

**INFORMAL REVIEW OF RESOURCES ESTIMATES PREPARED FOR  
THE REPORT OF THE HIGH-LEVEL PANEL ON GLOBAL ASSESSMENT OF RESOURCES FOR  
IMPLEMENTING THE  
STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020  
(UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/20)**

### COMMENTS FROM INFORMAL REVIEW OF ESTIMATES

Target/ Cluster of Targets	Methodology	Gaps	Magnitude of results	Areas of possible underestimate/overestimate	Possible areas of future research
Target 1	Reasonable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of the importance of awareness-raising among the general public.</li> </ul>	Appropriate, but with possible underestimates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity development process (possible underestimate).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline study of awareness in a number of countries to identify key audiences and aspects of biodiversity awareness.</li> </ul>
Target 2	Reasonable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Estimates of certain cost categories.</li> </ul>	Possible underestimate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National assessments (possible underestimate).</li> <li>Integration (possible underestimate).</li> <li>Accounting and reporting (possible overestimate).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments.</li> </ul>
Target 3	Reasonable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Estimates of certain cost categories.</li> </ul>	Mostly appropriate but with possible underestimates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy actions/implementation (possible underestimate)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments.</li> </ul>
Target 4	Differing interpretations of levels of action required to achieve Target.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of plans and strategies for SCP vs. cost of achievement of SCP itself.</li> </ul>	Possible underestimate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of action required indicated possible underestimate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments.</li> </ul>
Target 6	Reasonable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of fisheries profitability.</li> </ul>	Appropriate based on methodology but possible overestimate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costing fishing fleet reduction (possible overestimate).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on profitability including empirical and behavioural methods.</li> </ul>
Target 7 (aquaculture)	Reasonable but lacking in key areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of sustainable aquaculture and aquaculture profitability.</li> </ul>	Unclear.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on production economics, estimates of externalities, and options for costing improved sustainability.</li> </ul>
Target 7 - [agriculture component])	Differing interpretations of levels of action required to achieve Target.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of biodiversity within agricultural systems or food security and linkages between biodiversity and</li> </ul>	Possible underestimate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs associated with achieving agricultural sustainability not included.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summarizing work on biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in agricultural systems to support agricultural growth, development and</li> </ul>

		<p>sustainable agriculture.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of both wild biodiversity and domestic/cultivated agro-biodiversity.</li> </ul>			<p>food security and identify key aspects that differ from conventional agricultural growth patterns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summarizing the work on agricultural investment requirements for intensification/food security/growth and identifying what additional resources would be required to achieve sustainable agricultural systems (based on analysis in 2).</li> </ul>
Invasive alien species (Target 9)	Reasonable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of costs of mitigation/remediation and damage costs, particularly those associated with pathway management.</li> <li>• Costs (to government and users) of developing incentives for the avoidance/responsible management of potential IAS.</li> </ul>	Possible underestimate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omission of costs on pathway management as well as projections of introductions based on increases in global trade and expected damage costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs of IAS control and priorities for funding as well as development of more accurate regional estimates of IAS expenditures and cost needs.</li> <li>• Investigate the implications for actions to manage international trade/travel pathways.</li> <li>• Use expected marginal damage cost to compute the warranted cost of pathway control measures.</li> </ul>
Water, pollution and ecosystem services (Targets 5, 8, 14)	Reasonable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of benefit transfer method.</li> </ul>	Appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments provided.</li> </ul>

Target 10	Reasonable based on task.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of assessment of how effective programs have been at protecting coral reefs.</li> <li>• Wastewater management costs.</li> </ul>	Appropriate, possible underestimate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current ICZM costing (possible underestimate) given potential for acidification effects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research into systematically estimating costs and benefits of establishing and operating MPAs.</li> </ul>
Forest-related (Targets 5, 7, 11 [forest component], 15)	Reasonable with some limitations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity on assumptions and underlying data.</li> </ul>	<p>Appropriate but with possible overestimates and underestimates in some areas.</p> <p>Efficiency gains could be significant in some areas resulting in lower estimate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible overestimate in need for investment proposed for biodiversity.</li> <li>• Possible overestimate in terms of costs of seeds, nurseries, tenure.</li> <li>• Costs of REDD+ (possible overestimate).</li> <li>• Protected areas (possible underestimate)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further research to deepen the rigour of the numbers through analysis of a broader range of literature</li> <li>• Opportunities to strengthen regulation/enforcement/incentives/institutional capacity/management.</li> </ul>
Target 11 (marine)	Reasonable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of problems of enforcement.</li> </ul>	Mostly appropriate but with possible underestimates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs of compliance by local communities not considered therefore overall costs could be an underestimate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs and benefits of establishing and operating MPAs through stratified sampling of MPAs from various ecoregions / countries at different stages of development.</li> </ul>
Target 11 (terrestrial - Ervin and Gidda)	Some limitations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calculation and use of a global average cost for establishing protected areas on land vs. analysis of gaps by ecoregion would enable a more accurate overall estimate.</li> </ul>	Unknown. Possible over/underestimate due to variances in cost acquisition of protected areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern regarding the cost of establishing protected areas on land and therefore the validity of the overall total cost.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments available.</li> </ul>
Target 12	No comments available.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments available.</li> </ul>	No comments available.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments available.</li> </ul>
Target 13	Some limitations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of specific nature of</li> </ul>	Unclear.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As outlined in gaps.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wider analysis of costs based on existing</li> </ul>

		<p>crop genetic resources and in situ conservation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration regarding cultured aquatic genetic resources and their wild relatives as well as forest genetic resources.</li> </ul>			<p>experience, an appropriate and validated conceptual framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs estimates for the development and implementation of national strategies and action plans for the management of animal genetic resources and cost estimates for national in situ conservation programmes should be investigated.</li> </ul>
Target 16	Reasonable but limited in some areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting activities may include some overlap.</li> <li>• Building the capacity of government agencies to monitor</li> </ul>	Likely underestimate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity development (possible underestimate)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research into current market value of products derived from national genetic resources in national and international markets, the institutions/organisations that added value to these products and the methods required and costs of improving their capacity.</li> </ul>
Target 17	Reasonable but with limitations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costing of commencing implementation.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	Possible underestimate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of focus on implementation costs means that total cost is possible underestimate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments provided.</li> </ul>
Target 18	Reasonable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of differences in existing capacity, geographical scale and size.</li> </ul>	Possible underestimate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of differences in existing capacity, geographical scale and size.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considerable further research is required on the evidence for costs.</li> <li>• Linkages across Targets and associated savings.</li> </ul>
Target 19	No comments available.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments available.</li> </ul>	No comments available.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments available.</li> </ul>
Target 20	Some limitations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of costs of preparation</li> </ul>	Underestimate as it is based on GEF 6 assessments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of upfront investment on global methodology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify challenges encountered in</li> </ul>

		of the national Resource Mobilisation Strategies and their implementation.		development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reduction in review to 4-5 year cycle could reduce costs.</li></ul>	developing methodologies for the assessments that underpin the Resource Mobilisation Strategies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Compile information on countries that have developed partial Resource Mobilisation Strategies.</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--	---