positive incentive measures in the context of regional or national biotrade programmes is being finalized by the UNCTAD Biotrade Initiative and will be circulated as an information document.

63. Responding to the invitation of decision IX/6, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and its Working Group on Economic Aspects of Biodiversity (WGEAB)²¹ organized a series of workshops addressing pertinent issues, and prepared related analytical documentation:

(a) Workshop on incentives to capture biodiversity and carbon benefits for reducing deforestation, 26 March 2008;

¹⁹ <http://www.earthscan.co.uk/?tabid=92750>

²⁰ <http://www.fao.org/es/esa/pesal/PESmaterials0.html>

²¹ As of January 2011, by decision of OECD’s Environmental Policy Committee (EPOC), the Working Group on Economic Aspects of Biodiversity (WGEAB) will be merged with OECD’s work on water, currently undertaken under the Working Party on Global and Structural Policies, to form an upgraded Working Party on Biodiversity, Water and Ecosystems.

(b) Workshop on innovative international financing for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, 2 July 2009;

(c) Workshop on enhancing the cost-effectiveness of payments for ecosystem services, 25 March 2010.

64. The first workshop also responded to the invitation of the Conference of the Parties to international organizations to ensure that possible actions for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries do not run counter to the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, but provide benefits for forest biodiversity and, where possible, to indigenous and local communities (decision IX/6, paragraph 5).

65. The following working papers or publications have been or will be released in time for the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity:

(a) OECD 2009: *Promoting Biodiversity Co-Benefits in REDD* [ENV/WKP(2009)6]. This paper examines how biodiversity co-benefits in REDD (reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries) can be enhanced at the design and implementation level, by discussing the potential biodiversity implications of different REDD design options and by examining how the creation of additional biodiversity-specific incentives could be used to co-finance a REDD mechanism;

(b) OECD 2010 (forthcoming working paper): *International Financing for Biodiversity Conservation: Overview of Innovative Approaches and Persistent Challenges*. This paper provides an overview of the topic, examines underlying principles for effective biodiversity finance, and also reviews three case-studies of private voluntary initiatives (bioprospecting, conservation concessions and biodiversity offsets);

(c) OECD 2010 (forthcoming publication). *Paying for Biodiversity: Enhancing the Cost-Effectiveness of Payments for Ecosystem Services*. Drawing on the literature on efficient PES and a number of case-studies, this book identifies and reviews good practices in the design and implementation of payments for ecosystem services (PES) programmes in order to understand how to best enhance their cost-effectiveness.

66. Detailed information on OECD workshops, reports and other publications can be retrieved from the OECD website, under the ‘Biodiversity, Water and Natural Resource Management’ entry.²²

67. Addressing specifically the international dimension of the invitation expressed in decision IX/6, the United Nations Environment Programme, IUCN – the World Conservation Union, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, supported by the Government of The Netherlands, established a ‘Green Development Mechanism 2010’ initiative, which aims to develop and propose an innovative financial mechanism to create enabling conditions for increased private sector support for the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity. It seeks to mobilize private sector finance to mitigate biodiversity loss, much as the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) has done to mitigate climate change. The dedicated website as well as the information document submitted by the initiative provides more information on the initiative and its recent activities.²³

68. The TEEB report for policy-makers, referenced in paragraph 54 above, contains, in chapter 5, a detailed analysis of payments for ecosystem services and other positive incentive measures. A first

²² http://www.oecd.org/document/34/0,3343,en_2649_34285_44724002_1_1_1_1,00.html

²³ <http://gdm.earthmind.net/>.

version of the report was published 13 November 2009; at the time of preparation of this report, this version was under review for finalization and publication by early 2011.²⁴

69. The report of UNDP regional initiative for Latin America and the Caribbean, referenced in paragraph 26 above, will also include analyses of payments for ecosystem services and other positive incentive measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity applied in the region.

70. In paragraph 13 of decision IX/6, the Conference of the Parties invited the UNCTAD Biotrade Initiative to continue its work on trade promotion for biodiversity-based products which are produced in a sustainable manner and compatible with the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, through capacity-building, enhancing market access, promoting enabling environments and engaging relevant public and private actors. In addition to the activities summarized in paragraph 62 above, the UNCTAD Biotrade Initiative has continued its work in enhancing trade opportunities for sustainable products of biodiversity, by providing capacity building on issues such as sanitary and phytosanitary measures, good agricultural production practices and sustainable management plans for certain natural ingredients value chains; and by facilitating dialogue between producing and importing countries on development-friendly trade-policy making as related to biotrade products and services. A series of training modules on BioTrade were delivered in Peru in collaboration with local universities and research institutions. After this initial testing, the training modules are currently being revised and upscaled in order to develop post-graduate academic curricula on BioTrade and sustainable use tools and methodologies, including an e-learning platform. Furthermore, the UNCTAD Biotrade Initiative has set up two industry platforms with cosmetics and fashion companies that shall assist at establishing collaborative channels throughout their value chains and with governmental entities for the formulation and implementation of positive economic incentive measures for biotrade activities worldwide.

D. Further work on positive incentive measures: activities by the Executive Secretary

71. In paragraph 15 of decision IX/6, the Conference of the Parties also requested the Executive Secretary to encourage the further studies on payments for ecosystem services and other positive incentive measures to be undertaken by the referenced organizations and initiatives (see the language provided in paragraph 31). Accordingly, the Executive Secretary cooperated closely with the organizations and initiatives in undertaking the activities described in the previous subsection.

72. Document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/24 describes the activities undertaken by the Executive Secretary pursuant to paragraphs 6 and 7 of decision IX/6, pertaining to the organization on the international expert workshop on the removal and mitigation of perverse, and the promotion of positive, incentive measures, as well to paragraph 16 of SBSTTA recommendation XIV/15. Many of the aforementioned organizations and initiatives also contributed to this work.

E. Suggested way ahead

73. SBSTTA recommendation XIV/15 already includes, in paragraph 12, a recommendation to welcome the work of international organizations, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and its initiative on the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB), and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), IUCN – The World Conservation Union, as well as other international organizations and initiatives, and to invite them to continue and intensify this work with a view to raise awareness on, and promote common understanding of, the removal or mitigation of perverse

²⁴ See also <http://www.teebweb.org/ForPolicyMakers/tabid/1019/language/en-US/Default.aspx>.

incentives, the promotion of positive incentive measures, and the assessment of the values of biodiversity and ecosystem services. The Conference of the Parties may wish to consider amending this paragraph, as appropriate, in light of the information provided in the present section, by welcoming the pertinent work of partner organizations and taking note of the work of the Executive Secretary.
