



**CONVENTION ON
BIOLOGICAL
DIVERSITY**



UNEP



WCMC



2010 - The Global Biodiversity Challenge

21 – 23 May 2003

London, United Kingdom

MEETING REPORT

ADVANCE COPY

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Mandate for the 2010 target.....	2
Background to the meeting.....	2
Preparation for the meeting	3
Programme of the meeting	4
Discussion and recommendations	4
<i>Definitions.....</i>	5
<i>Communication.....</i>	5
<i>Measurement and assessment needs.....</i>	6
<i>Indicators and indicator frameworks.....</i>	7
<i>Reporting.....</i>	9
<i>Building on existing mandates and processes.....</i>	11
<i>Understanding and applying multiple targets.....</i>	12
<i>Cross-sectoral collaboration.....</i>	13
<i>Capacity building and technical support.....</i>	14
<i>Funding.....</i>	14
<i>Partnerships.....</i>	14
Summary of key points	15
Next steps	16
<i>Follow-up.....</i>	16
<i>Recommendations specific to the CBD Secretariat.....</i>	16
<i>Recommendations specific to national governments.....</i>	17
<i>Recommendations specific to other organizations and initiatives.....</i>	17



Ministerie van
Buitenlandse Zaken



INTRODUCTION

1. The year 2002 was a very significant year for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity for two key reasons. Firstly the international community adopted the far-reaching goal of significantly reducing the rate of biodiversity loss by the year 2010, and secondly the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) recognised that biodiversity plays a critical role in achieving sustainable development and poverty eradication. WSSD also acknowledged the key role of the Convention on Biological Diversity in the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources.

2. In May 2003, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre and the United Nations Development Programme jointly convened a meeting to review the 2010 target with the aim of better understanding the target and how its achievement, or otherwise, could be assessed. This is the report of that meeting. Additional financial support for the meeting was provided by the Governments of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, and by the United Nations Environment Programme, and some participants were also supported by BirdLife International, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and The Nature Conservancy.

MANDATE FOR THE 2010 TARGET

3. The meeting was a direct response to *decision VI/26* adopted at the 6th meeting of the Conference of the Parties in April 2002. In that decision, the Conference of the Parties adopted the Strategic Plan for the Convention, which commits Parties to "*achieve by 2010 a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national level as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on earth*". The Strategic Plan also commits Parties to a more effective and coherent implementation of the three objectives of the Convention.

4. In addition, the Ministers responsible for the implementation of the Convention met on 17 and 18 April 2002 on the occasion of the 6th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to discuss *inter alia* the role and contribution of the Convention to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. In the resulting Ministerial Declaration, the Ministers resolved to "*strengthen ... efforts to put in place measures to halt biodiversity loss ... at the global, regional, sub-regional and national levels by the year 2010*" (paragraph 11). The Ministerial Declaration further called on the World Summit on Sustainable Development to "*reconfirm the commitment to have instruments in place to stop and reverse the current alarming biodiversity loss at the global, regional, sub-regional and national levels by the year 2010*" (paragraph 15d).

5. At the World Summit on Sustainable Development, which took place in Johannesburg, South Africa in August/September 2002, governments adopted a Plan of Implementation which reconfirmed the role of the Convention as the key instrument for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from its use. With respect to the 2010 target, the WSSD Plan of Implementation recognises that "*the achievement by 2010 of a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological diversity will require the provision of new and additional financial and technical resources*" (paragraph 44).

6. In addition to endorsing the 2010 target, the World Summit also recognised the critical role played by biodiversity in overall sustainable development and poverty eradication. With the UN Secretary General's WEHAB initiative, biodiversity concerns were squarely at the top of the sustainable development agenda. For the first time outside the context of the Convention, biodiversity was recognised, together with water, energy, health and agriculture as a basic necessity for life, leading to the

wider acceptance of the importance of biodiversity in achieving the Millennium Development Goals. This provides the basis for linking the 2010 target more effectively to the wider human development agenda.

BACKGROUND TO THE MEETING

7. While the international community had agreed that "biodiversity loss" constitutes a serious challenge at the global, regional and national levels, there is as yet no commonly agreed set of monitoring and assessment procedures or parameters that can be used to measure either how much biodiversity there is, nor how much is being lost at genetic, species or ecosystem levels.

8. The challenge posed by the 2010 target clearly underlines the need for effective and well-coordinated monitoring mechanisms, complemented by innovative assessment tools to facilitate the generation of consistent and comprehensive evaluation of progress towards the achievement of this target.

9. Currently there are many different assessments and measurements being undertaken by a wide range of local, national, regional and global institutions and programmes. However, these assessments tend to focus on specific components of biodiversity with limited coordination or inter-linkages, and in consequence there are many duplications as well as considerable gaps.

10. In addition to the 2010 target, the international community has agreed to a wide range of other relevant targets and in some cases, targets that are specific to biodiversity. These include the 16 outcome-oriented targets of the CBD's Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, the Millennium Development Goals, the targets in the WSSD Plan of Implementation, WWF's marine conservation targets, the WWF/World Bank Forest Alliance targets, among others. Some of these targets are listed in Annex III. It is envisaged that the achievement of these targets will ultimately contribute to the achievement of the 2010 target.

11. In fact there are many initiatives at both national and international level that are addressing these targets directly or indirectly, in particular the CBD programmes of work and other biodiversity-related Conventions. Each of these initiatives is also reporting on measures and actions being taken, and in a number of cases on what their actions are achieving. However they are rarely assessing or reporting on rates of loss of biodiversity.

12. It is widely acknowledged that there needs to be increased collaboration between all stakeholders to ensure co-ordinated action to achieve the internationally adopted biodiversity-related targets, and to understand the degree to which they are being achieved. The achievement of the 2010 target requires an integrated and multi-stakeholder approach, possible strategic and operational re-orientation of on-going procedures to overcome identified obstacles, and a shift in emphasis from assessments to a combination of both assessments and actions. In recognition of these considerations and challenges and the need to operationalize the commitments that emerged from COP-6 and WSSD, the meeting was convened to find internationally acceptable and scientifically credible ways of achieving these commitments within the limited timeframe available.

PREPARATION FOR THE MEETING

13. In March 2003, the CBD Secretariat organised side events in the margins of the 8th meeting of Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) and the *Open-ended Inter-sessional meeting on the Multi-year Programme of Work for the Conference of the Parties up to 2010* (MYPOW), to discuss the significance of the 2010 target and efforts required to monitor and assess progress in achieving this target. The aim of these discussions was to support development of the

programme of the May meeting. All SBSTTA and MYPOW participants were invited to participate in these side events and contribute to the discussions.

14. The MYPOW meeting welcomed the initiative of the Executive Secretary, and the support provided by the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, to organize a meeting from 21 to 23 May 2003, on the occasion of International Biodiversity Day, on “2010 – the Biodiversity Challenge” in collaboration with other partners to identify ways and means, including priority measures for:

- a. Achieving the target of significantly reducing the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010
- b. Measuring achievements
- c. Reporting on progress

15. Parties to the Convention and other Governments and biodiversity-related conventions, as well as relevant organizations were invited by MYPOW to participate in, and contribute to, this initiative and the Executive Secretary was requested to report on the outcome of this initiative at the ninth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice so as to enable the Subsidiary Body to provide the Conference of the Parties at its seventh meeting with advice on follow-up activities.

16. In May 2003, The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity in partnership with the World Conservation Monitoring Centre of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP-WCMC) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) convened an international meeting on “**2010 – The Global Biodiversity Challenge**” to articulate a framework for action for addressing the internationally agreed target of reducing the current rate of biodiversity loss by the year 2010. The meeting which was held in London, UK, from 21 to 23 May 2003, brought together over 150 participants including Government nominated experts and representatives of biodiversity-related conventions, UN agencies, academic and research institutions, industry/business sector, local and indigenous communities, international and other relevant governmental and non-governmental organizations. A list of participants is provided in Annex 1.

PROGRAMME OF THE MEETING

17. The overall aims of the meeting were twofold, to articulate a framework for action for addressing the 2010 target, and to raise awareness of the target with a wide range of international organizations and processes. Specific objectives were to:

- a. review approaches for understanding and measuring biodiversity loss;
- b. review the 2010 target in the context of other biodiversity-related targets;
- c. identify key initiatives in addressing biodiversity loss (such as MEAs) and how they relate to the 2010 target; and
- d. explore and identify the most appropriate approaches to reporting on progress.

18. Following a half-day session to introduce participants to the aims of the meeting and provide a focus and context of the key issues for discussion, a greater part of the meeting was devoted to discussions in four breakout groups focusing on these four objectives. This report is based on the outcome of the breakout group discussions, as well as key issues that emerged from the plenary presentations and discussions. A copy of the agenda is appended as Annex 2.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

19. While the objectives of the meeting provided a valuable focus for discussions in each of the breakout groups, the reports of the group discussions indicated that there was an element of overlap with the result that some issues were covered by two or more breakout groups but to different levels of detail. *Indicators*, for example, came up in discussions on *understanding and measuring biodiversity loss*;

reporting; and *multiple targets*. The report and analysis of the discussions is therefore organized around key issues rather than around the objectives *per se*.

20. There were two specific recommendations of the meeting that are important in orienting appreciation of the outcomes:

- a. It was agreed that the whole process for assessing progress in achieving the 2010 target should be CBD-led and not CBD-centred. In other words, the CBD has a central role to play both in terms of its mandate and breadth of action at national and international levels, but there are many other important initiatives at all levels that have the potential to contribute to the achievement of the target, and should be encouraged to do so. CBD needs to play a leadership role, and to facilitate and focus action in partnership with many other organizations and initiatives.
- b. It needs to be understood that while 2010 is undoubtedly an important target, the efforts of the international community to reduce the rate of biodiversity loss should continue well beyond the year 2010. These efforts and the related monitoring and reporting actions should be designed to respond to 2010 as an important milestone rather than an end in itself.

Definitions

21. **Biodiversity** is defined in the text of the Convention on Biological Diversity as: *“the variability among living organisms from all sources including, inter alia, terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems”*.

22. **Loss of biodiversity** is not defined in the text of the Convention. It is a concept that reaches beyond extinction, with spatial and temporal dimensions, covering, *inter alia*:

- a. decline in extent, condition or sustainable productivity of ecosystems
- b. decline in abundance, distribution or sustainable use of populations, and species extinctions
- c. genetic erosion.

23. For the purpose of addressing the 2010 target, the meeting proposed two definitions of loss of biodiversity, one being technically focused for the scientific community, and the other written in a language that is more accessible and appropriate for wider use.

- a. For scientific use, loss of biodiversity is: *“the long term or permanent qualitative or quantitative reduction in components of biodiversity and their potential to provide goods and services, to be measured at global, regional and national levels.”*
- b. For a more general usage, loss of biodiversity is defined as: *“the long term reduction of abundance and distribution of species, ecosystems and genes and the goods and services they provide.”*

24. **Changes in the rate of biodiversity loss** can only be measured if there are comparable, multiple observations over time. Baselines are necessary as starting points for the observations and to give meaning to the information. It was agreed that an appropriate baseline rate for biodiversity loss would be that for the 1990s, with a second rate for the 2000s and a third at 2010. These three points would form the minimum requirement for looking at the changes in rates. Where data exists over a longer timeframe for particular indicators, these should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Communication

25. There are many initiatives, both national and international, that demonstrate global biodiversity losses, and there is clear evidence that biodiversity loss at current rates is impairing global life support systems and human development options. However, this evidence has not so far sufficiently influenced policy-makers, particularly in mainstream development sectors, to undertake proportional actions, and biodiversity loss is continuing. It remains essential for the “biodiversity community” to find ways to ***make biodiversity relevant*** to politicians and to those in other sectors. The biodiversity community has not yet adequately made the case that failing to meet the biodiversity target will have significant implications for life on earth, and for the economic and social well-being of people.

26. The biodiversity community should see the outcome of WSSD as a ***global wake-up call***, bringing the decisions taken at the 6th meeting of the CBD Conference of Parties earlier in 2002 to the attention of a far wider range of stakeholders. Means must be found to use the internationally adopted 2010 target to improve communication of the importance of biodiversity to all sectors.

27. The meeting therefore called for the development and implementation of a coherent ***communication strategy*** to effectively communicate the impacts of biodiversity loss and the actions being taken to meet the 2010 target. The strategy should provide linkages between these actions, including monitoring and reporting processes, to current national concerns. The communication strategy would:

- a. present clear, policy-relevant and scientifically credible messages on trends in biodiversity;
- b. pay strong attention to the impacts of the current rates of biodiversity loss on ecosystem goods and services, and human well-being;
- c. relate closely to current national concerns in relevant sectors;
- d. identify interrelationships with relevant WSSD targets, the Millennium Development Goals, and the UN Secretary General’s “WEHAB” initiative; and
- e. improve coherence between national and international assessment and reporting relating to the target.

28. In developing and implementing such a communications strategy, it was recommended that the following issues should be taken into account:

- a. A good case has often been made for intrinsic values of biodiversity (for example for *flagship* species), but the meaning of this in relation to development, economic and other sectors is poorly understood and even more poorly communicated.
- b. It is important to demonstrate the economic and ecological consequences of biodiversity loss, and one effective way of doing this is the development of different options with well-articulated cost and impact statements for each (drawing on experience from the reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change).
- c. Communication may be improved by emphasising user values and ecosystem services as well as intrinsic values of biodiversity, although the choice of the best vehicle will vary from one case to another.
- d. Effectively used, indicators are effective communication tools, simplifying and quantifying complex scientific information for policy audiences.

29. It was recognized that ***the term "biodiversity"*** or “biological diversity” remains a problem in communication, and is frequently misinterpreted, or only part of its full meaning conveyed. There is a need to market the concept more effectively, linking it to everyday life, and giving practical examples of how biodiversity management, ecosystem functions and conservation relate to development. Means for doing this need to be actively considered.

30. All of the above may lead to the development of a ***global campaign*** to raise awareness of the biodiversity target and its relevance and importance to all sectors of society.

Measurement and assessment needs

31. Data of value in assessing progress in achieving the 2010 target already exists although much of this data is incomplete or fragmented. In addition, there are a number of ***processes that already monitor some components of biodiversity*** at national, regional and global levels. It is therefore recommended that institutions and groups already working on data and information relevant to assessing progress in achievement of the 2010 target, take into account of the findings of this meeting, and consider ways in which their data can be effectively used in monitoring and reporting on progress in achieving the target.

32. At all levels there is a need ***to make the biodiversity data that exists more readily accessible*** and available in a timely manner. Actions to achieve this would include:

- a. disseminating information in appropriate formats for potential users
- b. using best practice in information management and dissemination
- c. supporting the development and implementation of tools, standards and protocols for data exchange that allow more effective sharing of information
- d. establishing inter-operable electronic databases that allow for more effective integration of information from multiple sources in real time
- e. improving use of the Internet as a tool for access and dissemination of biodiversity data, including increasing access to the Internet
- f. reviewing the adequacy of the existing data, assessing gaps and the action that needs to be taken to fill them

33. While it is well recognised that biodiversity has both intrinsic values and utility values, our understanding of, and ability to measure, utility values is far less well developed and used. It is essential to develop and apply practical methods of ***assessing trends in the economic and social value of biodiversity***.

34. Similarly, while methods of demonstrating biodiversity loss have been well developed over a long period of time, less well understood and communicated are the ecological, societal and economic consequences of that loss. It is essential to develop and apply practical methods of ***demonstrating the economic and ecological consequences of biodiversity loss***.

35. It is important to improve ***awareness of the availability of biodiversity data***, and of its importance, by, for example, developing demonstrations on mobilization of biodiversity data for practical uses and decision-making (e.g. building predictive models of the impact of climate change, alien invasive species, spread of diseases, planning of protected areas, etc.)

36. Assessment of biodiversity loss should take account of the ***ecosystem approach***, as losses need to be understood in terms of ecosystem processes, functions and management, the cross-sectoral interactions, and the impacts on life support systems. Conversely, implementation of the ecosystem approach should take account of the need to understand biodiversity loss and its potential impact.

37. Analysis is also needed of the ***processes that drive biodiversity loss***, and of the resulting threats to biodiversity. These drivers of change in biodiversity are development-related, and the need to engage with the development processes and initiatives in the context of cross-sectoral cooperation, is particularly crucial to the success of efforts aimed at achieving the 2010 target. Equally important is the need to carry out regular assessments of the extent to which governments and others respond to biodiversity loss, and

more specifically the nature and scope of the actions that are being taken as a direct response to the rates of loss in biodiversity.

38. Reference was made to the *Global Life Observation System* mooted at the March 2003 London meeting on biodiversity and the MDGs¹, and its potential value in monitoring achievement of biodiversity-related goals. Such a system might be modeled on the well-established GTOS and GOOS programmes, and the concept should be explored further.

39. Assessment is necessary of the *datasets currently available*, either through compilation of national-level data or through remote sensing, and of the processes for maintaining these data, in order to determine their potential value in addressing monitoring and assessment of achievement of the 2010 target, and their ability to contribute indicators.

Indicators and indicator frameworks

40. While a *single biodiversity index* would be a powerful communications tool, it was felt that the current state of knowledge on the rates of biodiversity loss does not build the necessary confidence in the development and use of such a measure. However, a small set of indicators covering multiple targets, both biodiversity and development, would be both possible and preferable to the current situation where there is overlap in the use and application of unrelated sets of indicators.

41. There is clear value in the development of *aggregated indices* that are easily grasped by the general public and policy makers. Aggregated indices provide a useful communication tool that might otherwise be lost if reliance were placed on a larger number of indicators. However, it is vital that aggregated indices do not lead to misinformation, and they therefore should be based on scientifically rigorous indicators, and also amenable to disaggregation and the verification of individual components. Specific attention is needed to test and review the application of existing aggregate indices, such as the Natural Capital Index, Biodiversity Intactness Index, Living Planet Index and Pressure Index.

42. For purposes of effective communication at all levels, it was recommended that a set of approximately *ten key indicators* be identified or developed. Priority should be given to regional and global indicators, and in order to ensure confidence in the indicators it would be necessary to ensure they were clearly based on identifiable and quality controlled datasets. The primary target audience for these indicators was identified as the key decision-makers and politicians who agreed to the 2010 target at WSSD, therefore they must be useful for policy formulation.

43. While the primary *focus* is clearly on the rates of biodiversity loss (noting the definitions in paragraph 22 and the need to be representative of the three levels of biodiversity, including ecosystem function), indicators and associated reporting also need to address two other related issues:

- a. activities undertaken to address biodiversity loss (and in particular those in response to specific targets such as the 2010 target)
- b. measurements of the underlying causes of biodiversity loss.

44. Criteria that should be employed for the identification and *selection of appropriate indicators* have already been discussed in the context of the CBD. The indicators liaison group is currently developing guidance for national-level indicators and monitoring for consideration at SBSTTA9, building on previous discussions, and recognising and building on the considerable work that has already been done and implemented nationally. In summary, indicators need to be:

- a. SMART - specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-related
- b. relevant and meaningful to diverse stakeholders

¹ <http://www.undp.org/equatorinitiative/secondary/biodiversity.htm>

- c. developed through a consultative process to ensure wide ownership
- d. tested for their utility at different scales
- e. formulated to take account of different timescales
- f. cost effective and affordable
- g. timely, both in terms of currency and sensitivity to change over appropriate timescales
- h. related to country-specific objectives
- i. integrated, constituting a set (or nested series) of increasingly aggregated indicators

45. Biodiversity indicators in current use are often a function of the *available data* rather than the result of generation of new data to support the development of additional indicators. As a result the indicators in use are not necessarily designed to measure progress towards meeting the 2010 biodiversity target or the MDG targets, both of which were set after the indicators had already been developed and adopted for use in a variety of situations. This needs to be considered when reviewing potential indicators to determine rates of loss and assessment of progress towards 2010.

46. On the other hand, *policy makers need information now*, and it is necessary to start immediately with currently available data and feasible indicators, while at the same time identifying and addressing gaps in assessment, monitoring, indicators and knowledge, and the associated needs for capacity building and funding. Indicators should be identified using a pragmatic approach employing existing data, initiatives and programmes. It is recommended that the CBD commission a study on available datasets and the ways in which they can be used in developing the required indicators. The study should identify the gaps in types of datasets and detail of the dataset to build improved designs for the future.

47. There may be a need for countries to *re-assess previous work* on biodiversity and development indicators in the light of discussion at this meeting. This may be linked to review of CBD national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and of associated target setting at national level.

48. However, it was noted that *indicators alone will not achieve the 2010 target*.—This requires well coordinated actions at various levels with a specific focus on achieving the 2010 target. Communication efforts to publicise the 2010 target must convey the need for these actions to go beyond the provision of indicators, which do not solve the problems that they are established to measure.

Reporting

49. There is already a large number of national reporting obligations, so it is essential that any new reporting approach adds value and builds on what is being done. There are three *complementary approaches to reporting* on the 2010 target, all of which need to be taken into account:

- a. Reports based on the ten key indicators described above
- b. Understanding how existing national reporting approaches could contribute to the reporting process for the 2010 target (noting that this goes beyond the existing reporting obligations to CBD alone to include other conventions and reporting processes)
- c. Exploring further how existing monitoring and assessment initiatives that generate periodic reports (such as the Global Biodiversity Outlook, the Global Environment Outlook, the Millennium Assessment, reports of FAO, UNEP-WCMC amongst others) could expand the scope and level of biodiversity reporting in order to provide additional contributions to the reporting process for the 2010 target.

50. On the basis of the above consideration, two levels of reporting were recommended. At the *national level* the primary responsibility for reporting on progress towards the achievement of the 2010 target should be vested with the CBD National Focal Points, supported by a national committee and/or task force involving relevant government entities, civil society, academia, and relevant research

organisations to ensure proper cross-sectoral involvement. It was further recommended that reporting should be:

- a. underpinned by a sound scientific approach to allow for comparability over time
- b. aligned with the MDGs and other relevant reporting mechanisms

51. The meeting stressed the need to ***strengthen national reporting processes***, particularly in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and in particular GEF should be approached to provide the necessary capacity building support.

52. The national reporting process and its outputs, together with the available relevant national, regional and global level assessments, datasets and indicators would then feed into the preparation of a ***global report*** on progress towards the 2010 target. The global report would be prepared, under commission from the CBD, by an independent body working in collaboration/partnership with a wide range of stakeholders including all international biodiversity-related conventions and programmes, national institutions and NGOs, and subjected to a peer review process through an independent scientific panel and/or a multi-stakeholder group. The roles the independent body preparing the report would include:

- a. aggregating national information
- b. collecting global datasets through, for example, remote sensing, other information centres, networks and partnerships
- c. analyzing data and identifying global trends

53. The ***audience for the report*** (or reports) should be carefully identified, and the reporting process structured to respond to the needs of this audience in order to raise awareness amongst the key stakeholders/actors and focus decision and action. With this in mind, potential users should be involved in the identification of what to report on and how. Key audiences would include the following:

- a. International institutions/processes such as: CBD, CSD, WTO, UNEP, MDGs (noting UNDP responsibility for country reporting), multilateral and bilateral donors, GEF.
- b. National Governments.
- c. Business, including through the World Business Council.
- d. Civil society, in particular through broad public access (e.g. Internet).

54. The ***frequency of reporting*** will depend on need and level. Monitoring and assessment programmes must be ongoing, building on the CBD national strategies and action plans and similar documents (and on the baselines used in their development where these exist). As a guideline, national-level analysis and reporting should take place every two years, perhaps linked to Convention reporting obligations. At the international level, global trend analyses and reporting should be carried out on a 4 to 5 year cycle. .

55. In order for reporting to be effective, the reasons for and ***benefits of reporting*** on the progress towards the 2010 target should be well articulated to the identified audience. In addition, the communication of these reasons and benefits should endeavour to incorporate the possible range of uses of the information to be generated by the reporting process. Some examples of potential use include:

- a. early warning systems to detect unsustainable development trends and their economic impacts
- b. better national management of biodiversity and natural resources through feedback on effectiveness, improved ability to identify priorities and target resource allocation
- c. helping to raise public awareness about the importance of biodiversity, leading to greater understanding and participation, increased willingness to allocate appropriate resources, etc.
- d. providing information which facilitates access to capacity building resources

56. It is also worth exploring the possibility of using **reporting compliance incentives** that help ensure more prompt (and more complete) reporting. These might include:

- a. publishing lists of delayed reports
- b. making allocation of funding support contingent on regular reporting
- c. applying restrictions for those unable to meet their reporting obligations (for example limiting participation in meetings, or applying sanctions specific to the agreement such as trade restrictions under CITES)

57. In order to ensure that the **reporting process for the 2010 target** is implemented at the earliest opportunity and that decisions to initiate the implementation process are taken by the appropriate partnerships, it is recommended that the CBD commission papers on the following issues so that the CBD SBSTTA meeting to be held in November 2003 can then make appropriate recommendations for the consideration and approval of COP 7:

- a. Recommendations on the format and content of the report, and the suite of indicators that will contribute to the reporting process
- b. Recommendations on the process by which reports will be compiled and presented
- c. Recommendations on suitable agencies or institutions who could play the role of an independent body to undertake the reporting process at the global level.

58. One recommendation, which merits special mention, concerns the need for all CBD Parties to share experiences in setting national targets and baselines, in implementing appropriate monitoring and assessment programmes for meeting the 2010 biodiversity target, and in setting clearly defined intermediate targets and/or milestones. With this in mind it was recommended that the **format of the third national reports** should incorporate specific questions on the broad range of activities undertaken (including national targets, status and trends) by all relevant sectors of government and civil society to achieve the 2010 target as well as the incorporation of this target and biodiversity concerns into the work of government sectoral programmes and strategies.

Building on existing mandates and processes

59. To the extent possible, any new reporting requirement should build on and **use existing processes** in order to avoid overloading national governments with yet more requirements for meeting targets and reporting, which many governments are already unable to report on adequately.

60. It is clear that there is insufficient time to obtain "political clearance" from all the various convention conferences of the parties if actions towards 2010 are to be effective. Whilst the approval process is desirable and perhaps necessary, the very limited timeframe in which governments and other partners are expected to demonstrate the achievement of positive progress towards the 2010 target suggests adoption of alternative but complementary approaches. It is therefore necessary to ensure that the identified activities **build on existing mandates**, while seeking renewed mandates as appropriate. Convention governance bodies will need to be aware that the mandates from WSSD and CBD COP 6 require action to start now, and cannot wait for full agreement on every action.

61. There are a number of **existing monitoring and assessment initiatives** that periodically report on the state of the environment or aspects of it. An analysis should be carried out to determine how these initiatives could contribute to the overall reporting process, including expanding their level of biodiversity reporting to provide additional inputs to satisfy the reporting requirements for the 2010 target. This assessment should also explore modalities for drawing on the information and related content of the existing national reporting approaches and past reports to support reporting on progress in achieving the 2010 target. This would include both reporting to international conventions and programmes, and national inputs to international monitoring networks and assessments.

62. For example, the role of *other international agreements* and programmes in providing indicators and related information on the status of biodiversity is particularly important to the overall reporting process. This role needs to be taken into account in the development of indicators (building on the ongoing work of the CBD Liaison Group on biodiversity indicators) and indices for communication and policy development purposes in the context of the achievement of the 2010 target. For example:

- a. The Convention on Migratory Species has recognised the need to identify potential indicators of the status of migratory species, from which one key indicator might be identified for the "ten key indicators" suggested in Paragraph 42.
- b. The Ramsar Convention is already reviewing effectiveness of the implementation of the Convention, and one or more indicators arising from this process may also contribute to the "ten key indicators" suggested in Paragraph 42.

63. Given the number and extent of coverage of the existing initiatives focusing on reporting in the context of international agreements and programmes, as well as on various monitoring and assessment aspects, it is clearly valuable to promote *harmonization and streamlining* of reporting and information management to reduce duplication and to identify synergies. This requires action at both the national and international levels.

64. With respect to the involvement of other key initiatives and programmes, it was recommended that the outcomes of the meeting be communicated to key thematic meetings such as the *World Parks Congress* scheduled to be held in September 2003. In this case the aim would be to highlight the importance of protected area data in the context of assessment of progress in meeting the 2010 target, the Millennium Development Goals, and other targets set by WSSD.

Understanding and applying multiple targets and goals, and the development of sub-targets

65. There is a *plethora of international environment and development goals and targets*, and often little understanding and appreciation of the relationship between them at the international level, let alone at the national level. This therefore emphasises the need for:

- a. improved understanding and communication of the relationship between the different internationally agreed targets
- b. improved understanding of how to adapt international targets to national situations in a meaningful manner

66. It is well understood within the biodiversity community that meeting and sustaining the *Millennium Development Goals* will depend to a large extent on meeting the three objectives of the CBD as reflected in the CBD Strategic Plan and the 2010 biodiversity target. However there is still a real need to communicate this message more effectively, and to mainstream biodiversity into other sectors. This includes the need to:

- a. Communicate the relevance of the biodiversity target to those implementing the other international targets, such as the Millennium Development Goals.
- b. Incorporate the 2010 biodiversity target into the MDGs and other international goals and targets, including trade and other social and economic targets.
- c. Integrate actions in support of biodiversity targets into other strategies and sector policies, at both the national and international level, and within the government and private sectors.

67. There is a clearly identified need to articulate the *interdependence between biodiversity and the Millennium Development Goals* at all levels, between sectors, and in both developed and developing

countries. This should include defining biodiversity targets for ecosystem services relevant to each MDG that can be built upon at the national level. A process is then needed in every country to articulate the role of biodiversity in achieving the MDGs, recognising that issues and priorities will vary from country to country. It is also essential to ensure that those responsible for assessing progress in achieving each of the Millennium Development Goals are also aware of the important role that biodiversity plays.

68. The *livelihoods/health/vulnerability/food security classification* being used in other fora was identified as a valuable way of understanding and communicating the linkages between key issues that concern people and governments, and this should be investigated further in communicating the importance of biodiversity to all sectors of society (see attached matrix). The links to existing assessment processes such as the Global Biodiversity Outlook, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and the Global Environment Outlook could usefully be explored further, along with discussion on how to develop and use this matrix.

69. There should be a clearer process for *adapting international targets to national situations*, and possibly also for understanding how setting and achieving national targets contributes to achievement of international targets. Countries might need additional guidance in how to do this, particularly as some of the work could be done internationally and then used to support national action. The process might include:

- a. identifying all the targets that a country has committed to
- b. clarifying whether they are all clear and achievable targets
- c. identifying how the biodiversity and development targets relate to each other (recognizing that this might vary between countries)
- d. developing national targets that are a function of the available information in the country
- e. identifying institutional responsibility for each target

70. The *CBD programmes of work* provide a framework for implementation of the Convention at national and local levels, including understanding and assessing biodiversity loss at the biome scale as a basis for co-ordinated global action. It is recommended that the process used in the development of the targets for Global Plant Conservation Strategy should guide the review of the existing thematic programmes of the CBD to develop specific sub-targets, milestones and timelines in support of achieving the 2010 target.

71. The review/revision of the existing CBD *national biodiversity strategies and action plans* should incorporate the identified recommendations on the 2010 target and related actions to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, as well as any national targets and sub-targets that may have been set by the relevant sectors of government. The review process may require additional finance to ensure that it is done in a participatory cross-sectoral manner.

72. Implementation of the *ecosystem approach* can be used as a basis for addressing policy issues in implementing international targets at national and regional levels, but the means for doing this will need to be considered in the context of the review of NBSAP implementation within each country, and the development of specific targets within CBD programmes of work. Further advice may be required on how to accomplish these tasks.

73. It was recommended that the *identification and adoption of additional targets* and sub-targets by other MEAs and international initiatives should be carried out in a coordinated manner to ensure a coherent approach in support of the 2010 target. The process used in the development of targets for the CBD Global Strategy for Plant Conservation could also be applied to the identification of targets for other taxonomic groups.

74. Finally, it was also noted that *voluntary independent biodiversity reviews* carried out under the auspices of the CBD could be an important means to assist parties in implementing the international biodiversity and development targets. Such independent reviews are already carried out in the context of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Cross-sectoral collaboration

75. The issue of strengthening cross-sectoral linkages between government agencies is central to the achievement of the 2010 target, and of particular concern is the question of how to get biodiversity expertise into other sectors. An effective process needs to be created for promoting *ownership of the 2010 target amongst sectors*, and identifying how they can support implementation and assessment of the achievement of the target.

76. It was recognised that identifying and *quantifying ecosystem services* was one obvious way to understand and communicate the linkages between biodiversity and other sectors.

77. Most countries have some form of co-ordinating mechanism between sectors, and strengthening this co-ordination is crucial to achieving the international targets. This will be supported by ensuring that the *results of both London meetings* are effectively disseminated to all CBD National Focal Points and others in such a manner that they can be used to enhance cross-sectoral linkages through dialogue and planning. It is recommended that these focal points be encouraged to discuss these reports and their implications with all other government departments and other stakeholders.

78. Several examples are available of *institutional arrangements* that address biodiversity in development processes. It may be of value to share experience on how this is done, and therefore to compile case studies on the institutional linkages between biodiversity and development.

79. It is desirable for bilateral and multilateral *development assistance programmes* to recognise and adopt the 2010 target and take the necessary actions to communicate this message to the relevant donor agencies and to ensure that this recognition is achieved in the appropriate fora. This could be linked to promoting recognition that Goal 7 of the Millennium Development Goals (*ensuring environmental sustainability*) is essentially a guiding principle for achieving the other Millennium Development Goals.

Capacity building and technical support

80. It should be noted that the targets will not be achieved unless the necessary capacity to achieve them exists wherever required. Therefore as part of the commitment to achieving the 2010 target *countries need assistance* to develop the required strategies, including a focus on ecosystem services, assessment of progress in achieving the target, and communication of biodiversity values to all sectors. The latter includes demonstrating the benefits of monitoring, assessment and reporting.

81. In particular, the development and strengthening of monitoring, assessment and reporting capacities at the national level, especially in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, will inevitably require financial and technical support. It is recommended that the CBD request the *Global Environment Facility* to provide the required capacity building support. The monitoring, assessment and reporting process should be viewed as a capacity building exercise.

82. Technical cooperation and capacity building to achieve and monitor progress towards the 2010 target must be *integrated at the international level*, including efforts at harmonization and streamlining building on the work currently being led by UNEP and the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre.

Funding

83. With regard to the issue of resources, the meeting recommended a significant increase in the size, efficiency and effectiveness of funding available for activities aimed at meeting the 2010 target. This could be done through the adoption of innovative approaches including making more effective use of existing funds in the environmental and other budget allocations, such as sector and poverty reduction strategies; development of partnerships with private sector and non-governmental sources; ensuring that spending in other areas either supports biodiversity targets or is neutral; increasing funding directed specifically to biodiversity targets through a range of mechanisms such as GEF, ODA, International Finance Institutions (IFI), and regional and bilateral arrangements; and getting the economic equations right by decreasing negative (perverse) incentives. The establishment of national level targets in the context of the 2010 target and reporting on progress in meeting this target should be an incentive for funding and investment. The meeting also called for the creation of conditions that encourage the use of market forces to help meet the biodiversity targets.

Partnerships

84. Achievement of the 2010 target, and assessing progress towards 2010, will require ***improved coordination, synergy and partnership***. It is clear there are still many coordination problems that need to be resolved, between national and international levels in many countries. Addressing the challenges posed by such problems will require:

- a. Gathering and promoting practical examples of good practice at national and international levels.
- b. Promoting mainstreaming between programmes and departments with different responsibilities, but responding to the same targets.
- c. Promoting the use of partnerships among relevant environmental or developmental agencies, and specifically building on the experience of WSSD type II partnerships.

85. The development and implementation of the ***global partnership for biodiversity*** proposed by the CBD open-ended inter-sessional meeting on the multi-year programme of work (March 2003) should also provide a valuable forum for improving coordination, and a focus on building coordination and synergy in achieving the 2010 target would provide a valuable initial mandate.

SUMMARY OF KEY POINTS

86. Discussion was inevitably wide-ranging, and a significant number of valuable recommendations and suggestions were made. A number of the key messages include *inter alia* the following, covered in more detail in earlier paragraphs. Recommendations targeted on specific organizations, and in particular on the CBD process, are listed later.

87. Improved ***communication*** of biodiversity and its role was seen as being fundamental in both achieving the 2010 target, and in convincing many of the players of the importance of monitoring and reporting programmes. This includes the need to more effectively relate biodiversity to other sectors and concerns, for example the Millennium Development Goals.

88. Development of a few achievable and reliable ***indicators*** is essential for communicating concerns and achievements, and for supporting policy intervention, although it was recognised that this would need to be underpinned by substantial data and allow for input from a wide range of sources and sectors.

89. The importance of recognising the ***breadth of existing targets***, and finding some way of relating these targets more effectively to help focus both action and reporting at all levels was emphasised. This would include recognition of the essential importance of biodiversity in achieving the Millennium Development Goals, and potentially include identification of existing datasets and derivation of reports or indicators to support reporting on more than one target.

90. The essential importance of ***cross-sectoral understanding*** was recognised, and the need to find better ways of communicating the fundamental importance of biodiversity. One option discussed was the need to develop indicators in areas such as ecosystem services, as well as the more generally accepted biodiversity-related indicators.

91. The 2010 target is relevant to all biodiversity-related MEAs, and needs to be incorporated into their respective activities (including reporting) in a coordinated manner, building on existing strategies and plans. Actions to reduce biodiversity loss and report on achievements need to be ***CBD-led***, but not CBD-centred, recognising the vital role of many other stakeholders.

92. A wide range of ***existing assessment and monitoring programmes*** are already under way which can be oriented to deliver information relevant to assessment of progress in achieving the target. The secretariats and governance bodies of these processes should be invited to identify the ways in which they could address the 2010 target. A report is needed to identify how all these initiatives can contribute to assessment of progress in achieving the target.

93. Within the CBD it is important to ***incorporate targets*** into the existing work programmes, and to promote the incorporation of appropriate targets into the national strategies and action plans. There were similar calls on other conventions to adopt a similar approach with regard to their respective programmes in the context of contributing to the achievement of the 2010 target and the other targets arising from WSSD.

94. There were calls for a comprehensive ***review of existing datasets, monitoring, assessment*** and related information management approaches and initiatives, to provide a basis for more informed decisions on indicators and reporting.

95. With regard to ***finance and capacity***, the meeting recommended increased financial and technical support for activities aimed at meeting the 2010 target. The meeting further proposed a number of innovative approaches through which this support could be generated and applied more effectively and efficiently. It was also recognised that getting the message across appropriately was a necessary step in achieving the provision of the required financial and technical support.

96. In the ***longer term***, it was recognised that 2010 should not be seen as the end of the process, but a key focus for action and reporting with the expectation that the outcomes and achievements of these activities up to 2010 would be used as significant inputs in the setting of future related targets .

NEXT STEPS

Immediate follow-up

97. It was agreed that once the report had been drafted and reviewed by the CBD Secretariat, UNEP-

WCMC and UNDP, it would be made available for review by all of those who participated in the meeting. Once their input had been received and incorporated, it would be widely circulated.

98. Meanwhile an action plan would be developed based on the report of the meeting, and the CBD Secretariat, UNEP-WCMC and UNDP would jointly agree on how to maintain progress on the issues discussed through regular meetings and teleconferences. This would include identification of mechanisms to ensure broad ownership of the target and the mechanisms to assess progress in achieving it.

Recommendations specific to the CBD Secretariat

99. The meeting made the following recommendations that are specific to follow up by the Convention on Biological Diversity, as the "key instrument" for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. These need to be addressed by the Secretariat, SBSTTA and the COP.

100. Submission of the report of the London meeting as an information paper to CBD SBSTTA9, with action to be taken identified in a SBSTTA pre-session document.

101. Preparation of other supporting information papers for SBSTTA9 on, *inter alia*, recommended indicators, use of existing datasets and assessment processes, use of other reporting processes, communication strategy, funding issues, institutional arrangements and coordination, etc.

102. Draft recommendations for SBSTTA 9 on other follow-up action concerning integration of targets cross-sectorally, indicator development and their use, development of the sub-targets, reporting framework, communications strategy, etc.

103. Identification of ways to integrate the deliberation of the London meeting into the work of the CBD liaison group on indicators and discussion of that work at SBSTTA9.

104. Communication of the report with appropriate guidance to CBD National Focal Points and relevant agencies and organizations following the SBSTTA meeting.

105. Provision of advice and guidance to Parties on follow-up activities at the national level, including integration of the target and identified subsidiary targets into NBSAPs and other sectoral programmes, reporting, communication, indicator development, collaboration and coordination.

106. Draft recommendation for consideration and approval of COP 7 including approval of a framework for reporting, and request to the GEF to fund capacity building to establish national assessment and reporting framework.

107. Interim progress report on 2010 Target implementation and review of reporting framework at COP7 and COP8.

Recommendations specific to national governments

108. Many of the recommendations in this report are relevant to national governments, but particular attention is drawn to the following:

- a. The need to set targets at the national level that respond to the internationally adopted targets in the context of national requirements
- b. The need to have in place monitoring, assessment and reporting processes that assist governments in reviewing progress in achieving these targets, and responding accordingly

- c. The need for cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approaches for achieving and reporting on the achievement of the targets set
- d. The need for effective communication of biodiversity issues to all sectors and stakeholders to ensure an understanding of the importance of biodiversity
- e. The need for capacity development to achieve the above

109. National governments also need to consider their role in influencing international processes, and the ways in which MEAs, international organizations and international programmes respond to the 2010 target and reporting on its achievement.

Recommendations specific to other organizations and initiatives

110. Secretariats, advisory and governance bodies of *other MEAs* should consider reviewing the implications of the 2010 target for their own activities, and identifying ways in which they can respond to the target and report on the action that they are taking and its effects.

111. The secretariats and advisory bodies for *international assessments* should consider ways in which the results of their work can support assessment of the extent to which the 2010 target is being achieved, and at the same time identify ways to ensure that the role of biodiversity is adequately reflected and reported on in their work.

112. The secretariats, advisory and governance bodies of other *international programmes* should consider reviewing the implications of the 2010 target for their own activities, and identifying ways in which they can respond to the target and report on the action that they are taking and its effects.

113. *International organizations* should review their information holdings and programmes, and consider how their resources and activities can support both achievement of the 2010 target and reporting on the extent to which it is being achieved.

114. *International research and information sharing networks* should consider identifying how their resources and activities can support assessment of the extent to which the 2010 target it is being achieved, and where appropriate also support activities that support achievement of the target.

115. *Development assistance* programmes should consider ways in which support can be given to the development of capacity for assessment and reporting, integrated with support for other actions to work towards achievement of the 2010 target.

	Species (including genetic level)	Ecosystem Functions	Ethics/intrinsic Factors
Link to Millennium Ecosystem Assessment service categories	Provisioning	Regulating and Supporting	Cultural
Livelihoods (e.g. MDG 1: Poverty)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food, fiber, medicinals • Biochemicals • Bioremediation • Genetic resources • Ecotourism—charismatic fauna • Income generating opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary production • Fresh water • Water regulation for energy production • Payment for ecosystem services • Ecotourism—biome 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecotourism—vista/nature • Future opportunities • Beauty/aesthetics • Recreation • Educational • Equity • Inter-generational equity
Food security (e.g. MDG 2: Hunger)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agrobiodiversity (for increased food production) • Wild relatives • IPM • Pollinators • New products • Protein sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food production – water supply issues • Pollination • Soil productivity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity of foodways • Market access/equity
Health (e.g. MDGs 4-6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medicinals/ pharmaceuticals, including traditional uses • Nutrition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean water • Disease – control of vectors • Detoxification/nutrient cycling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mental health • Spiritual and religious values • Inspirational
Vulnerability (of humans and the environment) to disasters, resource security/loss, etc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tipping point of genetically reduced populations • Mobility problems due to climate change shifts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robust response to natural and human-caused disasters • Climate-regulation • Water capture • Emerging diseases due to ecosystem disruption • Flood/drought/erosion control • Primary production • Adaptability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural identity • There are more than humans • Aesthetic • Communal • Symbolic • Gaia concept of ‘whole organism’ i.e. cannot separate human security from planetary security

Target audiences:

International: Integration and collaboration within the international system

National: Achievement at the national level;

Civil Society: Support and mainstreaming at the private sector and civil society level