



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/19/INF/3
13 October 2015

ENGLISH ONLY

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC,
TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Nineteenth meeting

Montreal, 2-5 November 2015

Item 4.3 of the provisional agenda*

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENT ON THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS
OF THE COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP ON FORESTS TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF
THE FOREST-RELATED AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS AND TO THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EXPANDED PROGRAMME OF WORK ON FOREST
BIODIVERSITY**

Note by the Executive Secretary

1. In response to paragraph 21 of decision XII/6, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to prepare a study on the ways in which international organizations and secretariats with substantial programmes on forests are assisting in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and to the achievement of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets. To this end, the member organizations of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) were specifically invited to contribute to this study.
2. The decision further requests the Executive Secretary to report back to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) prior to the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties the results of this study, including on options for further action to achieve the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets, in a mutually supportive manner, while acknowledging the ongoing review of the International Arrangement on Forests (IAF), discussed at the eleventh session of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), in May 2015.
3. The present information document summarizes the information received from all the other 13 members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests to the questionnaire prepared by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. To support the information extracted from the responses, additional information was drawn from the websites and relevant documentation of all member organizations of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests. A draft of this note has been made widely available for peer-review (notification SCBD/SAM/RH/SS/AC/84874).
4. The synthesis and analysis of this note has been reproduced in the note by the Executive Secretary on the role of international organizations in supporting the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/19/8) presenting options for further action to achieve the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

* UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/19/1.

Table of Contents

I.	BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION.....	3
II.	THE COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP ON FORESTS.....	4
III.	CPF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE FOREST-RELATED AICHI TARGETS AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EXPANDED PROGRAMME OF WORK ON FOREST BIODIVERSITY	5
	Target 1: Awareness Increased	10
	Target 2: Biodiversity values integrated	11
	Target 3: Incentives reformed	12
	Target 4: Sustainable consumption and production	13
	Target 5: Habitat loss halved or reduced	15
	Target 7: Sustainable agriculture, aquaculture and forestry.....	17
	Target 9: Invasive alien species prevented and controlled.....	18
	Target 11: Protected areas increased and improved.....	19
	Target 12: Extinction prevented.....	20
	Target 13: Genetic diversity maintained.....	21
	Target 14: Ecosystems and essential services safeguarded.....	23
	Target 15: Ecosystems restored and resilience enhanced	24
	Target 18: Traditional knowledge respected.....	26
	Target 19: Knowledge improved, shared and applied	27
	Target 20: Financial resources from all sources increased	28
IV.	STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS IN SUPPORT OF THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE FOREST-RELATED AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS.....	29
V.	CONCLUSIONS.....	31
VI.	Annexes.....	33
	Annex I Forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets	33
	Annex II Questionnaire sent to member organizations of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests	34
	Annex III Timeline for the preparation of the study	38
	Annex IV Abbreviations.....	39

I. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1. At the twelfth meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP), through decision XII/6, paragraph 21, the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was requested to prepare a study on the ways in which international organizations and secretariats with substantial programmes on forests are assisting in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and to the achievement of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The decision specifically invites the member organizations of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) to contribute to this study.

2. The decision further requests the Executive Secretary to report back to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) prior to the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties the results of this study, including on options for further action to achieve the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets, in a mutually supportive manner, while acknowledging the ongoing review of the International Arrangement on Forests (IAF), discussed at the eleventh session of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), in May 2015.

3. To this end, the Secretariat of CBD has initiated this study. The primary source of information utilized for the study was a questionnaire prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with the other thirteen CPF member organizations. The questionnaire serves as the basis for compiling information on the ways in which these organizations are explicitly and implicitly contributing to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and, specifically, the achievement of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets are presented in annex I.

4. As a first step in the preparation of this study, the questionnaire was sent to CPF members on 28 January 2015 with an explanatory letter (Ref. No. SCBD/SAM/DC/CS/LM/84273). The questionnaire is presented in annex II and the timeline for the preparation of this study is presented in annex III.

5. To date, all members of the CPF have submitted responses. This information document summarizes the information from the responses to the questionnaire. In addition, to support the information extracted from the responses, additional information was drawn from the websites and relevant documentation of all CPF member organizations.

6. An earlier draft of this study was sent for review to all CPF members in April 2015. Comments received have since been incorporated. The study and opportunities for further collaboration in supporting the achievement of the Aichi Targets, were discussed in a panel with representatives of GEF, ITTO, and the UNCCD Secretariat at a side event during the eleventh session of UNFF, organized by the CBD Secretariat that was also attended by representatives from ICRAF, IUCN, IUFRO and UNEP, as well as from the CITES Secretariat and the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. Following this, the study was sent for a second peer-review process to all CPF members in May 2015 along with a synthesis and analysis document (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/19/8). Comments received through this peer-review process were also incorporated into the below text.

7. The present information document serves as the basis for the synthesis and analysis document the role of international organizations in supporting the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/19/8). The synthesis and analysis document present options for further action to achieve the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets, building on the ongoing contributions of CPF member organizations reported in the information document, and developed in a mutually supportive manner through discussion panels and peer review processes.

8. The document is divided into five parts: In addition to the above background information and introduction, the second part describes the history of the CPF; the third summarizes information from the thirteen responses to the questionnaire on the forest-related Aichi Targets; the fourth provides a

discussion for strengthening relevant international efforts; and the fifth presents some concluding points.

II. THE COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP ON FORESTS

9. United Nations Resolution 2000/35 of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), establishing UNFF, invited the executive heads of relevant international and regional organizations, institutions and instruments to form a collaborative partnership on forests. The Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) was subsequently created in April 2001 with a mandate to support the work of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) and to enhance cooperation and coordination among its participants, and to call upon their governing bodies and their heads to support the activities of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests to achieve the goals of the Forum.

10. At its inception, it consisted of the eight members that comprised the Inter-Agency Task Force on Forests that supported the work of the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF), the predecessor of UNFF: the Secretariat of the CBD, the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Secretariat of UNFF and the World Bank.

11. The CPF is currently comprised of 14 member organizations, which include the eight original members plus the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO), the Secretariat of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF).

12. This study of the work of the CPF member organizations in support of the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets complements the work undertaken by the Aichi Biodiversity Targets Task Force established through a Memorandum of Cooperation signed between the CBD Secretariat and 27 international organizations in September 2011. Today the Task Force numbers 30 member organizations, eight of which—the CBD Secretariat, ITTO, IUCN, FAO, the GEF Secretariat, UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank—are also CPF members. MOUs between the CBD Secretariat and the individual Task Force members serve as a platform for cooperation and coordination of activities in support of achieving the Targets. With the support of the CBD Secretariat, the Task Force maintains a living document that records and summarizes actions committed towards the achievement of the Targets.¹

13. The degree of support to the achievement of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets varied greatly from one CPF member organization to another largely due to differences in their mandates and programmes of work. By their nature, the secretariats of the UNCCD, UNFCCC and UNFF are not implementing agencies; their primary function is to service the meetings of their contracting Parties, or Member States in the case of the UNFF, and follow-up on the decisions of their COPs and subsidiary bodies.

14. Implementation responsibilities for multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) fall principally on the shoulders of contracting parties or Member States and supportive implementing international organizations, several of which are CPF members. These include FAO, IUCN, UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank, all of whom are implementing agencies for the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

15. Scientific and highly technical organizations such as CIFOR, ICRAF, IUFRO and IUCN focus more sharply on research and analysis, the development of instruments and tools for policy implementation, and, in support of these ends, the implementation of projects and initiatives at the

¹ Aichi Biodiversity Targets Task Force, Actions in support of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the attainment of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (1 May 2015).

global, regional and national levels, often in concert with FAO, UNEP, the World Bank and other CPF members.

16. The GEF, ITTO and the World Bank are key organizations providing funding for sustainable forest management and sustainable use of biodiversity primarily at the national and regional levels, but also at the global level. The former operates as the financial mechanism for several MEAs, including the CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC, while ITTO is a cross between an MEA secretariat, a funding mechanism for the sustainable management of tropical forests and an implementing organization.

III. CPF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE FOREST-RELATED AICHI TARGETS AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EXPANDED PROGRAMME OF WORK ON FOREST BIODIVERSITY

17. The following information extracted from the responses to the questionnaire in the monitoring of progress towards the achievement of the Aichi Targets by international organizations did not result in consistent norms. CPF members have not been requested to formulate a protocol on criteria and indicators for assessing progress towards the achievement of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Responses to the CBD questionnaire indicate that only FAO, GEF, ITTO and UNDP have provided budgeting for biodiversity monitoring and reporting. These four, along with CIFOR, UNCCD, UNEP and UNFF use criteria and indicators for forest biodiversity monitoring, in accordance with their own specific monitoring needs and requirements.

18. Several CPF members—FAO, GEF, IUCN, IUFRO, UNCCD, UNDP, UNEP and UNFF—reported that they assess the impact of their activities on the achievement of their specific forest biodiversity objectives. In the case of GEF, this is accomplished with the use of tracking tools at the portfolio and project levels, including the monitoring and evaluation of project logical frameworks.

19. A good indicator of an organization's support to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets is their explicit consideration in the strategies, plans and/or programmes of work of CPF member organizations. This is the case for eight CPF organizations: CIFOR, FAO, GEF, ITTO, IUCN, UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank:

(a) *CIFOR's 2008-2018 Strategy* is currently being revised and the updated version will specifically refer to the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets;

(b) FAO prepared a document highlighting the organization's existing tools and guidance for assisting countries in implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and for achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.² Sustainability is at the center of FAO's new Strategic Framework, with a specific focus of its Strategic Objective 2, which aims at sustainably increasing the provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and *fisheries*. Although not explicit, there are several links to the Aichi Targets;³

(c) GEF in its *GEF-6 Programming Directions* prioritizes addressing three principal drivers—habitat loss, overexploitation and invasive alien species—which remain the most critical for the achievement of the Aichi Targets and that are largely responsible for current trends in biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation;⁴

² FAO, *FAO's Tools and Guidance to Assist Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* (updated April 2014), p. 1.

³ <http://www.fao.org/3/contents/1e09fa36-b63e-45e1-ba72-7fba5f981ffe/I3940E00.htm>

⁴ GEF, *GEF-6 Programming Directions* (Extract from GEF Assembly Document GEF/A.5/07/Rev.01, May 22, 2014), pp. 16-17.

(d) Through the ITTO/CBD Collaborative Initiative for Tropical Forest Biodiversity, ITTO will focus on supporting *efforts* towards the achievement of Aichi Targets 5, 7, 9, 11, 14 and 15;⁵

(e) *The IUCN Programme 2013-2016* also clearly states that it will be contributing to many of the targets of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, particularly targets 5, 9, 11, 12 and 13 under Strategic Goals B and C, which are described in Table 1;⁶

(f) In alignment with the CBD Strategic Plan and the Aichi Targets, UNDP developed the *UNDP Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework 2012-2020*, which indicates how the organization intends to leverage its substantial portfolio of projects worldwide to help Parties meet the Targets, including Target 5 on habitat loss and Target 7 on sustainable forestry;⁷

(g) UNEP, in its Medium-Term Strategy 2014-2017 and related bi-annual Programmes of Work makes explicit *reference* to all Aichi Targets and outlines how UNEP will address them;⁸

(h) *A Biodiversity Roadmap for the World Bank Group*⁹ states that the post-2015 development agenda and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets offer a comprehensive framework for addressing poverty and development in an environmentally sustainable way; the roadmap also provides a breakdown of World Bank projects that have supported the attainment of the Aichi Biodiversity Goals and Targets.

20. In a few cases, CPF member organizations in collaboration with the CBD Secretariat have taken on the role of lead international organization for providing advice and, where appropriate, capacity building to countries in their efforts to achieve specific forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets. FAO has formally agreed to assume the leading role as Biodiversity Champion in supporting the achievement of Targets 7 on sustainable agriculture, forests and fisheries and 13 on agricultural genetic diversity, while IUCN plays a similar role for Target 12 on extinction prevention. UNDP has the informal, de facto lead for Target 2 on the integration of biodiversity values into development strategies and planning.

21. Resource capabilities, both in terms of human resources and budgetary allocations, vary greatly among CPF member organizations. Seven organizations—CIFOR, FAO, GEF, ITTO, UNCCDS, UNDP and UNEP—reported having specific allocations for forest biodiversity activities, while five—IUFRO, IUCN, UNFCCCS, ICRAF and the World Bank—informed that they did not. However, the World Bank clarified that allocations for biodiversity activities are provided based on country-driven demand. UNFFS informed that biodiversity activities are supported through one project funded from the UN Development Account. Although it does not have a specific allocation for biodiversity activities, ICRAF clarified that biodiversity aspects receive attention through their six science domains.

22. Five organizations—CIFOR, FAO, GEF, ITTO and UNDP—responded that they have both full-time and part-time staff assigned to forest biodiversity issues, with CIFOR at the lead with three full-timers and two part-timers. ICRAF, UNCCDS, UNFFS and the World Bank reported that they have four, three, one and two staff, respectively, working part-time on forest biodiversity. IUCN, IUFRO and UNFCCCS informed that they did not have any staff dedicated to forest biodiversity.

⁵ ITTO and CBD, *ITTO/CBD Collaborative Initiative for Tropical Forest Biodiversity: Programme Document* (May 2011), pp.14-15.

⁶ IUCN, *The IUCN Programme 2013-2016* (September 2012), pp. 9-10

⁷ UNDP, *The Future We Want: Biodiversity and Ecosystems— Driving Sustainable Development. United Nations Development Programme Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework 2012-2020* (2012), pp. vi, 1, 3, 14-15, 18, 26, 29, 31, 48.

⁸ UNEP 2014-2017 Medium-Term Strategy, www.unep.org/pdf/MTS_2014-2017_Final.pdf.

⁹ World Bank, *Investing in Natural Capital for Eradicating Extreme Poverty and Boosting Shared Prosperity: A Biodiversity Roadmap for the WBG* (2014), pp. 5, 9, 10.

23. As the organization providing the secretariats of the CBD, CITES and CMS, as well as several regional seas conventions with biodiversity protocols that promote sustainable forest management of critical watersheds affecting the marine and coastal environment, UNEP plays an especially important role in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Moreover, Ecosystem Management, including forests, is one of UNEP's six priority areas of concentration.¹⁰ Although UNEP does not have a staff member in headquarters working full time on forest biodiversity issues, it has one staff dedicated to following the CPF and implementing relevant international forest-related commitments, including forest biodiversity, as well as several staff in UNEP's UN-REDD team whose terms of reference include forest biodiversity.¹¹ Currently the UNEP GEF Biodiversity Focal Point is based in UNEP's Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, supporting globally the development of a number of GEF-funded forest biodiversity projects contributing to the implementation of the CBD and its Aichi Targets. UNEP-WCMC based at Cambridge University in the United Kingdom has a large team of experts in the biodiversity and ecosystem services of terrestrial, freshwater and marine environments, as well as ecological modellers, social scientists, economists, lawyers, GIS specialists, policy analysts and programmers.

24. When asked if their organizations had altered their budgets after the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 to 2020, three—GEF, FAO and ITTO—answered positively. Not surprisingly, the GEF, which is the financial mechanism for the CBD, reported the greatest financial contribution. For the GEF-6 period from 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2018, US \$1.8 billion will be made available to fund projects supporting the implementation of the CBD's Strategic Plan. ITTO reported that, as a result of the creation and implementation of the ITTO/CBD Collaborative Initiative for Tropical Forest Biodiversity, it will be contributing \$12.5 million related to biodiversity conservation and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. FAO indicated that it will be providing some financial support, which is unspecified, through its *Reviewed Strategic Framework 2010-2019* to ensure dedicated support to the organization's work on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, although this is admittedly not directly in response to the CBD's Strategic Plan. UNDP responded that figures were unavailable for the post 2011 period, but indicated that it has provided approximately \$750 million to countries on forest-related work through its Ecosystems and Biodiversity portfolio over the past 25 years, with \$360 million coming from the GEF Trust Fund. All the other CPF member organizations responded that they had not altered their budgets to support the Strategic Plan and the achievement of its forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

25. Table 1 provides an overview of the specific Aichi Biodiversity Targets¹² that CPF member organizations reported that they were contributing to since 2010. Most of the information provided was qualitative rather than quantitative. The fifteen that are shaded in light green are the forest-related biodiversity targets. The six forest-centered Aichi Targets: 5, 7, 11, 14, 15, and 20, appear in italics. While the efforts of CPF member organizations are spread across all 20 of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, collectively they are concentrated on five: Targets 1, 5, 11, 14 and 15. Since many targets are closely interlinked, specific contributions to the achievement of one target can also contribute to the achievement of other targets.

26. As should be expected, the GEF secretariat as the CBD's financial mechanism is the most engaged and supports projects towards the achievement of all 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets, by financing projects that are implemented by GEF implementing agencies such as FAO, IUCN, UNDP, UNEP, WWF and the World Bank, among others. A breakdown of the relationship between the Aichi Targets and the 10 programmes of the GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy is provided in Annex I

¹⁰ UNEP, *Sustaining forests: investing in our common future*, UNEP Policy Series, Ecosystem Management (August 2011), 17 pp.

¹¹ The UN-REDD Programme is a collaborative initiative involving UNEP, UNDP and FAO in support of the decision of the Parties to the UNFCCC reached at COP-13 on the Bali Action Plan and REDD in December 2007, assisting countries in the preparation and implementation of national REDD+ strategies and mechanisms. It builds on the convening role and expertise of these three international organizations. Contributions of the collaborative partners are presented further below.

¹² Detailed Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and Aichi Biodiversity Targets are provided in Annex 1

of its Strategy.¹³ UNDP and UNEP follow the GEF, providing support to the implementation of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 20 and 18 respectively. The other CPF member organizations supporting through their actions a wide range of targets include CIFOR, ITTO, FAO, IUCN, ICRAF, UNFF and the World Bank. It should be noted that for some organizations it remains inherently difficult to estimate outputs as they do not always directly impact on targets.

27. GEF funding for the Biodiversity Focal Area for the four-year GEF-6 cycle increased to total allocations of approximately US\$ 1.8 billion. Moreover, in the fifth replenishment (2010-2014), the GEF SFM-REDD+ Programme provided more than US\$700 million to forest projects and leveraged an additional US\$4.6 billion in co-financing. This compares with US\$470 million in GEF-4¹⁴. Under the GEF-6 replenishment covering the four-year period 2014-2018, the SFM strategy is based on a resource envelope of \$250 million, including maintained forest resources (US\$70 million), enhanced forest management (US\$80 million), restored forest ecosystems (US\$50 million), increased regional and global cooperation (US\$30 million) and contributing to integrated approach pilots (US\$20 million)¹⁵. The envelope will be used as an incentive mechanism to encourage countries to invest portions of their GEF allocations from biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation into fully integrated multi-focal area SFM projects and programmes. Through this approach, synergies will be created, especially in landscape-scale projects where the incentive will make sure that the project has a clear forestry focus by applying SFM impact indicators to the entire project and should contribute significantly to the achievement of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

¹³ GEF, *GEF-6 Programming Directions*, pp. 40-41.

¹⁴ GEF (2014), p. 161.

¹⁵ GEF (2014) p. 173-174.

Table 1: Aichi Biodiversity Targets¹⁶ contributed to by CPF Member Organizations														
	CIFOR	FAO	GEF	ICRAF	ITTO	IUCN	IUFRO	UNCCD	UNDP	UNEP	UNFCCC	UNFF	World Bank	Total
Strategic goal A. Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society														
Target 1: Awareness increased	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	11
Target 2: Biodiversity values integrated	x	x	x				x	x	x	x		x	x	9
Target 3: Incentives reformed	x	x	x				x	x	x	x		x	x	9
Target 4: Sustainable consumption and production	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x			x	10
Strategic goal B. Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use														
Target 5: Habitat Loss halved or reduced	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	12
Target 7: Sustainable agriculture, aquaculture and forestry	x	x	x	x	x				x	x			x	8
Target 9: Invasive species prevented and controlled		x	x	x	x	x	x		x			x	x	9
Strategic goal C. Improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity														
Target 11: Protected areas increased and improved	x	x	x		x	x			x	x		x	x	9
Target 12: Extinction prevented	x		x	x	x	x			x	x			x	8
Target 13: Genetic diversity maintained	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x			x	10
Strategic goal D. Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services														
Target 14: Ecosystems and essential services safeguarded	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	13
Target 15: Ecosystems restored and resilience enhanced	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	12
Strategic goal E. Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity-building														
Target 18: Traditional knowledge respected	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x		x	9
Target 19: Knowledge improved, shared and applied	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x			x	9
Target 20: Financial resources from all sources increased	x		x		x	x			x	x		x	x	8
Total	14	12	15	10	13	10	9	7	15	14	3	9	15	

¹⁶ Detailed Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and Aichi Biodiversity Targets are provided in Annex 1

Target 1: Awareness Increased

28. CIFOR is contributing to the achievement of this target through a wide range of initiatives reaching a number of stakeholders. These include communication products and outlets on issues such as food and biodiversity, forest conservation and management, bushmeat, landscapes, payment for ecosystem services, and livelihoods, among others. Key initiatives cited are the Global Landscapes Forum and the CGIAR Development Dialogues. The organization's publications, including published research, are available online for free.

29. In its response FAO highlighted three periodic assessments that are widely distributed to governments, international organizations and other stakeholders, which are also available on line free of cost:

- (a) The State of the World's Forest Genetic Resources;
- (b) The Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA); and
- (c) The biennial State of the World's Forests.

Each issue of the latter, besides reporting on major developments affecting forests, focuses on a featured theme.

30. GEF biodiversity focal area projects implemented during the fifth and sixth replenishment cycles are all structured for sustainability and replication.¹⁷ A wide range of stakeholders from the public and private sectors, from the local to the national levels, are required to be engaged in project design, with many participating in project implementation. Projects are designed for replication, which involves the dissemination of lessons learned and outputs, the sharing of experiences, and outreach and capacity building directed at a new set of stakeholders, both within and outside project intervention areas.

31. ITTO has undertaken an array of activities raising the awareness of the values of biodiversity:

- (a) The development and application of policy tools such as policy guidelines and criteria and indicators of SFM (C&I)
- (b) The organization of international meetings such as the International Forum on Payment for Environmental Services of Tropical Forests held in April 2014, and
- (c) The development and dissemination of policy papers, technical reports and other publications (http://www.itto.int/policypapers_guidelines/)

32. Activities reported by IUFRO consisted principally of scientific meetings and knowledge products, including:

- (a) The Global Forest Expert Panels (GFEP) 2012 assessment report on "Understanding Relationships between Biodiversity, Carbon, Forests and People: The Key to Achieving REDD+ Objectives. A Global Assessment Report",
- (b) Publications of the Special Project on World Forests, Society and Environment (WFSE);
- (c) The "Research Letter on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services" (2015) by the IUFRO Task Force on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, and
- (d) IUFRO Spotlight, which is an initiative to introduce significant research findings of IUFRO member organizations to a worldwide network of decision makers, policy makers and researchers.

33. While IUCN is engaged in a number of activities for raising awareness of the values of biodiversity, *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2014.3* is at the center of its awareness raising and communications efforts. The Red List provides online taxonomic, conservation

¹⁷ The fifth and sixth cycles cover the periods 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2014 and 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2018.

status and distribution information on plants, fungi and animals. Its main purpose is to catalogue and highlight plants and animals facing a higher risk of global extinction, listing them as critically endangered, endangered and vulnerable.

34. UNDP replied that it was requested by the UN Secretary-General to facilitate the Forests Action Area of the UN World Climate Summit, which was held in New York on 23 September 2014. In this role, UNDP led a global coalition of actors to generate ambitious announcements on forests for the Summit. Under UNDP's leadership, the Climate Summit's Forests Action Area mobilized a global partnership of developing and developed countries, states and provinces, major companies, indigenous peoples and civil society organizations to agree to the first global timeline to slow and end deforestation, resulting in the New York Declaration on Forests, and to announce specific individual commitments to help reach that goal. Endorsed by 179 entities, including countries, states and provinces, indigenous peoples, NGOs and major companies, the New York Declaration on Forests pledges to halve deforestation by 2020 and end it by 2030, to restore 350 million hectares of degraded forest landscapes, and expresses government buy-in to private sector supply chain goals. The Forests package was hailed by the media as the key outcome of the Climate Summit and placed forests at the centre of world leaders' attention.

35. UNEP reported that UN-REDD Programme countries often undertake awareness raising workshops in relation to the Cancun REDD+ safeguards, including on the values of forest biodiversity. In some countries, economic valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services is undertaken. UNEP efforts to raise awareness of the values of biodiversity include publications for many different audiences. Among these are a guidance document and roadmap (produced jointly by UNEP-WCMC and IEEP) to support Parties in producing updated NBSAPs that are compliant with Aichi Biodiversity Targets 1 and 2 through the incorporation of biodiversity and ecosystem service values, and *The A-Z of biodiversity terminology guide*, which reaches out to the business sector.

36. The UNFF played a critical role in promoting the adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of resolution 61/193 of 20 December 2006 on the International Year of Forests, 2011. As a result of the successful events of 2011 raising awareness of the importance of sustainable forest management, the General Assembly through resolution 67/200 of 21 December 2012 proclaimed 21 March of each year as the International Day of Forests, with its observation commencing in 2013, in order to celebrate and raise awareness of the importance of all types of forests and trees outside of forests. The resolution requests the UNFF Secretariat, in collaboration with FAO, to facilitate the implementation of the International Day of Forests, in collaboration with Governments, the CPF and international, regional and subregional organizations and processes as well as relevant major groups. The UN Secretary-General issued a statement focussing on the 2015 theme of "Forests and Climate Change". In addition to UNFFS and FAO, other CPF members who organized or participated in this year's celebration included CIFOR, ITTO, IUCN, the secretariats of UNCCD and UNFCCC, and the World Bank.

Target 2: Biodiversity values integrated

37. The GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Strategy strongly emphasizes biodiversity mainstreaming. This is "the process of embedding biodiversity considerations into policies, strategies, and practices of key public and private actors that impact or rely on biodiversity. Mainstreaming enables biodiversity to persist across entire landscapes and seascapes." It goes on to state: "The societal failure to adequately price the economic value of biodiversity has undermined the long-term sustainability of mainstreaming efforts, which have often focused too narrowly on threat mitigation and palliative attempts to offset biodiversity loss. GEF support to biodiversity mainstreaming actions that addresses this systemic failure is paramount."¹⁸ According to the GEF Secretariat, there are 146 countries eligible for support to effect biodiversity mainstreaming.

38. The World Bank reported that it has worked in integrating biodiversity values into development and poverty reduction planning in ≥ 49 countries from 1988 to 2014.

¹⁸ GEF, *GEF-6 Programming Directions* (Extract from GEF Assembly Document GEF/A.5/07/Rev.01, May 22, 2014), p. 17.

39. UNDP informed that it is assisting countries with the reform of legal and regulatory frameworks so that poor, indigenous populations and local communities can have secure access to forest resources as well as to ensure that benefits arising from the sustainable use of biodiversity (including from bio-prospecting) can be shared in a fair and equitable way, consistent with international instruments and national legislation. UNDP is supporting 90 countries in mainstreaming work, including that related to forests, through a range of projects currently at different stages in their implementation, including 45 countries in the development of NBSAPs. Closely linked to valuation work and incorporation of biodiversity and ecosystems into national accounts is the Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN), launched in 2012 as a new global partnership seeking to address the biodiversity finance challenge in a comprehensive manner – to define biodiversity finance needs and gaps with greater precision through detailed national-level assessments, to determine challenges and opportunities for resource mobilisation, and to build a sound business case for increased biodiversity investment. BIOFIN is supported by the European Union and the Governments of Germany, Switzerland, Norway and Flanders. The Global Environment Facility is a further partner financing parallel in-country projects. As of January 2015, BIOFIN’s total budget is US\$ 28 million.

40. UNEP replied that, through its World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC), it is working with national governments to integrate biodiversity values into national strategies and planning processes by providing data and information to strengthen capacity for biodiversity decision-making, as well as providing tools and guidance on biodiversity mainstreaming. Through the Government of the United Kingdom’s Darwin Initiative-funded project “NBSAPs 2.0”, UNEP-WCMC is providing support for the mainstreaming of biodiversity and development in NBSAPs through knowledge exchange, challenge exercises and the development of tools and resources. UNEP has also provided support for the establishment of the African Leadership Group – an open-ended voluntary body to promote biodiversity-development mainstreaming in the African region. With funding from the Government of Norway, UNEP-WCMC provided support to the CBD secretariat in delivering training on biodiversity mainstreaming to over 90 parties to the Convention at the global workshop on reviewing progress and building capacity for the NBSAPs revision process held in Nairobi in November 2013. Moreover, UNEP is continuing TEEB efforts (The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity), which is undertaking several national, regional and sectoral assessments, e.g., current TEEB for Food and Agriculture. UNEP is also a partner in VANTAGE and other key projects on ecosystem valuation and natural capital accounting.

41. CIFOR replied that it has contributed mainly at the global level by promoting the forestry sector case in the GEF-financed Biodiversity Planning Support Programme and in the evaluation/revision of several CBD National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and UNFCCC Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) and National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs). It also informed that ecosystem valuation studies have been undertaken in Gabon and Cameroon, as well as realizing an extensive body of work related to payment for ecosystem services (PES) in several tropical countries.

42. FAO responded that it is contributing to this target through the work of the Committee on Forestry (COFO), the International Poplar Commission (IPC) and the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA).

Target 3: Incentives reformed

43. CIFOR has undertaken a significant amount of work on perverse incentives and the underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation. It has also had success in evaluating the effectiveness of payment for ecosystem services.

44. The GEF is currently monitoring and evaluating the effects of positive incentives in projects that it is funding. Programme 10 of the GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy on the “Integration of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services into Development and Finance Planning” states: “Policy and finance reforms must accompany valuation so that the finance and development decisions that impact natural ecosystems and biodiversity include incentives and price signals that result in more cost

effective and sustainable biodiversity management.”¹⁹ GEF-6 biodiversity Focal Area projects that build on strong engagement of the private sector generally promote the use of positive incentives.

45. The World Bank reported that it has promoted payment for ecosystem services as an incentive for forest biodiversity conservation in developing countries such as Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica and Mexico.

46. UNDP informed that its project interventions are designed to build the capacity and know-how on-the-ground to manage different forest types, facing different threats (clearance for agriculture, fragmentation, fires, pests and other pressures), strengthen the abilities of public institutions to manage forests, and put in place necessary rules and regulations and financial incentives.

47. The UNCCD has assessed and proposed positive incentives in the context of supporting countries in the elaboration and implementation of Integrated Financing Strategies (IFS) and Integrated Investment Frameworks (IIF) on sustainable land management (SLM), but not specifically for forest biodiversity conservation.

48. Within its Green Economy work, UNEP has tackled the issue of subsidies and provided evidence of the role of fiscal policies in addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. The vision for its REDD+ work is to promote the application of positive incentives for forest conservation based on the Cancun safeguard that REDD+ actions are consistent with the protection and conservation of natural forests, their ecosystem services and biological diversity.

Target 4: Sustainable consumption and production

49. The GEF is strongly involved in engaging the private sector in sustainable production and consumption through several of its programmes that are listed below:

(a) Biodiversity Programme 2: Nature’s Last Stand: Expanding the Reach of the Global Protected Area Estate;

(b) Biodiversity Programme 6: Ridge to Reef+: Maintaining Integrity and Function of Globally Significant Coral Reef Ecosystems;

(c) Biodiversity Programme 7: Securing Agriculture’s Future: Sustainable Use of Plant and Animal Genetic Resources;

(d) Biodiversity Programme 8: Implementing the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing;

(e) Biodiversity Programme 9: Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface;

(f) Biodiversity Programme 10: Integration of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services into Development and Finance Planning;

(g) SFM-1: Maintained Forest Resources: Reduce the pressures on high conservation value forests by addressing the drivers of deforestation;

(h) SFM-2: Enhanced Forest Management: Maintain flows of forest ecosystem services and improve resilience to climate change through SFM;

(i) SFM 3: Restored Forest Ecosystems: Reverse the loss of ecosystem services within degraded forest landscapes; and

(j) Integrated Approach Pilot: Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains.

GEF-6 programmes are just commencing implementation. The monitoring and evaluation components of the respective projects are currently on-going and the results and findings will most likely not be available for the majority until the end of the cycle in mid-2018. Consequently, the number of involved companies will not be available for some time.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, p. 34.

50. ITTO has not only directly assisted companies, but both in the past and currently is assisting the Governments of Indonesia, Gabon, Guyana and Peru in the implementation of national or regional timber tracking systems. The organization is also involved with two projects in a global programme on the integrated use of DNA fingerprinting and stable isotope analysis in commercially traded timber. The aforementioned programmes indirectly contribute towards the sustainability of companies' supply chains. In its response to the questionnaire, ITTO listed 10 companies that it has worked with.

51. To address deforestation and forest degradation, UNDP established the Green Commodities Programme (GCP) in 2009, with the mission of transforming agricultural production and trade around the world through multi-stakeholder collaboration and the establishment of effective national enabling environments in producer countries. It is broadly recognized that innovative strategies are needed in order to implement improved agricultural practices, increase supply chain efficiencies, combat poverty, maintain ecosystem services and biodiversity, strengthen rural economic development and ensure the long-term supply of commodities to markets. GCP combines public and private efforts to transform a given commodity sector (i.e. Oil Palm; soy beans), bringing together the various stakeholders of the targeted sector at country level to address underlying structural problems. GCP focuses on highly traded commodities with substantial environmental and social impacts. It has initiated programs on palm oil, pineapple, cocoa, coffee, soy, beef and dairy. In partnership with the UN-REDD Programme, the GCP is working to facilitate the phase out of deforestation and forest degradation from productive and financial supply chains. It works towards this goal by (i) identifying necessary incentives, levers and enabling conditions for supply chain actors to adopt widely recognized good agricultural practices and, (ii) by identifying financial instruments and mechanisms to channel private-sector finance and other investments into sustainable land-use activities and REDD+.

52. UNEP's International Resources Panel has been examining the decoupling of resource degradation from economic growth, resulting in the publication of several reports on sustainable production and consumption. It is hosted by UNEP's Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE) in Paris, France, which has a long productive history of working with private industry companies on a wide range of sustainable production and consumption issues. Its policy and technical reports are generally prepared in close consultation and collaboration with industry representatives. The Panel includes scientists, representatives of industrial associations, including the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), representatives of civil society and government experts. Some of its most recent publications, among others, include:

- (a) Managing and Conserving the Natural Resource Base for Sustained Economic and Social Development (February 2014);
- (b) Decoupling Natural Resource Use and Environmental Impacts from Economic Growth (2011)
- (c) Decoupling 2: Technologies, Opportunities and Policy Options (2014),
- (d) Building Natural Capital: How REDD+ Can Support a Green Economy (2014)
- (e) Assessing Global Land Use: Balancing Consumption with Sustainable Supply (2014).

In addition, UNEP-WCMC has continued to support the CBD Secretariat on key issues related to the development of voluntary standards and certification schemes incorporating safeguards for biodiversity (decision X1/7, paragraph 4), such as work on the assessment of data to support identification of Critical Habitat from International Finance Corporation (IFC) Performance Standard 6 requirements on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Resources. Recent work has also included a review of reports from signatories to the UNEP "Principles of Sustainable Insurance" to assess levels of activity related to biodiversity and to identify areas of best practice.

53. Through its Forest and Farm Facility, FAO assists producer organizations with capacity building and governance strengthening.
54. The IUCN Business Engagement Strategy promotes sustainability standards and safeguards in companies' sourcing activities that have a positive impact on biodiversity and the livelihoods of local people.
55. The UNCCD has worked with private sector stakeholders on innovative financing within the Integrated Financing Strategies and Integrated Investment Frameworks on sustainable land management, but has not monitored how many companies have actually altered their practices.
56. ICRAF reported that it has programmes in place to assist companies along the supply chain to alter practices, produce and consume more sustainably, including for:
- (a) Cacao – Vision for Change in Cote d'Ivoire
 - (b) Allanblackia – Tanzania & Ghana
 - (c) Coffee – Central America
 - (d) Rubber – Indonesia, China
 - (e) Indigenous fruits – Southern Africa

Target 5: Habitat loss halved or reduced

57. According to FAO, the latest assessment (FRA, 2010) provided information on the current extent of forest and trends for the period 1990-2000-2005 for 219 countries and territories. However, FRA 2010 also highlighted the large variation in the methodology of estimation, quality of data, year to which the data belongs, availability of data over time and ease with which the data can be verified. The rate of deforestation—mainly the conversion of tropical forest to agricultural land – shows signs of decreasing in several countries but continues at a high rate in others. Both Brazil and Indonesia, which had the highest net loss of forest in the 1990s, have significantly reduced their rate of loss. In Australia, severe drought and forest fires have contributed to the apparent loss of forest since 2000.²⁰ Afforestation and natural expansion of forests in some countries and regions have reduced the net loss of forest area significantly at the global level. The net change in forest area in the period 2000-2010 period is estimated at -5.2 million hectares per year (an area about the size of Costa Rica), down from -8.3 million hectares per year in the period 1990-2000 (<http://www.bipindicators.net/foretextent>). Unfortunately, at the time of the preparation of this paper FRA 2015 was not yet available, so there was no way to determine on a global scale progress towards the achievement of Target 5 since 2010. FRA 2015 is expected to be launched at the World Forest Congress in September 2015.

58. More recent information has been provided by the on-line Global Forest Watch mapping application utilizing satellite technology, open data and crowd sourcing, launched by the World

²⁰ Australia's forests are well adapted to climatic variability and respond to drought by reducing their canopy to minimise water loss. This is observed by satellites to be a 'loss' of forest when in fact it is only an apparent loss, as the tree canopies typically thicken with new leaves after the drought breaks, though the timing of the response varies. While the Australian National Greenhouse Accounts National Inventory Report (2011) endeavoured to account for this, it remained unclear what the contribution of drought-stressed forests were to the forest cover change figures. (Australia's Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) 2010 country report to the FAO (p12) <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/al448E/al448E.pdf>) There has been a net increase in forest cover of almost 1 million hectares for the period 1990 to 2000; however, there has subsequently been a net decline in Australia's forest area. It is understood the most likely reason for the detected decline in forest extent is the extended drought across much of Australia since 2000 which has resulted in a double loss: a decline in forest regrowth along with a decline in tree foliage from water stress (the reduced foliage is detected by satellites as a loss of forest extent). It is unclear at this stage whether the climatic-induced reduction is a temporary or permanent loss of forest. Since 2000 there have been a number of high-intensity mega fires, especially in Australia's open forests – the long term effect on Australia's forest extent as a result of these fires is, as yet, unclear.

Resources Institute (WRI), UNEP and Google in February 2014. Its assessments indicate that 20.8 million hectares of tree cover was lost in 2012. From 2000 to 2012, 229.8 million hectares of forest cover was lost and 80.6 million hectares of forest cover was gained for a net loss of 149.2 million hectares, or 12.43 million hectares per year.

59. ICRAF reported that its Land Degradation Surveillance Framework (LDSF)²¹ is a landscape based approach for assessing ecosystem health at multiple spatial scales and has been featured in Leadley et al. (2014)²².

60. The World Bank has supported the reduction of deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon through long term engagement with a range of financing instruments (grants, loans, analytical work), resulting in the reduction of deforestation by 83% for the period 2004 to 2014. Approximately 80 million hectares of forests have benefitted from Bank projects in Brazil, Mexico and Colombia alone.²³ Since 2002, 73 million hectares were brought under participatory community forest management.

61. Specifically in relation to the UNDP-managed GEF Small Grants Programme, as of 2011 SGP-supported community-based projects are estimated to have contributed to the protection of over 12.9 million hectares of forests from human and non-human impacts. UNDP also supports the delivery of work on REDD+ in a number of other ways, including as a delivery partner for the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) and through UNDP's Country Offices. Through this agreement, UNDP is currently supporting Cambodia, Honduras and Suriname to implement their FCPF Readiness Grants of US \$3.8 million each. Papua New Guinea, Panama and Paraguay have also requested UNDP to act as Delivery Partner and arrangements are currently being finalized. UNDP Country Offices are also supporting REDD+ related work in Viet Nam, Mexico, Guyana and Malaysia.²⁴ In its peer review of this document, Mexico reported that it is currently supported by the World Bank in the implementation of an FCPF Readiness Grant in the amount of \$3.8 million.

62. CIFOR reported that its activities since 2010 have avoided the deforestation of approximately 150,000 hectares in Indonesia and 200,000 hectares in Peru, while reducing forest degradation on 500,000 hectares per year in the Congo Basin. During that same period, its projects and activities have benefitted approximately 10 million hectares in the Congo Basin, 2 million hectares in Peru and 2 million hectares in Indonesia.

63. In order to contribute to the reduction of tropical deforestation and forest degradation, ITTO has implemented projects, programmes and other activities to assist its producer member countries in:

(a) Enhancing collaborative forest management with local communities, including the development of alternative livelihoods and income sources;

(b) Developing methodologies and mechanisms, as well as institutional set-up and capacity related to REDD+, such as the forest monitoring system and benefit sharing arrangements; and

(c) Developing and implementing schemes for payment for the environmental services provided by forests.

64. ITTO estimates that through its projects deforestation and forest degradation have been avoided in approximately 32,211 hectares in Asia, 3,560 hectares in Latin America and 1,000 hectares in Africa, for a total of 36,771 hectares, since 2010.

²¹ Available at www.landscapeportal.org

²² Leadley, P.W., Krug, C.B., Alkemade, R., Pereira, H.M., Sumaila U.R., Walpole, M., Marques, A., Newbold, T., Teh, L.S.L, van Kolck, J., Bellard, C., Januchowski-Hartley, S.R. and Mumby, P.J. (2014): Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets: An Assessment of Biodiversity Trends, Policy Scenarios and Key Actions. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Montreal, Canada.

²⁴ In the case of Mexico, UNDP has provided technical and administrative assistance for the development of a Measurement, Reporting and Verification system (MRV), as well as a National Safeguards System.

65. The GEF was unable to provide a quantified response since many of the 146 countries implementing GEF projects do not have monitoring, report and verification (MRV) systems in place that would allow it to provide an answer at this time.

66. UNEP actively supports the REDD+ mechanism under the UNFCCC and wider efforts to reduce deforestation and forest degradation. Much of this support is provided through the UN-REDD Programme, which supports countries in preparing to implement REDD+. However, UNEP was unable to provide any figures for the impacts of the UN-REDD Programme, since there currently is no global scale monitoring programme on the impacts of UN-REDD activities on changes in forest cover and areas of forest degradation. Thus data is drawn from the FAO Global Forest Resources Assessments. Most countries are still in the REDD+ readiness phase and, therefore, quantified information at the national level is not yet available. Nevertheless, UNEP reported that it is contributing to the achievement of this target in other ways. WCMC's Protected Areas Programme develops and supports the scientific basis for the valuation of protected areas, assesses the management and ecological effectiveness of these areas, and monitors performance at a global level. UNEP also helps reduce fragmentation and degradation of natural habitats by working to identify, support and promote networks of protected areas, particularly those that are linked by a common focus, with similar values and management approaches. As part of a project funded by the MacArthur Foundation, UNEP-WCMC is identifying current and future trade-offs between the demand for commodities and biodiversity in the Great Lakes of Africa, the watersheds of the Andes and the Greater Mekong and its headwaters. The project has already modelled current and predicted land use change in the Great Lakes of Africa to reveal which watersheds are important for biodiversity and future commodity provision. UNEP-WCMC is also a partner in the REDD-PAC project in which land use modelling is used to assess the potential impacts of REDD+ policy options in Brazil and the Congo Basin, helping to identify those options that will be most effective in securing both forests and biodiversity in these important regions.

67. In its response to the questionnaire, the UNFCCC Secretariat reiterated that COP, in its decision 1/CP.16, has affirmed that, in the context of the provision of adequate and predictable support to developing country Parties, Parties should collectively aim to slow, halt and reverse forest cover and carbon loss, in accordance with national circumstances, consistent with the ultimate objective of the Convention, as stated in Article 2.

Target 7: Sustainable agriculture, aquaculture and forestry

68. The *Report of the Team of Independent Consultants* assessing the International Arrangement on Forests that was presented at the eleventh session of the UNFF in May 2015 looked at progress in the implementation of the Forest Instrument and its Global Objectives on Forests. In assessing progress towards Global Objective 3, which is closely linked to Target 7, the report emphasized that, "by (April) 2014 the certification of the world's sustainably managed forests reached 437.41 million hectares, equivalent to 11 percent of the earth's total forest cover. This was an increase of nearly 161 million hectares since 2006, representing an increase of 58.2 percent in certified forests in the eight years from 2006 to 2014. It should be noted, however, that these figures are inflated since there is some double counting, unofficially estimated at around 10 percent, between FSC and PEFC".^{25 26}

69. The GEF reported that 7.36 million hectares of forest have come under SFM since 2010 as a result of its projects. It further informed that approximately 25 of its projects use forest certification as a management tool, although certification is not the major objective of these projects.

²⁵ Blaser, Juergen; Chipeta, Mafa Evaristus; Illueca, Jorge; Lobovikov, Maxim; Umali, Ricardo; *Independent Assessment of the International Arrangement on Forests* (September 2014), p. 158.

²⁶ The majority of countries are engaged in Programme for Endorsement of Forest Certification Schemes (PEFC), which is the most extensive of global certification programmes, and/or the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) process. As of April 2014, forests certified by PEFC and FSC covered 258 million hectares and 179.41 million hectares respectively for a total of 437.41 million hectares. Forest Stewardship Council, *Global FSC certificates, types and distribution* (April 2014), p. 4; and www.pefc.org (consulted 24 April 2014).

70. Through World Bank projects, at least 8.9 million hectares have been brought under SFM since 2002, including 3.5 million hectares under certification schemes.

71. ITTO responded that it is currently in the process of conducting a survey to monitor, assess and report on the status of tropical forest management, including the area of sustainably managed tropical forests, to follow up the former survey conducted in 2010 (*Status of Tropical Forest Management 2011*, hereinafter referred to as SFM Tropics 2011). It was discovered as the result of the SFM Tropics 2011 that the area of sustainably managed production Permanent Forest Estate (PFE) in ITTO producer member countries increased from 25.2 million ha in 2005 to 30 million ha in 2010. During the same period, sustainably managed protection PFE also increased from 11.2 million ha in 2005 to 22.7 million ha in 2010. According to SFM Tropics 2011, the area of certified natural forest production PFE in ITTO producer countries increased from 10.5 million hectares in 2005 to 17 million hectares in 2010. It is assumed that these trends have continued after 2010. The area of forests where activities to achieve SFM have been carried out under ITTO projects since 2010 is approximately 1.5 million hectares in Africa, 2,404,565 hectares in Latin America and 320,000 hectares in Asia, for a total of 4,224,565 hectares. The area of forests certified under ITTO projects since 2010 is approximately 4,430,326 hectares, primarily in Africa (approximately 4 million hectares) with a lesser amount in Latin America (430,326 hectares).

72. CIFOR reiterated that approximately 10 million hectares of forests in the Congo Basin are sustainably managed.

73. Although it did not provide figures on the area of sustainably managed forests resulting from its project interventions, UNDP reported that since its launch in 1992, the GEF Small Grants Programme has supported more than 18,000 community based projects with an estimated 40 per cent of those (approximately 7,000 community projects) focused on the protection, rehabilitation and sustainable use of forests ecosystems across the world. This portfolio comprises US \$192 million in grants. Nearly 1,000 of these projects have focused specifically on reducing deforestation, with 40 per cent occurring in Africa, 32 per cent in Latin America and 21 per cent in Asia. SGP has also financed 69 strategic projects, with a higher grant ceiling (up to US \$150,000) allowing communities to upscale local activities or address deforestation problems more extensively at a landscape wide level. These projects are supported in a demand driven manner with project proposals generated by communities, community based organizations, and civil society organizations.

74. UNEP responded that it is working to ensure that planning for areas such as those under forestry, agriculture and aquaculture is supported by technical tools (modelling, scenarios, etc.) and communication products to allow decision-makers to integrate biodiversity into national land-use decisions. For example, using datasets of current and projected land use change based on possible shifts in demand for agricultural commodities and datasets of current biodiversity importance, UNEP-WCMC has begun to model impacts of different scenarios of agricultural development and their potential impacts upon biodiversity at watershed scales. This will help to provide input into future land-use planning decisions. UNEP is also working to support this target by helping build best practice guidance on the biodiversity benefits of different farming systems, integrating biodiversity considerations into agriculture policies, and building incentive schemes for maintaining biodiversity in agricultural landscapes.

75. ICRAF emphasizes that as a research organization, it is difficult to estimate outputs as work may not always directly impact on targets. As such, ICRAF replies that they have certainly contributed to Target 7 but do not have a direct assessment of this impact.

Target 9: Invasive alien species prevented and controlled

76. GEF reported that it has 12 projects focusing on invasive alien species (IAS), but added that many others have a component dealing with IAS. Three projects that it highlighted on this issue in the Latin American region are:

(a) Argentina: Strengthening of Governance for the Protection of Biodiversity through the Formulation and Implementation of the National Strategy on Invasive Alien Species (NSIAS);

(b) Mexico: Enhancing National Capacities to Manage Invasive Alien Species (IAS) by Implementing the National Strategy on IAS;

(c) Chile: Strengthening and Development of Instruments for the Management, Prevention and Control of Beaver (*Castor Canadensis*), an Invasive Alien Species in the Chilean Patagonia.

77. The World Bank responded that it has projects addressing the threats of invasive alien species, including:

(a) The Cape Peninsula Biodiversity Conservation Project in South Africa;

(b) The GEF Tabuleiro State Park: Conservation of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Rehabilitation Project in Brazil;

(c) The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund 2 Project; and

(d) The Brazil Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Institutional Consolidation Project.

78. UNEP replied that it is playing a key role in tracking, monitoring and assessing wildlife trade and species information. This information, helps contribute to the identification of alien invasive species. Through UNEP-WCMC, UNEP has also carried out work to inform action relating to invasive alien species within the framework of the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations. UNEP-WCMC, together with the Invasive Species Specialist Group coordinated by IUCN, is exploring the development of national indicators to track progress in managing alien invasive species for Small Island Developing States.

79. IUFRO has included the assessment of the risks and impacts of biological invasions, pathway risk management, surveillance and incursion response as an emphasis area under Theme 4 on Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services and Biological Invasions of its 2015-2019 Strategy.

80. ICRAF replied that they monitor the invasiveness of agroforestry species, especially from their gene banks, improving the planning, prevention and control of invasive alien species.

81. FAO noted that the FAO guide to the implementation of phytosanitary standards in forestry (2011) includes information on IAS.

Target 11: Protected areas increased and improved

82. GEF reported that 7.36 million hectares of forests alone have been set aside since 2010 as protected areas solely as a result of its Sustainable Forest Management Strategy.

83. As per ITTO's response to the questionnaire, the area of protected forests where forest management has been improving through the implementation of ITTO projects since 2010 is approximately 1,408,000 hectares in Asia, 464,140 hectares in Latin America and 95,000 hectares in Africa, for a total of 1,973,981 hectares.

84. Through its joint management with IUCN, of the World Database on Protected Areas and related activities, UNEP plays an important role in tracking global progress towards protected areas targets and supporting global and national level work on the monitoring and evaluation of protected areas coverage, as well as on the effectiveness of protected areas and other area-based conservation measures. UNEP informed that the UN-REDD Programme has no global scale monitoring on forest protected area designation as a result of Programme activities, but uses the UNEP-WCMC World Database of Protected Areas.

85. In its decision XI/24, the Conference of the Parties to the CBD invited UNEP-WCMC and its partners to continue to report progress towards achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 and related targets through the Protected Planet Report. To that end, UNEP-WCMC launched the new global Protected Planet Report at CBD COP12, as well as the Protected Planet Asia report. UNEP-WCMC has also engaged in numerous capacity building activities including:

(a) Ongoing work with funding support from BIOPAMA to provide training and targeted capacity building on protected area data to ACP countries;

(b) Support through the GEF funded work on "the Assessment of the connectivity of the PA network in West Africa"; and

(c) The development of tools and principles for reporting on protected areas management effectiveness.

86. UNEP is also working closely with governments and with the ICCA consortium to assist with national recognition of Indigenous Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs) and to develop the ICCA registry (see Target 18).

87. UNDP reported that it does not have statistics for protected areas set aside through its projects for the 2010-2015. Since 2000, an area of approximately 250 million hectares of production land has been directly impacted upon by support through UNDP-managed GEF-financed projects to modify production practices in the agriculture, fisheries, forestry, tourism, extractive industry and other sectors; and to promote sustainable use of biodiversity. In addition, projects have reported cumulative impacts across more than 2,000 protected areas covering almost 300 million hectares, including marine, terrestrial and indigenous and community conserved areas. The projects active in 2014 have directly supported the creation of more than 6 million hectares of new protected areas around the world, though this figure includes non-forest ecosystems.

88. IUCN and IUFRO responded that they were unable to determine how many hectares of forests have been set aside as protected as a result of their activities. For IUCN to determine this, it would be very difficult since its position is that the target is too generalized and needs to be brought down to the level of forest types.

Target 12: Extinction prevented

89. GEF informed that all of its projects support and improve ecosystem management which benefits species. In addition, the Save our Species programme has a specific species emphasis. The Global Project: Save Our Species is implemented by the World Bank supported by a \$4.9 million GEF grant and \$18.8 million in co-financing.

90. The World Bank replied that it has a number of projects that aim at improving the status of endangered species, including:

- (a) The Kihansi Catchment Conservation Project in Tanzania;
- (b) The LA-Nam Et-Phou Louey Tiger Landscape Project in Lao People's Democratic Republic;
- (c) The Fighting against Wildlife Poaching Project in Africa; and
- (d) The Tiger Futures: Mainstreaming Conservation in Large Landscapes Project.

91. Under the ITTO-CITES Programme for Implementing CITES Listings of Tropical Timber Species, work to sustain the following species, among others, can be highlighted:

- (a) *Pericopsis elata* (afro-rosewood or assamela);
- (b) *Prunus africana* (pygeum) and *Diospyros* spp. (ebony) of Central Africa and Madagascar;
- (c) *Swietenia macrophylla* (big-leaf mahogany);
- (d) *Cedrela odorata* and other *Cedrela* spp. (cedro) in Latin America;
- (e) *Dalbergia* spp. (rosewood) in both Africa and Latin America; and
- (f) *Gonystylus* spp. (ramin) and *Aquilaria* spp./*Gyrinops* spp. (agarwood) in Southeast Asia.

92. UNEP has collaborated with a range of partner organisations in the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP) to develop indicators of sustainable use of species: the Wild Commodities Index and the Red List Index of internationally traded species, and the Red List Index of utilized species.

These indicators can be used to track the wild populations and commercial demand for a selection of highly used animals and plants, and reflect the extent to which the use of these species is sustainable. In addition, UNEP-WCMC and partners have recently published the scientific rationale for an index of utilized species and a harvest index.

93. In addition, UNEP-WCMC also produces trade analyses and reports based on this extensive dataset. Moreover, it also supports the European Commission to ensure effective implementation of the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations and is developing analysis and capacity building support for different regions, including a recent workshop for seven countries of the Central American region (<http://citescentroamerica.unep-wcmc.org/wordpress/english/>). UNEP-WCMC is also developing new technologies such as online data dashboards and electronic permit exchange mechanisms as a way to improve monitoring in near-real time and ultimately ensure wildlife trade is sustainable.

94. UNEP-WCMC re-launched in 2013-14 both “Species+” – a website designed to assist parties in implementing various multilateral environmental agreements - and an upgraded CITES trade database to provide information on species protected by CITES, CMS and the European Union Wildlife Trade Regulations. These have been used to help inform decision-making on threatened species and determine actions that need to be undertaken to improve their conservation. The CITES Trade Database holds over 14 million records of trade in some 35 000 taxa listed by CITES.

95. UNEP has also undertaken analysis of international trade in timber species. Support has been provided to both the CITES Secretariat and the Commission of the European Union to generate outputs of certain CITES-listed timber species and quantities in trade. In addition, UNEP-WCMC produced for the European Union a review of non-CITES timber species from South East Asia to assess the potential need for international regulation of the trade in these species.

96. UNEP has also contributed to the CPW media toolkit on bushmeat and provided information on tools and activities to support sustainable wildlife management. UNEP-WCMC is currently developing a model of bushmeat hunting in Africa. It has also contributed a chapter to a recent publication on the impact of extractive industries on great apes.

97. UNDP replied that species-specific data are captured in the annual performance reports of each individual project, as tracked against specific indicator species where relevant. One relevant example is the threatened population of Loveridge's Sunbird—which is endemic to the Uluguru Mountains in Tanzania and estimated at 37,000 individuals. The primary threat to this species is the slow destruction of their forest habitat. The three Forest Reserves in which the species lives, have been used for firewood and small amounts of timber; the long term effects of this seemingly minor habitat degradation on the species are as of yet unclear, though decreases in the population are presumed. By working to improve the management of the Uluguru Mountain Blocks, the UNDP-GEF project has helped to protect the habitat of this rare bird. For instance, the project contributed to the revision of the IUCN Red List status of the Sunbird from Near Threatened to Endangered in 2008.

98. CIFOR reported that it is working on the preservation of selected species. These include on:

- (a) The great ape and poverty linkages;
- (b) The unsustainable exploitation of *Prunus africana* in collaboration with CITES; and
- (c) *Pericopsis elata* (*Afromosa*) and other timber species.

99. IUCN is unable to provide comprehensive information on the improved status of threatened species without first conducting extensive and lengthy consultations with the IUCN global network. Nevertheless, its over 1,200 member organizations and institutions in more than 160 countries are actively working to protect and improve the status of a large number of threatened species. Similar responses were provided in the questionnaire on questions related to Targets 13 and 18.

Target 13: Genetic diversity maintained

100. FAO's Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA) provides a unique intergovernmental forum to reach global consensus on policies relevant to all sectors of

genetic resources for food and agriculture (i.e. plant, animal, forest, aquatic, etc.). It guides the preparation of global assessments, negotiates global plans of action, codes of conduct and other instruments for the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources for food and agriculture. In 2009, the CGRFA established an Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Forest Genetic Resources (ITWG-FGR) which has identified strategic priorities for improving the management of forest genetic resources at the national, regional and global levels. In 2013, the FAO Conference adopted these priorities as the Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Sustainable Use and Development of Forest Genetic Resources (GPA-FGR). The Commission supports FAO in its leading role as Biodiversity Champion for Aichi Biodiversity Target 13.

101. Relevant GEF projects are being developed through the following programs of the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy:

(a) Biodiversity Programme 1: Improving Financial Sustainability and Effective Management of the National Ecological Infrastructure;

(b) Biodiversity Programme 7: Securing Agriculture's Future: Sustainable Use of Plant and Animal Genetic Resources.

Annex 6 of the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy identifies priority genetic reserve locations for wild relatives for 14 major food crops (finger millet, barley, sweet potato, cassava, banana/plantain, rice, pearl millet, garden pea, potato, sorghum, wheat, faba bean, cowpea and maize).

102. Since 2012, UNDP has supported the implementation of the third objective of the CBD through GEF-funded projects that facilitate access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing in about 20 countries. This includes working with governments and stakeholders in developing countries that already have a policy framework in place for ABS to assist them in accessing financing and to facilitate ABS deals such as sustainable ethical bioprospecting programs or deals between corporations interested in accessing genetic resources and organizations representing the providers of these resources. In this context, UNDP is also supporting local and indigenous communities for the development of payment and benefit-sharing mechanisms and bio-cultural community protocols.

103. ITTO projects PD 393/06 Rev.1 (F) and PD 534/08 Rev.1 (F) contributed to rehabilitating degraded forest lands in Ghana (Ashanti and Eastern Regions) with the involvement of women groups using agroforestry combining *Moringa olifera* and food crops (cassava, cocoyam, plantain banana) with indigenous timber species (*Triplochiton scleroxylon*, *Terminalia superba*, *Terminalia ivorensis*, *Milicia excelsa*, etc.). Moringa products, which are nutrient-rich, as well as food crops, are used to combat malnutrition in rural areas and as a source of income for women groups involved in forest rehabilitation activities. ITTO pre-project PPD 165/12 Rev.1 (F) provided assistance to Benin for the identification of key stakeholders to collect baseline information and data required for the preparation of a project intending to contribute to the sustainable management of sacred forests. In addition to the cultural and ritual roles, sacred forests are playing a crucial role for biodiversity conservation in many West African countries with low forest cover such as Benin.

104. CIFOR informed that it is not working on minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding genetic diversity at the species level per se, but at the broader biodiversity/agriculture interface. Key publications include:

(a) Powell et al [in press] Strategies to improve diets with wild and cultivated biodiversity from across the landscape. Food Security.

(b) Foli et al. 2014. Exploring the dynamics between forests, ecosystem services and food production: A systematic review protocol. Environmental Evidence.

(c) Ickowitz et al. 2014. Dietary Quality and Tree Cover in Africa. Global Environmental Change.

(d) Johns et al. 2013. Agricultural biodiversity as a link between traditional food systems and contemporary development, social integrity and ecological health. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture, 93(14):3433-42.

(e) Powell et al. 2013. The role of forests, trees and wild biodiversity for improved nutrition-sensitivity of food and agriculture systems. Expert background paper for the International Conference on Nutrition 2, FAO, Rome.

105. ICRAF reported that it is directly involved in maintaining tree genetic diversity by maintaining and managing ex situ genebanks for orthodox tree species and circa situm live genebanks for recalcitrant and intermediate tree species. Furthermore, ICRAF is involved in developing indicators for monitoring genetic diversity and dynamics. At the global headquarters of ICRAF, the African Orphan Crops Consortium (AOCC) Laboratory is housed with the goal to use the latest scientific equipment and techniques to genetically sequence, assemble and annotate the entire genomes of 100+ traditional African food crops (including trees, as the AOCC closely collaborates with the molecular laboratory of ICRAF). The organization has also produced a number of scientific publications on forest and agroforestry genetic diversity as well as prepared relevant management tools.²⁷

Target 14: Ecosystems and essential services safeguarded

106. According to the GEF, its sustainable forest management programs have resulted in the restoration of 424,013 hectares. This figure does not take into account restoration undertaken through GEF Biodiversity Programs. Since monitoring and evaluation of projects is still ongoing, it is not possible at this time to provide information on how forest restoration has affected the livelihoods of women, indigenous and local communities.

107. Since 2010, approximately 800 hectares in Africa, 2,481 hectares in Asia and 3,560 hectares in Latin America of degraded forests, totalling 6,841 hectares, were restored and rehabilitated as a result of ITTO projects. Regarding the benefits generated for local and indigenous communities, ITTO project PD 424/06 Rev.2 (F) contributed to the conservation and utilization of medicinal timber species in three ecological zones of Ghana (forest savanna, semi-deciduous rainforest and high rainforest) with the involvement of local communities. While local communities have been trained in the management and conservation (in-situ and ex-situ) regarding medicinal timber species, the project also contributed to carry out the inventories of medicinal timber species in these three ecological zones and document their uses through a participatory approach involving the Forestry Research Institute of Ghana (FORIG) and local communities. In Latin America, the following four projects were implemented that all benefitted local and indigenous communities:

(a) RED-PD 18/09 (F): Sustainable forest management and utilization of ecosystem services in forests managed by the Ese'Eja native community in Infierno, Peru;

(b) PD 622/11 Rev.1 (F): Marketing of Native Plant Seeds, Seedlings and Timber Products to Improve Living Standards and Strengthen Regional Forest Policies in the Amazon Region of Peru: A Pilot Case on the Taulia Molinopampa Rural Community;

(c) PD 482/07 Rev.2 (F): Sustainable Forest Production and Conservation with Community Participation in the Chepigana Forest Reserve of Darien, Panama; and

(d) PD 668/12 Rev.1 (F): Integrated Management of Natural Resources and Biodiversity in the Tacaná Volcano and Its Range of Influence in Mexico and Guatemala.

108. In its response, UNEP informed that it provides support for the achievement of this target by examining the importance of ecosystem services to human well-being, the role of biodiversity in underpinning ecosystem services, and by promoting and developing mechanisms such as ecosystem assessments to support decision-making. To this end, UNEP is building capacity to improve information and knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystems and make it available for use by decision-makers. Relevant UNEP-WCMC work focuses on biodiversity indicators and assessments, ecosystem services and their values for people, and support to policy processes at national, regional and global scales to ensure that ecosystems are safeguarded and restored. UNEP research in support of the High-

²⁷ More information available at: <http://www.scidev.net/sub-saharan-africa/education/news/transforming-orphan-crops.html>

level Panel on Global Assessment of Resources for Implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 has also provided a comprehensive assessment of the benefits of meeting the Aichi Targets and a database of references from this research will be provided to the CBD Secretariat. With funding from the UK Government, UNEP-WCMC completed in 2014 "*The Relationship between Biodiversity, Carbon Stock Resilience, and the provision of other Ecosystem Services: A critical review of the evidence base*". This provides guidance for the forestry component of the UK government's International Climate Fund (ICF), including on the implications for the selection and development of interventions in tropical forests designed to maximise carbon storage, livelihoods benefits and enhancement of biodiversity. Finally, in 2013-14, UNEP-WCMC completed a global synthesis on the ecosystem services from mangroves, *The Importance of Mangroves to People: A Call to Action*. The initiative included input from a broad constituency of internationally recognised leaders in the field and through a multi-stakeholder review.

109. CIFOR replied that since 2013 the Sloping Lands in Transition (SLANT) project organized several relevant research activities and workshops with experts on upland reforestation projects targeting smallholder landscapes in China, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. Local communities have participated, bringing their knowledge and expertise to bear on diverse topics, including how upland forest landscape restoration (FLR) affects environmental outcomes (erosion, flood control, water provision, biodiversity) and social conditions (smallholder community economic development, gender-differentiated benefits, minority relations), and how FLR is governed around the Asian region. In Amazonia, CIFOR's project on Smallholder and Community Forestry engaged national government partners and international practitioners on the topic of smallholder-led forest restoration, which is practiced throughout Amazonia at the small scale within agriculture-forest mosaic landscapes. Smallholder forest restoration through conservation of the germplasm of over-exploited timber species holds great promise in terms of safeguarding the biodiversity and ecological integrity of the forests of the future.

110. UNDP reported that its *Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework 2012-2020* lays out a roadmap for the organization's contributions to the achievement of the CBD Strategic Plan and, more specifically, the Aichi Targets. The overall strategic objective outlined in the Framework—to maintain and enhance the goods and services provided by biodiversity and ecosystems in order to secure livelihoods, food, water and health, enhance resilience, conserve threatened species and their habitats, and increase carbon storage and sequestration—has been reinforced by the integration of biodiversity considerations in the *UNDP Strategic Plan for 2014-2017*.

111. FAO informed that it is implementing projects on the restoration of mangroves in Central Africa, which offer a number of goods and services to local communities.

112. ICRAF is also linking the value of genetic diversity in forests and agroforestry for functional uses for food security and nutrition. It has developed interactive spatially-explicit species selection tools (documenting species distribution; www.vegetationmap4africa.org) linked with databases (documenting environmental services, products and biosafety implications which are based on principles of selecting 'the right tree for the right place', including methods of selecting the right seed sources and species-site matching for agroforestry, restoration and landscape diversification projects.²⁸

Target 15: Ecosystems restored and resilience enhanced

113. As indicated in its response related to Target 14, the GEF reported that its sustainable forest management programs alone have resulted in the restoration of 424,013 hectares of forests, based on the application of its SFM tracking tool. At the moment, the GEF is unable to determine the rate of increased carbon storage in restored forests since it has a multiplicity of projects in 146 countries, many of which are just establishing GHG accounting systems.

114. IUCN responded that it has secured approximately 60 million hectares of contributions to the Bonn Challenge 2020 goal of restoring 150 million hectares of forests. Countries that have pledged

²⁸ More information available at : <http://www.worldagroforestry.org/products/switchboard/index.php>

include Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Rwanda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Uganda and the United States; under the 20x20 Initiative that aims at 20 million hectares, pledges have been made by Mexico, Peru, Ecuador, Chile and the organization Conservación Patagónica.²⁹ IUCN has not yet attempted to measure the area restored since 2010, but will do so with a range of partners in the future, using the 2011 baseline of the Bonn Challenge.

115. Over a 20-year horizon, UNDP-managed SFM initiatives are expected to reduce or avoid emissions from forest and peatland degradation by more than 12 million tCO₂-eq. Specifically, in relation to the UNDP-managed GEF Small Grants Programme, as of 2011 SGP-supported community-based projects are estimated to help communities restore 1,746,360 hectares of degraded forest worldwide. Community demand for projects addressing forest issues continues to rise, with a three to four fold increase since the early 2000s. This increased demand demonstrates the strong interest on the part of communities to take action to rehabilitate and conserve forests.

116. Through its participation in the UN-REDD Programme and its Global Programme Framework on Support to National REDD+ Action (SNA), UNEP is offering a coherent package of support to countries on REDD+ environmental safeguards and multiple benefits. Relevant outputs since COP11 have included reports examining the role of spatial analyses in informing decisions on REDD+, multiple benefits, and biodiversity safeguards in several countries; training materials on these topics; guidance and policy documents, including a 2013 policy brief exploring synergies between REDD-plus and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets; and a number of global and regional workshops on multiple benefits and safeguards in REDD-plus planning and implementation. The UN-REDD Programme has no global scale for monitoring ecosystem restoration as a result of its activities, but individual countries are exploring restoration as a possible REDD+ activity (enhancement of forest carbon stocks). UNEP has an agreement with IUCN, within the Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration (GPFLR), to pool expertise and resources to support countries in the implementation of restoration activities. In addition, UNEP is undertaking several other relevant activities:

(a) It has an active programme of work to support ecosystem based adaptation to climate change, including in mountainous areas and more recently in coastal ecosystems in Small Island Developing States;

(b) Through a three year project funded by the MAVA Foundation for Nature, UNEP-WCMC in collaboration with the Secretariat of the Regional Network of Marine Protected Areas in West Africa (RAMPAO for the French acronym) and others, as well as national and local governments, protected area managers and local community members, is developing a "sustainable livelihood action plan for West African coastal protected areas in the context of climate change". The goal of the project is to increase socio-ecological resilience in protected areas systems to the negative effects of climate change;

(c) Through the work of the REDD-PAC project funded by the German government's International Climate Initiative, UNEP-WCMC is working with partners in Brazil and the Congo Basin to use land-use change models to assess the impacts of REDD+ policies, including on biodiversity, and achievement of the Aichi Targets. UNEP-WCMC is also supporting an additional 5 countries (Viet Nam, China, Uganda, Peru, and the Philippines) through capacity-building on multiple benefits from REDD+ (including biodiversity) and a series of publications on the role of spatial analysis in exploring synergies between environmental benefits from REDD+ and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in the Congo Basin, China, Peru, the Philippines, and Uganda, as well as a report on preliminary analyses mapping the potential for REDD+ to deliver biodiversity conservation in Viet Nam;

(d) UNEP-WCMC has also worked with the CBD Secretariat to increase awareness among REDD+ and CBD focal points of the synergies between the objectives of REDD+ and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

²⁹ In its peer review of this document, Mexico reported that it has committed to restore 8.4 million hectares of degraded forest lands through the 20x20 Initiative.

117. IUFRO carries out a range of research activities and capacity building, which contribute to enhancing knowledge about the restoration of forest ecosystems and hence supports the Bonn Challenge.

118. FAO has stated that they are unable to quantify their contribution to forest restoration at present, but project monitoring has shown that various restoration projects have made a contribution.

Target 18: Traditional knowledge respected

119. The use of traditional knowledge for forest management and conservation is integrated into project design and implementation, as appropriate, in all GEF-6 Biodiversity and SFM programs. The GEF does not track information on the number of forest management plans that have been consulted with indigenous communities.

120. In Africa, ITTO project PD 028/00 Rev.2 (F) contributed to set up 12 community forests in the Mefou and Afamba Valley in Cameroon. These community forests are governed by simplified management plans, which had been prepared with the full participation of local communities (using their traditional knowledge for the important activities such as forest inventory) and included some obligations regarding biodiversity conservation and management. The implementation of this project contributed to finalize the national guidelines for the establishment of community forests in Cameroon. ITTO also informed that several management plans covering 642,000 hectares in Latin America utilizing traditional knowledge were the result of projects such as:

(a) PD 351/05 Rev.1 (F): Criteria and Indicators for the Evaluation of Tropical Forest Management Sustainability in Mexico (Southeastern Coastal Plains: Gulf of Mexico and Yucatan Peninsula), with the participation of approximately 20 Ejidos (agricultural communal lands) of various ethnicities;

(b) PD 602/11 Rev.3 (F): Tropical Forest Governance in the Region of Darien, Panama, involving several communities in the Embera-Wounaan Comarca;

(c) RED-PD 18/09 (F): Sustainable forest management and utilization of ecosystem services in forests managed by the Ese'Eja native community in Infierno, Peru, with the participation of two Ese'Eja native communities; and

(d) RED-PD 33/11 (F): Value adding to environmental services from managed forests belonging to seven communities in the Ucayali region, involving seven Ashaninka native communities.

121. IUFRO responded that it is not directly contributing to the incorporation of traditional knowledge in forest management practices for the conservation of biodiversity. It has been and will continue to support this target through networking and knowledge products of the Task Force on Traditional Knowledge. Moreover, the topic figures prominently in the IUFRO 2015 GFEP assessment report entitled "Forests and Food Security".

122. UNDP replied that the UN-REDD Programme recently established a partnership with the GEF Small Grants Programme to support Community-Based REDD+, a mechanism to deliver grants directly to indigenous peoples and local communities to empower them to fully engage in the design, implementation and monitoring of REDD+ readiness activities, and distil experiences and lessons learned and develop recommendations at the local level that can feed into national REDD+ processes. CBR+ will support community-level projects that complement UN-REDD National Programmes, national REDD+ readiness processes and/or strategies. With an initial investment of US \$4 million from the Government of Norway, through the UN-REDD Programme, and matching co-financing from the GEF Small Grants Programme, this initiative is being delivered by UNDP in six pilot countries: Cambodia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay and Sri Lanka.

123. UNEP reported that the UN-REDD Programme has no global scale monitoring on consultation of indigenous communities on forest management plans. However, it has a target of "30% increase in the number of countries that have full activities and mechanisms to support full and effective participation of indigenous peoples, local communities CSO and other stakeholder

organizations in REDD+ decision making, strategy development and implementation” (Outcome 4, SNA monitoring Framework). UNEP is also contributing to progress on Target 18 through continued development of the Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas Registry. UNEP-WCMC is working closely with governments to assist with national recognition of indigenous community conserved areas and, in partnership with the indigenous community conserved areas consortium, has continued to develop the registry to increase information about these areas, document their values and to promote and better understand ICCAs worldwide. A policy brief on indigenous community conserved areas and biodiversity conservation was presented to CBD COP12.

124. UNFCCC replied that the incorporation of traditional knowledge into forest management plans for biodiversity conservation are being achieved through the implementation of the REDD+ safeguards as referred to in decision 1/CP.16, appendix 1.

125. ICRAF replied that they have summarized a large number of methods that explicitly include local ecological knowledge and have also worked on social safeguards in the REDD+ context.³⁰

Target 19: Knowledge improved, shared and applied

126. CIFOR reported that it has published more than 1300 papers in peer-reviewed journals and relevant reports since 2011, without specifying how many were directly and indirectly related to the status and trends of forest biodiversity conservation.

127. While the GEF does not promote scientific research on biodiversity conservation, project design and implementation call for widely disseminating information on findings and lessons learned from project implementation, including the application of know-how, technologies, best environmental practices and good agricultural practices. Moreover, many biodiversity projects undertake and build upon assessments of a variety of environmental parameters for evaluating progress in the achievement of project objectives.

128. UNEP has provided substantial support to the establishment of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), and this has included extensive technical support from UNEP-WCMC. Both UNEP and UNEP-WCMC are continuing to provide interim support as the work of the Platform gets under way, and are in addition providing technical support in the key areas of capacity building and developing the guide for assessments.

129. Through numerous projects each year, UNEP-WCMC makes a significant contribution to the development of a comprehensive knowledge base for biodiversity to support assessments and valuations of biodiversity and ecosystem services and to build tools and methodologies for understanding the environment. Biodiversity data held in the Species+ database, the CITES Trade Database and the World Database of Protected Areas are all publically available and accessible via the web. Some other recent advances have included: the first composite Global Natural Capital Map (<http://tinyurl.com/q8rxc7u>) ; and two new biodiversity models that can help predict biodiversity changes and allow decision makers to explore the effects of their decisions on biodiversity: The 'PREDICTS' model (<http://www.predicts.org.uk/>) and *The Madingley model* (<http://tinyurl.com/m6ql3xw>). UNEP-WCMC continues to convene the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP) and to facilitate its monitoring of progress towards the CBD Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets. During 2012-2014 the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership's website was restructured and re-launched, in order to provide a simple 'toolkit' of resources for national indicator development, including indicators for NBSAPs. UNEP-WCMC also prepared a review on the use of remote sensing data, which was a key resource for discussions at SBSTTA 17 on the adequacy of observations and data systems for monitoring the biodiversity attributes in the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and the use and development of indicators.

³⁰ Publications include: Van Noordwijk M, Lusiana B, Leimona B, Dewi S, Wulandari D (eds). 2013. Negotiation-support toolkit for learning landscapes. Bogor, Indonesia. World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) Southeast Asia Regional Program; Minang, P. A., van Noordwijk, M., Freeman, O. E., Mbow, C., de Leeuw, J., & Catacutan, D. (Eds.) Climate-Smart Landscapes: Multifunctionality in Practice. Nairobi, Kenya: World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), 404 pp.

130. UNEP produces every five years the Global Environment Outlook (GEO), a comprehensive assessment of environmental factors affecting human well-being with an analysis of policies leading to the achievement of global environmental objectives and goals. It is the product of a consultative process involving the world's top authorities in different fields of environmental management coming from governments, international organizations, academia, and scientific and technical research institutions. Over 800 such experts are participating in the production of *GEO 6* which is scheduled to be launched in mid-2017. GEO utilizes an integrated assessment methodology, with a strong emphasis on regional assessments, on the state, trends and outlook of the environment. It is comprised of a series of products designed to assist decision-making and to facilitate the interaction between science and policy. It contains chapters dedicated to biodiversity and land, with forests being addressed in the latter chapter. Specialized regional assessments and selected policy reports are published separately.

131. ITTO responded that a number of technical reports related to tropical forest management can be found on its website (www.itto.int). These reports contribute periodically to the revision of the *ITTO Voluntary Guidelines for the Sustainable Management of Natural Tropical Forests*. The organization is paying increased attention to knowledge management. This includes its on-line project search tool (http://www.itto.int/project_search/), which allows to search for information on all ITTO projects completed, operational or pending financing, providing a project summary and allowing to download projects documents.

132. IUCN replied that it is working with UNEP-WCMC in monitoring the extent of protection of forests through the Protected Planet/World Database on Protected Areas. The last appraisal of extant and protected forests was conducted in 2010, although IUCN and UNEP-WCMC publish the biannual Protected Planet Report to reflect progress towards the achievement of the Aichi Targets. In support of monitoring the progress of restoration contributions and participating countries and to support the implementation of the Bonn Challenge goal, IUCN launched a new website at Bonn Challenge 2.0, in March 2015 (<http://www.bonnchallenge.org/>).

133. In responding, IUFRO referred to the GFEP 2012 report "Understanding Relationships between Biodiversity, Carbon, Forests and People: The Key to Achieving REDD+ Objectives. A Global Assessment Report".

134. ICRAF replied that in 2014 the organization contributed to a major international review of forest genetic diversity, as well as a special issue of *COSUST (Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability)* with several agroforestry-biodiversity review papers. Application of knowledge is less relevant for ICRAF as they do not manage forests, due to its status as a research-based organization.

Target 20: Financial resources from all sources increased

135. GEF funding for biodiversity was increased for the four-year GEF-6 cycle, with total allocations at approximately US\$ 1.8 billion.

136. As a result of the creation and implementation of the ITTO/CBD Collaborative Initiative for Tropical Forest Biodiversity, agreed to on 2 March 2010, ITTO reported that funding for biodiversity conservation and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets increased by US\$ 12.5 million. Specifically, the Initiative provides support to ITTO producer member countries to reduce losses of biodiversity through the implementation of the CBD Programme of Work on Forest Biodiversity, focussing on the common objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the ITTO Action Plan.

137. UNEP reported that its project "Improving the effectiveness of and cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions and exploring opportunities for further synergies" explores opportunities for enhanced cooperation between national and regional focal points to contribute to the efficient use, and enhanced mobilisation of resources. Case studies and approaches have been included in a sourcebook on national level synergies. In addition, UNEP-WCMC supported the CBD Secretariat in its series of regional resource mobilization workshops during 2013 and 2014. UNEP-

WCMC has also coordinated research in support of the High-level Panel on Global Assessment of Resources for implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and preparation of its report and recommendations.

138. Under FAO's new strategic framework, some financial resources have been "ring-fenced" to ensure dedicated support to the organization's work on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (including FGR), but this is not exclusively a response to the CBD Strategic Plan.

IV. STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS IN SUPPORT OF THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE FOREST-RELATED AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

139. Overall, cooperation and coordination among CPF member organizations occurs at two broad levels. Firstly, CPF operates at the principal level to enhance cooperation and communication on a number of strategic issues, including reporting and financing of SFM, among other issues of common concern. CPF also meets regularly at the principal level to respond to invitations from the UNFF, and the governing bodies of other member organizations, on types of support to specific policy and technical issues. Secondly, aside from principal level meetings, CPF member organizations cooperate and collaborate bilaterally and multilaterally on a number of initiatives described in the following paragraphs, as well as on joint projects and programmes, as in the case of the UN REDD Programme.

140. CPF member organizations all expressed an openness to work with other organizations that have a substantive focus on biodiversity. Current collaborative partnerships include, among others:

(a) The Global Partnership for Forest and Landscape Restoration (IUCN as the secretariat, FAO, UNFF, UNEP-WCMC, CBD, ITTO, CIFOR, ICRAF, IUFRO, WRI, among others);

(b) Landscapes for People, Food and Nature Initiative (ICRAF, FAO, UNEP, UN University, Bioversity International);

(c) International Model Forest Network (CIFOR, FAO, UNDP, CATIE, Government of Canada);

(d) Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management (FAO as secretariat, CBD as Chair, UNEP, CIFOR, IUCN, IUFRO, CITES, CMS, CIC, IIFB, Traffic, International Trade Centre, OiE);

(e) The UN-REDD Programme (FAO, UNDP, UNEP);

(f) Collaboration Agreement between UNEP/UN-REDD and IUCN to support UN-REDD countries in defining and implementing forest landscape restoration goals;

(g) The ITTO/CBD Collaborative Initiative for Tropical Forest Biodiversity;

(h) The ITTO-CITES Programme for Implementing CITES Listings of Tropical Timber Species;

(i) The ITTO/IUCN guidelines for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in tropical timber production forests;

(j) The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (GEF, the World Bank, EU, the Governments of France, Japan, Conservation International and the MacArthur Foundation);

(k) World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) (World Bank, UNDP, FAO, IDB)

(l) World Bank's Programme on Forests (PROFOR) (CIFOR, FAO, IUCN, UNEP);

(m) The UNCCD Global Mechanism (UNCCD, IFAD and FAO);

(n) The Rio Conventions Joint Liaison Group (CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD);

(o) Aichi Biodiversity Targets Task Force (CBD, FAO, GEF, ITTO, IUCN, UNDP, UNEP, World Bank, among others).

141. In addition, the GEF works jointly with a large number of implementing and executing agencies for its projects, many of which are international organizations with substantive work on biodiversity (e.g., WWF, WRI, Forest Trends) or collaborative initiatives (UN-REDD).

142. Despite the valuable information received from the CBD questionnaire, one shortcoming was that it did not allow for organizations with extensive relevant programs and projects such as the GEF, IUCN, ITTO, UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank sufficient time to gather all the requested information and data. The World Bank alone has implemented 245 projects in 74 countries addressing several elements of the Aichi Targets.³¹

143. The degree of effectiveness of collaborative partnerships among international organizations greatly depends on clear mandates from the respective governing bodies and the availability of resources. Some such as the UN-REDD Programme, PROFOR, the ITTO/CBD Collaborative Initiative for Tropical Forest Biodiversity and the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund can be expected to contribute more to the conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity as a result of this.

144. According to the *Independent Assessment of the International Arrangement on Forests (IAF)*, which closely examined its structure, role and accomplishments, the CPF operates as a voluntary partnership that depends on its members' commitment to collaboration and joint activities. It does not have its own human and financial resources, and its activities are financed through its members', mostly in-kind, contributions as well as through limited financial contributions towards specific joint activities. "The extent to which the CPF can respond to the invitations of the UNFF is largely determined by the availability of resources."³² It should be expected that this would also be the case for invitations coming from other member organizations for CPF to engage in joint activities.

145. Nevertheless, in their responses to the CBD questionnaire, all CPF member organizations supported greater collaboration in aligning their efforts to support the achievement of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Four—IUCN, ITTO, UNCCD and UNEP—were more focussed on stronger bilateral cooperation with the CBD. The GEF Secretariat proposed increased alignment with GEF implementing agencies' programmes. Other member organizations proposed closer collaboration on issues such as awareness raising, monitoring and reporting, and forest genetic resources.

146. CIFOR provided a more elaborate suggestion for strengthened collaboration:

"CIFOR would benefit from an increased focus on biodiversity issues as they pertain to development, as much as conservation. There is little in-house expertise in this regard and we should, through strategic partnerships, further develop a programme of work on this topic. In short, we should: Support the enabling conditions for biodiversity conservation through sound science and a strong evidence-base; reducing priority drivers and threats to biodiversity; integrating conservation and other development sectors for improved outcomes; building partnerships to mobilise resources in support of biodiversity conservation; influence key international processes and policies in support of biodiversity conservation and applying science, technology and learning to enhance biodiversity conservation practice."

147. All but one of the 12 responding member organizations were open to collaborating on an international publication on progress made to achieve the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Such an initiative would provide an excellent opportunity for CPF members to assess in greater depth their contributions. A comprehensive publication would not only serve as an important reference for assessing progress towards the achievement of the Targets, it could also serve as a basis for the CPF to prepare a blueprint or action plan to support the achievement of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

³¹ World Bank, *Investing in Natural Capital for Eradicating Extreme Poverty and Boosting Shared Prosperity: A Biodiversity Roadmap for the WBG* (2014), pp. 7 and 9.

³² Blaser, Juergen; Chipeta, Mafa Evaristus; Illueca, Jorge; Lobovikov, Maxim; Umali, Ricardo; *Independent Assessment of the International Arrangement on Forests* (September 2014), p. 58.

148. At the moment, there is no common approach or methodology agreed upon by CPF members on how to proceed in reporting to the CBD on progress towards the achievement of the forest-related Aichi Targets. The CPF would have to consider how to improve future reporting on the targets, bearing in mind the Aichi Targets Passport, which presents a suite of indicators that are global in coverage and relevant to the specific targets. These indicators were selected to highlight progress made towards each target at the national level and the existing baselines for monitoring future progress.

149. Attention would have to be given by the member organizations to avoid double counting in quantifiable information and data presented in reports on the Aichi Targets to the CBD. For example, GEF implementing agencies such as the World Bank, UNEP, UNDP, FAO and IUCN could report figures on area of hectares of forests restored or number of endangered species being protected through GEF-funded projects that are also taken into account in the figures provided by the GEF Secretariat. Double counting could also take place in GEF-funded projects involving two or more GEF implementing agencies that are also CPF members.

150. Following a more in depth analysis of the direct and indirect contributions of member organizations, which could be along the lines of the joint publication referred to in paragraph 137, the CPF could consider working together on the formulation of a plan for supporting actions contributing to the forest-related Aichi Targets, including bilateral and multilateral partnerships directly linked to the achievement of other multilateral forest-related targets. The implementation of such a joint initiative would in all likelihood depend on the availability of financial and human resources.

V. CONCLUSIONS

151. Member organizations of the CPF have made considerable efforts to support the achievement of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets in the period since 2010. Because of the strategic focus that CPF addresses at the principal level, and the bilateral and multilateral projects, programmes and initiatives among member organisations, there is potential for the CPF to further its contribution to common priorities including on reporting on progress towards the attainment of the forest-related Aichi Targets and other relevant multilateral forest related commitments by 2020. Such contribution could also focus on the alignment of operational activities in countries and regions, in support of the Aichi Targets, as well as on the application of science, technology and learning to enhance biodiversity conservation practice, through partnerships with non-CPF member international organizations.

152. A number of joint activities between CPF members, and among other international organizations, are being implemented that support the Aichi Targets, in particular on Targets 1, 5, 14 and 15. The degree of effectiveness of these joint initiatives is largely dependent on clear mandates from the respective governing bodies and the availability of resources.

153. Eight CPF member organizations—CIFOR, FAO, GEF, ITTO, IUCN, UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank—have explicitly considered the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in their strategies, plans and/or programmes of work. At the moment, the GEF, UNFF and ITTO have linked their respective objectives and/or programmes of work to specific Aichi Targets.

154. However, the CPF does not have a common and collective approach| for coordinating and reporting on contributions to the achievement of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Some organizations with large global networks and project portfolios covering many countries such as the World Bank, the GEF and IUCN require significant consultation periods to determine with greater exactitude the degree and scale of their contributions to the specific Aichi Targets. Consequently, the information and data provided by individual member organizations was inconsistent and highly variable and, therefore, difficult to assess in terms of the collective effectiveness of the CPF in contributing to the achievement of the targets.

155. As a result of the lack of a common reporting approach, there are methodological problems and challenges that need to be addressed by the CPF if it is to contribute in a meaningful manner to

future reporting on progress towards the achievement of the Aichi Targets. For example, some of the information and data provided by those CPF member organizations that are also GEF implementing agencies, on their contributions to the achievement of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets, could reflect double counting of information and data reported by the GEF Secretariat.

156. More accurate quantifiable information and data was provided by CPF member organizations that are implementing agencies that have projects with clearly designed objectives to support forest-related aspects of the Aichi Targets and that include monitoring and assessment programs with baselines and indicators for measuring progress towards the achievement of project objectives and goals.

157. CPF member organizations such as FAO, GEF, ITTO and UNFF that have periodic reporting from countries on progress towards the achievement of their respective objectives and goals appear to be in a more advantageous position to provide information and data relevant to measuring progress towards the achievement of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets. However, the indicators that they use are designed primarily to meet their respective needs and requirements and do not necessarily match or complement the suite of indicators contained in the Aichi Targets Passport.

158. All CPF member organizations supported greater collaboration in aligning their efforts to the achievement of the Aichi Targets by 2020. However, given that the resources of CPF member organizations are concentrated in implementing their respective programmes of work, it is likely that increased collaborative efforts in support of the Aichi Targets, including improved reporting, could require adjustments to their current programmes of work within their existing budgetary allocations, as well as additional seed funding, provided by interested and committed donor countries, for catalysing joint activities. Addressing these issues while preparing the IAF Strategic Plan 2017-2030 and related CPF work plan, as called for in the UNFF 11 resolution, could provide a useful opportunity.

VI. ANNEXES

Annex I

FOREST-RELATED AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

A: Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society	Target 1: By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.
	Target 2: By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.
	Target 3: By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio-economic conditions.
	Target 4: By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits.
B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use	Target 5: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced.
	Target 7: By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.
	Target 9: By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment.
C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity	Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.
	Target 12: By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those in most decline, has been improved and sustained.
	Target 13: By 2020, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socio-economically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity.
D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services	Target 14: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.
	Target 15: By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.
E: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building	Target 18: By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels.
	Target 19: By 2020, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to

	biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied.
	Target 20: By 2020, at the latest, the mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 from all sources, and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, should increase substantially from the current levels. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resource needs assessments to be developed and reported by Parties.

Annex II

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS OF THE COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP ON FORESTS

Name of organization:

Name of person filling in the form (optional):

QUESTION	ANSWER	DETAILS
Institutional/Organizational Mandates, Strategic Goals, Missions, and Vision		
1. Does the mandate, goals, mission or vision of your organization/institution include biodiversity or some aspect of it?	Yes No	List mandate(s) and corresponding aspect(s) linked to the CBD objective(s) ³³ :
2. Does the mandate, goals, mission or vision of your organization/institution relate to one or more of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets?	Yes No	List corresponding Target(s) ³⁴ :
Planning, Allocations, and Monitoring		
3. Does your organization/institution explicitly consider the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in forest planning or programme management activities?	Yes No	List 2-3 planning and/or management activities and corresponding Target(s).
4. Is there a specific financial allocation in your organization/institution for forest biodiversity activities and/or projects?	Yes No	List (in order of funding) the thematic areas that receive the most financial support in the current and next funding cycle, if available.
5. Related to question 4, has funding been leveraged for biodiversity monitoring and reporting?	Yes No	Which forest Aichi Biodiversity Targets does your organization report on?
6. Does your organization/ institution use criteria and indicators for forest biodiversity monitoring?	Yes No	List 2-3 criteria and indicators used to measure aspects of biodiversity or the publication(s) containing this information.
7. Does your organization/institution measure the impacts of its activities with regards to meeting its forest biodiversity objectives?	Yes No	List 2-3 examples of how these are being measured and the publication containing measurement guidance.
8. (a) Is there staff in your organization/institution working on a full time basis on forest biodiversity thematic areas?	Yes No	List names (or main focal point) and emails of responsible staff and how their work relates to the FPOW ³⁵ .

³³ See Convention Objectives in Annex 1.

³⁴ See listing of relevant forest Aichi Targets in Annex 1.

QUESTION	ANSWER	DETAILS
(b) Is there staff working on a part time basis on forest biodiversity thematic areas?	Yes No	
Implementation		
9. Does your organization/institution implement activities related to the forest Aichi Biodiversity Targets in developing countries and countries with economies in transition?	Yes No	List 3-6 activity(ies), main geographic region and corresponding forest Aichi Target(s).
10. Does your organization/institution carry out joint programme(s) with organization(s)/ institution(s) that have a substantive focus on forest biodiversity?	Yes No	List at least 3 joint programme(s) and organizations/ institutions and the associated websites, if available.
Forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets under consideration		
11. For Target 1, is your organization/ institution making people aware of the values of biodiversity?	Yes No	What techniques/programme are used to generate a better understanding of sustainable use and conservation? List 4-6 deliverables that your organization/ institution produces to enhance awareness of forest biodiversity?
12. For Target 2, has your organization/institution worked towards incorporating biodiversity into development and poverty planning?	Yes No	For how many countries, provinces, and/or communities?
13. For Target 2, has your organization/institution worked towards supporting biodiversity valuation in national accounting?	Yes No	For how many countries?
14. For Target 3, has your organization/institution worked to eliminate perverse incentives?	Yes No	How successful have you been?
15. For Target 3, has your organization/institution worked towards creating or supporting positive incentives for forest biodiversity conservation?	Yes No	Which positive incentives have been proposed? Which ones have been successfully implemented? On what scale and for which countries, communities, and/or projects?
16. For Target 4, does your organization/ institution have programmes in place to assist companies along the supply chain to produce/consume sustainably?	Yes No	List programmes. How many companies have altered practices accordingly?
17. For Target 5, through the work of your organization/ institution:		How has deforestation and degradation been reduced and how much less is the rate now compared to in 2010 with the support of your organization? How many ha of forest have benefited from your projects and activities since 2010? Compared to a business-as-usually scenario, how much more natural habitat is there now?
18. For Target 7, through the work of your organization/ institution:		How many ha of forest have come under SFM since 2010 with your organization's support?

³⁵ See listing of programme of work on forest biological diversity (POWFB) in annex 1.

QUESTION	ANSWER	DETAILS
		How many ha under projects of your agency have been certified as SFM since 2010?
19. For Target 9, has your organization/ institution improved the planning for IAS, prevention, control and/or eradication of some species?	Yes No	How many IAS plans have been developed with the support of your organization? List 3-4 projects/programmes, the number of species they aim to prevent or control, and whether any species has been eradicated?
20. For Target 11, through the work of your organization/ institution:		How many ha of forest have been protected since 2010, that would not otherwise have been set aside without your organization's work?
21. For Target 12, has your organization/ institution worked towards improving the species rank (e.g., IUCN, or other lists) and/or ensured that the number whose rank is low has not worsen?	Yes No	How many species have been positively affected? List 2 to 4 project examples.
22. For Target 13, is your organization/ institution working towards preserving the genetic diversity of cultivated plants through wild relatives, including other socio-economically and culturally valuable species?	Yes No	If yes, list 3-4 projects/programmes, the species and whether a strategy has been developed to preserve genetic diversity.
23. For Target 14, has the work of your organization/ institution focused on restoration of ecosystems important to specific services: health, water and livelihoods?	Yes No	How many ha of forest have been restored for these specific purposes with the support of your organization? How has this result improved the livelihoods of women and indigenous communities? List 2 to 4 project examples.
24. For Target 15, through the work of your organization/ institution:		How many ha of degraded forest have been restored since 2010 with the support of your organization? How has this been measured/determined? What is the relative level of biodiversity in these restored forests compared to in natural forests of the same age/type? What is the rate of carbon storage in these restored systems compared to what was on the site previously?
25. For Target 18, through the work of your organization/ institution, has the use of traditional knowledge been incorporated into forest management practices to conserve biodiversity?	Yes No	Explain How? How many management plans have indigenous communities been consulted by your organization/ institution since 2010?
26. For Target 19, does your organization/institution produce science based assessments on the status and trends of forest biodiversity conservation?	Yes No	How many papers in peer-reviewed journals and relevant reports have been published? How has new knowledge related to forest functioning been incorporated into the

QUESTION	ANSWER	DETAILS
		management practices of your organization/institution?
27. For Target 20, after the Strategic Plan was agreed to in 2010, did your organization alter funding (increase or shift) to increase efforts on behalf of biodiversity conservation?	Yes No	If yes explain. How much has funding related to biodiversity conservation and the Aichi Targets has been allocated/increased in your agency?
Enhancing Cooperation and Coordination		
28. Is there the potential within your organization/institution to increase collaborative links to further align efforts in support of the implementation of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets?	Yes No	Explain how?
29. Is your organization/institution willing to support an international publication on progress made to achieve the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets, drawing from the information provided through this questionnaire?	Yes No	Indicate the focal point for this publication for follow up review and validation.

I. Three Main Objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity:

1. the conservation of biological diversity;
2. the sustainable use of its components; and
3. the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources.

Further information at: <http://www.cbd.int/convention/articles/default.shtml?a=cbd-01>

II. Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020

Vision	Strategic Goal	Relevant Forest Aichi Biodiversity Target
"By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people."	A: Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society	1 – Awareness increased
		2 – Biodiversity values integrated into national development strategies
		3 – Incentives reformed
		4 – Sustainable consumption and production
	B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use	5 – Habitat loss halved and degradation reduced
		7 – Sustainable agriculture, aquaculture and forestry
		9 – Invasive alien species prevented and controlled
		10 – Pressure on vulnerable ecosystems reduced
	C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity	11 – Protected areas increased and improved
		12 – Species extinction prevented
		13 – Genetic erosion reduced
	D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services	14 – Ecosystems and essential services safeguarded
		15 – Ecosystems restored and resilience enhanced
	E: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building	18 – Traditional knowledge respected
		19 – Scientific knowledge and technologies improved, shared and applied
20 – Financial resources from all sources increased		

Further information at <http://www.cbd.int/sp/>

III. Expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity (FPOW)

Programme elements:

1. Conservation, sustainable use and benefit-sharing (5 goals)
 - Apply the Ecosystem Approach to the management of all types of forests
 - Reduce the threats and mitigate the impacts of threatening processes on forest biodiversity
 - Protect, recover and restore forest biodiversity

- Promote the sustainable use of forest biodiversity
 - Access and benefit-sharing of forest genetic resource
2. Institutional and socio-economic enabling environment (3 goals)
 - Enhance the institutional enabling environment
 - Address socio-economic failures and distortions that lead to decisions that result in loss of forest biodiversity
 - Increase public education, participation and awareness
 3. Knowledge, assessment and monitoring (4 goals)
 - Characterize and analyse from forest ecosystem to global scale and develop general classification of forests on various scales in order to improve the assessment of status and trends of forest biodiversity
 - Improve knowledge on and methods for the assessment of the status and trends of forest biodiversity
 - Improve understanding of the role of forest biodiversity and ecosystem functioning
 - Improve the infrastructure for data and information management for accurate assessment and monitoring of global forest biodiversity

Further information at <http://www.cbd.int/forest/pow.shtml>

Annex III

TIMELINE FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE STUDY

Activity	Date
CBD Secretariat questionnaire sent to CPF members	28 January 2015
Deadline for submission of responses to CBD questionnaire by CPF members	18 February 2015
First draft of study	7 April 2015
Peer review of first draft of study by CPF members	8 - 22 April 2015
Side-event at UNFF 11 for discussing opportunities for coordination and cooperation among CPF members in support of the Aichi Targets	13 May 2015
Release of second draft of study and first draft of the synthesis and analysis document	22 May 2015
Peer review by CPF members of second draft of study and first draft of the synthesis and analysis document	25 May – 26 June 2015
Peer Review by Parties of study	30 July – 30 August 2015
Estimated release date of the finalized study (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/19/INF/3)	1 September 2015
Estimated release date of the synthesis and analysis document (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/19/8)	1 October 2015
Discussion on potential approaches to further collaboration and a global CPF publication - side event at SBSTTA 19	First week of November 2015

Annex IV

ABBREVIATIONS

ABS	Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources
BIP	Biodiversity Indicators Partnership
C&I	Criteria and indicators
CATIE	Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBR+	Community-Based REDD+
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CGRFA	Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
CIC	International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CMS	Convention on Migratory Species
COFO	Committee on Forestry
COP	Conference of the Parties
CPF	Collaborative Partnership on Forests
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DTIE	UNEP's Division of Technology, Industry and Economics
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FCPF	World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)
FGR	Forest Genetic Resources
FLR	Forest landscape restoration
FORIG	Forestry Research Institute of Ghana
FRA	Global Forest Resources Assessment
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
FTA	CGIAR Research Program: Forests, Trees and Agroforestry
GCP	UNDP's Green Commodities Programme
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEO	Global Environment Outlook
GFEP	Global Forest Expert Panel
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GIS	Geographic information system
GOFs	Global Objectives on Forests
GPA-FGR	Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Sustainable Use and Development of Forest Genetic Resources
GPFLR	Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration
IAF	International Arrangement on Forests
IAS	Invasive alien species
ICC	International Chamber of Commerce
ICCA	Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IEEP	Institute for European Environmental Policy
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IFS	Integrated Financing Strategies
IIFB	International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity

IIF	Integrated Investment Frameworks
IPC	International Poplar Commission
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organization
ITWG-FGR	Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Forest Genetic Resources
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
IUFRO	International Union of Forest Research Organizations
MEAs	Multilateral environmental agreements
NAMAs	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions
NAPAs	National Adaptation Programmes of Action
NBSAPs	National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans
NSIAS	National Strategy on Invasive Alien Species
OiE	World Organization for Animal Health
PEFC	Programme of Endorsement for Forest Certification
PFE	Permanent Forest Estate
PROFOR	World Bank's Programme on Forests
RAMPAO	Regional Network of Marine Protected Areas in West Africa
REDD	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation
REDD-PAC	REDD+ Policy Assessment Center
SBSTTA	Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SGP	UNDP-managed GEF Small Grants Programme
SLM	Sustainable land management
SNA	Support to National REDD+ Action: Global Programme Framework
TEEB	The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
UNFI	United Nations Forest Instrument
VANTAGE	Valuation and Accounting of Natural Capital for Green Accounting
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WBCSD	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
WCMC	UNEP's World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WRI	World Resources Institute
