



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/3/Add.1
25 February 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

Third meeting

Nairobi, 24-28 May 2010

Item 5 of the provisional agenda*

REVISION AND UPDATING OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN: SYNTHESIS/ANALYSIS OF VIEWS

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In decision IX/9, the Conference of the Parties outlined the process and some guidelines for revising and updating the Strategic Plan with a view to adopting a revised Strategic Plan at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
2. According to that decision, the Working Group on the Review of Implementation is due to prepare at its third meeting, scheduled for May 2010, a revised and updated Strategic Plan, including a revised biodiversity target, as well as a multi-year programme of work for the period 2011-2022 and proposals for the periodicity of meetings after 2010.
3. The Conference of the Parties specifically requested the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis/analysis of issues relevant to the revision and updating of the Strategic Plan, drawing upon the note by the Executive Secretary on the subject (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/14/Add.1), submissions of Parties and observers, the fourth national reports, the results of the in-depth reviews of the Convention's programmes of work, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, and other material gathered for the preparation of the third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook.
4. Accordingly, the Secretariat has prepared the present note to assist the ongoing discussions among Parties and stakeholders regarding the updating and revision of the Strategic Plan. This document is an update of document UNEP/CBD/SP/PREP/1/Rev.1 which was released on 31 December 2009, and which itself was an update of document UNEP/CBD/SP/PREP/1 which was released on 5 June, 2009. Section II contains a report on the consultative process for the updating and revision of the Strategic Plan. Background information on the existing Strategic Plan and related issues, and on other decisions to be taken into account, is provided in section III. A preliminary synthesis/analysis of issues is presented in section IV, based on submissions and consultations up to and including November 2009. Section V, includes the main views emerging from submissions and consultations in the period December 2009 to February 2010, that is following the release of the discussion document UNEP/CBD/SP/PREP/2 which provided a possible outline and possible elements for the new Strategic Plan. The full submissions provided by Parties and observers, and the conclusions of consultative workshops are provided on the

* UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/1.

website of the Convention on Biological Diversity at: <http://www.cbd.int/sp2010+>. In addition, the reports of the recent consultative workshops held in London and Trondheim (see para. 6 below) are being made available as information documents to the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the third meeting of the Working group on Review of Implementation respectively.

II. REPORT ON THE PROCESS FOR UPDATING AND REVISING THE STRATEGIC PLAN

5. In line with decision IX/9, the Executive Secretary issued a notification on 7 July 2008, inviting Parties to submit views. An additional notification for observers was issued on 27 October 2008. A third notification requesting the submission of views was distributed on the 10 of June 2009. As of 31 December 2009, submissions have been received from the following Parties: Botswana, Brazil, Canada, China, France (on behalf of the European Union), the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Mexico and Qatar. Eleven submissions have been received from observers.¹ To facilitate submission of further views from Parties and observers, the Secretariat established an online forum in November 2008. Additional inputs have been provided through this means, including inputs from the focal point of Argentina and a number of organizations and individuals.²

6. A number of informal workshops that have been organized have helped to gather further inputs from Parties and observers. These include:

The side event at the margins of the ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES), held in Putrajaya, Malaysia from 10 to 12 November, 2008, when the e-forum was launched;

(a) A one-day brainstorming session on “Sustainability beyond 2010: perspectives from experiences”, convened by UNEP on 13 February 2009 on the margins of the twenty-fifth session of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum;

(b) A high-level working group on the 2010 target and the post-2010 target(s) convened by the Presidency of the Conference of the Parties in Bonn from 6 to 9 March 2009;

(c) A session during the annual meeting of the scientific committee of DIVERSITAS, held in Washington DC on 9-10 February 2009);

(d) A panel discussion on the post-2010 target for the European Union was held as part of the European Commission’s Conference, held in Athens on 27-28 April 2009);

(e) Consultations organized by IUCN Countdown 2010, in cooperation with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and other Pan-European partners (Athens, 28-29 April 2009), and South America (Lima, 19-20 May 2009);

(f) A discussion held with least developed countries from Africa participating in a Workshop of the Convention on Biological Diversity on the Fourth National Reports, held in Addis Ababa from 4 to 8 May 2009;

(g) Discussions on the links between an updated Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC) and the Convention’s Strategic Plan post-2010 during the third meeting of the Liaison Group on the GSPC, held in Dublin from 26 to 28 May 2009;

¹ UNEP, UNFCCC Secretariat, IUCN, Joint Submission by Birdlife International, Conservation International, IUCN-WCPA, The Nature Conservancy; World Wild Fund for Nature and the Wildlife Conservation Society, the Global Canopy Programme, the Steering Group on Linking Conservation and Poverty, Plantlife International, CEEWeb for Biodiversity, *Museum national d’Histoire naturelle de France* Forest Peoples Porgamme the International Maritime Organization, Pro Natura – Frieds of the Earth Switzerland, and the Swedish Species Information Center.,and an individual submission from Richard Laing,

² Sasha Alexander, Steven Goldfinger, Hanna Hoffman, Mike Parr, Maurizio Ferrari, Neil Brummet, Michael Hermann.

- (h) A workshop to review the use and effectiveness of the indicators agreed in decisions VII/15 and VIII/30, held in Reading, United Kingdom, from 6 to 8 July 2009;
- (i) Workshop on Biodiversity Conservation, Ecosystem Services and Poverty Reduction, held in Vilm, Germany, from 17 to 21 September 2009;
- (j) The PEBLDS Conference “Biodiversity in Europe” (supported by UNEP, Council of Europe and Norway), held in Liege, Belgium, from 22 to 24 September, Liege, Belgium;
- (k) Post-2010 Global Biodiversity Targets Expert Meeting, supported by UNEP, Countdown 2010 and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, held in Nairobi on 2-3 October 2009;
- (l) The DIVERSITAS Open Science Conference in October 2009;
- (m) A Regional Workshop for the Caribbean and Central America, held in Panama City, from 7 to 10 December 2009, organized by the Secretariat, the UNEP regional office for Latin America and the Caribbean, and IUCN Countdown 2010;
- (n) A Regional Consultation for Africa, held in Cairo on 11-12 December 2009 and organized by the Secretariat and the UNEP Regional Office for Africa, with additional support from GTZ;
- (o) A Regional Workshop for East, South and South-East Asia, held in Tokyo from 15 to 18 December 2009, organized by the Secretariat with the support of Japan;
- (p) An informal experts consultation on access and benefit sharing and the Strategic Plan, co-organized by UNEP and the United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies, held in Yokohama, Japan, on 18-19 December;
- (q) Regional Workshop for the Middle East and North Africa, held in Cairo on 10-11 January 2010 and organized by the Secretariat and the UNEP Regional Office for West Asia and the League of Arab States;
- (r) An Informal Expert Workshop on the Updating of the CBD Strategic Plan for the post-2010 period, held in London from 18 to 20 January 2010;
- (s) The Sixth Trondheim Biodiversity Conference, held in Trondheim, Norway, from 1 to 5 February 2010.

7. An issue management group has been established under the United Nations Environmental Management Group to consider the potential contributions of United Nations agencies to the formulation and achievement of the post-2010 targets. The outputs of this process will be made available to the third meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

8. In addition, the G-8 Environment Ministers, together with ministers from Australia, Brazil, China, the Czech Republic and Sweden (as the respective current and upcoming Presidencies of the European Union), Egypt, India, Indonesia, Mexico, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, and participating international organizations, meeting in Syracuse, Italy, adopted the “*Carta di Siracusa*” on Biodiversity which recognizes the importance of the 2010 target, and the urgent need to support and strengthen the international process for the identification of an ambitious and achievable post-2010 common framework on biodiversity. This process should involve all relevant actors and stakeholders, be based on the lessons learned from the 2010 target, as well as consider the informal discussions of the High-Level Working Group on the Future of Global Targets for Biodiversity, convened by the current presidency of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Bonn, in March 2009. The “*Carta di Siracusa*” on Biodiversity proposes a common path toward the post-2010 framework on biodiversity encompassing the following points:

- “(a) The multiple challenges that the world faces today are an unmistakable indication that we need to strengthen our efforts to conserve and sustainably manage biodiversity and natural resources;

(b) As significant economic loss arises due to the unsustainable use of biodiversity, timely and proper programmes and actions, aimed at strengthening the resilience of ecosystems, must be taken;

(c) Notwithstanding the efforts and commitments to achieve the 2010 target, direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, aggravated by climate change, still continue. Furthermore, the world has been changing rapidly since the adoption of the 2010 target. All of these drivers of biodiversity loss, causing mid- and long-term threats to biodiversity and identified on the basis of scientific research, should be considered in the development of the post-2010 framework;

(d) A thorough communication strategy, fully engaging all the different sectors, as well as stakeholders, indigenous and local communities and the private sector, to emphasise their own participation and their responsibilities, is also a key factor for the effective implementation of the post-2010 biodiversity framework;

(e) The reform of environmental governance at all levels is essential to integrate biodiversity and ecosystem services into all policies, to turn the current weaknesses in economic systems into opportunities and to boost sustainable development and employment, taking particular account of the circumstances of developing countries.”

9. The General Assembly, at its sixty-fourth session, adopted resolution 64/203 of 21 December 2009 on the Convention on Biological Diversity, in which, the Assembly, *inter alia*, encouraged all Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to continue to contribute to the discussions leading to an updated Strategic Plan for the Convention to be adopted at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, bearing in mind that this Strategic Plan should cover all three objectives of the Convention, and emphasized that the revision of the Strategic Plan is important for the enhanced implementation of the Convention.³

10. Finally, the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties has considered the preparation of the updated Strategic Plan at its meetings in Nairobi (February 2009), in Paris (April 2009) and in Montreal (November 2009). At the latter meeting, the Bureau met jointly with the SBSTTA Bureau and considered a draft of document UNEP/CBD/SP/PREP/2.

11. An updated list of all relevant events is accessible on the website of the Convention on Biological Diversity via <http://www.cbd.int/sp2010+>.

12. The third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-3) contains relevant information, including an assessment of the progress in implementing the Convention, achieving the 2010 target and a study of future trends and scenarios for biodiversity and ecosystem services. The Executive Secretary circulated the first draft of GBO-3 for peer-review in August. Based on the comments received as well as input from a scientific advisory meeting, and from the bureaux of the Conference of the Parties and SBSTTA a shorter and more synthetic version of GBO-3 was developed and released for peer-review in November 2009. Both documents were available for peer-review until 31 December 2009. SBSTTA focal points and Bureau were proactively invited to review the draft throughout the process.

13. A high-level meeting of the General Assembly, with the participation of Heads of State and Government, will be convened on 22 September 2010 to discuss biodiversity and give political momentum to the development of the post-2010 biodiversity target.

14. In October 2010, at its tenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties will consider with a view to adoption the revised and updated Strategic Plan, including the post-2010 goals, targets and indicators.

³ Resolution 64/203, para. 9.

III. BACKGROUND: THE CURRENT PLAN AND 2010 BIODIVERSITY TARGET

A. *The current Strategic Plan*

15. The current Strategic Plan comprises the Plan itself, adopted in decision VI/26 (which includes the 2010 biodiversity target and strategic (process) goals), and a framework for assessing progress towards that target, adopted in decision VII/30⁴ (which includes focal areas, goals, targets and indicators).

16. In paragraph 2 of decision VI/26, the Conference of the Parties adopted the Strategic Plan. Through the Plan, Parties committed themselves to more effective and coherent implementation of the three objectives of the Convention in order to achieve, by 2010, a significant reduction in the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional, and national levels.

17. The Plan document, which is annexed to decision VI/26, comprises two introductory paragraphs, four sections and an appendix, as follows:

(a) *Introductory paragraphs.* The Plan is “to guide further implementation [of the Convention] at the national, regional and global levels”; its purpose is “to effectively halt the loss of biodiversity so as to secure the continuity of its beneficial uses”;

(b) *Section A (“The issue”)* includes background information noting: that biodiversity loss is accelerating; the threats; the Convention as an essential instrument; achievements; and challenges;

(c) *Section B (“Mission”)* states that “Parties commit themselves to a more effective and coherent implementation of the three objectives of the Convention to achieve, by 2010, a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national level as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on Earth”. This has come to be known as the 2010 biodiversity target;

(d) *Section C (“Strategic goals and objectives”)* sets out four goals, each with four to six objectives;

(e) *Section D (“Review”)* states that the Plan will be implemented through the programmes of work developed under the Convention, national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and other activities, and that better methods should be developed to evaluate progress;

(f) The *Appendix* lists obstacles to the implementation of the Convention.

18. In decision VII/30, the Conference of the Parties adopted a framework for the evaluation of progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan, establishing a set of outcome-oriented goals and targets, and related indicators. These were refined in the light of experience and the advice of SBSTTA and adopted in decision VIII/15 “Framework for monitoring implementation of the achievement of the 2010 target and integration of targets into the thematic programmes of work”. In the latter decision, the Conference of the Parties noted that that the framework for monitoring implementation of the Convention and the achievement of the 2010 target is comprised of the following five components (decision VIII/15, paragraph 1):

(a) The four goals and 19 objectives of the Strategic Plan adopted by the Conference of the Parties in decision VI/26;

(b) A limited number of indicators to measure progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan, to be developed on the basis of the proposed indicators in annex I to the decision;⁵

⁴ Later refined by decision VIII/15.

- (c) The provisional framework for goals and targets, consisting of seven focal areas, 11 goals and 21 targets, adopted in decision VII/30;
- (d) Outcome-oriented indicators to measure progress towards the 2010 target (as adopted by decision VII/30 with amendments recommended by SBSTTA in recommendation X/5, as summarized in annex II to the decision); and
- (e) Reporting mechanisms, including the Global Biodiversity Outlook and national reports.

B. 2010 biodiversity target

19. The 2010 biodiversity target, adopted as the mission of the Strategic Plan (see paragraph 17 (c) above), was supported in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation of the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development. At the 2005 World Summit, Heads of State and Government agreed that “All States will fulfill commitments and significantly reduce the rate of loss of biodiversity by 2010”. Following requests to the Secretary General, from the Conference of the Parties at its seventh meeting and the high-level segment at its eighth meeting, the 2010 biodiversity target was incorporated into the framework for the Millennium Development Goals in 2007 as target 7 B (“Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss”).⁶

IV. SYNTHESIS/ANALYSIS OF INPUTS FROM THE NINTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES, PARTIES AND OTHERS ON THE REVISION AND UPDATING OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN AND POST-2010 TARGET

20. This section synthesizes the views expressed by Parties and stakeholders in official submissions, the on-line forum and in discussions at the various workshops referred to in paragraph 7 above. The statements that follow, unless otherwise qualified, reflect views for which there appears to be general agreement. However, they do not necessarily indicate consensus and are provided primarily to encourage further consideration of the issues and additional submissions of views. As far as possible, the Secretariat has attempted to reflect the general spirit of the contributing views as made, while combining similar or overlapping views.

A. Scope of the new Plan and general points

21. **The revised and updated Strategic Plan will be important both in providing a framework for future action under the Convention itself, and in reaching out to a broader community.** All submissions agreed on the crucial importance of the exercise of revising and updating the Strategic Plan as a way of broadening stakeholder engagement beyond the constituency of the Convention on Biological Diversity and of widening the ownership. Compared to the existing Plan, some changes of focus are proposed. The Plan should more clearly highlight the links between biodiversity and human well-being (including poverty eradication) and economics; there should be more focus on supporting implementation (see paragraphs 30 and 52-61 below; and the new Plan must acknowledge the current context of global change and address the challenges and opportunities raised by such change (see paragraph 28 below). In addition, in revising and updating the Plan, efforts should be made to ensure that it is a more coherent framework for future work under the Convention.

⁵ A list of possible indicators was included in document UNEP/CBD/WGRI/1/2, table 1. This was reviewed by the Working Group on Review of Implementation at its first meeting, and a revised list was annexed to decision VIII/15. Through this decision, the Secretariat was requested, in consultation with the members of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for Assessing Progress Towards the 2010 target, and other partners to elaborate, on the basis of the annexed list, a limited number of relevant, robust and measurable indicators to measure progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Accordingly, the Secretariat organized a discussion forum and invited the AHTEG members to participate. This has been an insufficient basis on which to further refine the indicators. Given that only very limited time is available before the end of 2010, and the major exercise in reviewing the implementation of the Strategic Plan is already underway, it is proposed that further refinement of the set of indicators be coordinated with the revision of the Strategic Plan itself.

⁶ <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/mdg/Host.aspx?Content=Indicators/OfficialList.htm>.

22. **The Strategic Plan should cover the three objectives of the Convention in a balanced manner⁷ and enhance their implementation.** In implementing the current Strategic Plan, there has been most success in *conservation*. Further progress on this objective, and on *sustainable use*, which some feel also needs to be given greater priority, will require more efforts in reaching out to other constituencies that influence the indirect and direct drivers of biodiversity loss. Except for Goal 10 of the current framework, there is little attention in the current plan to the fair and equitable sharing of benefits from the use of genetic resources. *Access and Benefit Sharing* should be given higher priority in the new Plan.⁸ However, few of the submissions address this issue.

23. **The Strategic Plan for the Convention and the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety should be complementary and mutually consistent.** The 2002 Strategic Plan includes objectives related to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as an integral part of the overall Plan. However, the Conference of Parties and its subsidiary bodies have generally opted not to include the Protocol when evaluating progress (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/14/Add.1) and a separate plan is under development for the Protocol, to be considered at the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The two Plans should be consistent with each other and complementary.

24. **The Plan should promote and enable effective use of the Ecosystem Approach in planning and implementation processes.** Though the Ecosystem Approach is widely recognized as the key framework for implementing the Convention practical application remains problematic with many of the best examples of its use being confined to the local level. Simple tools and adequate capacity-building are needed. If they incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services, tools, such as Strategic Environmental Assessment, can be very useful in this regard. Integrating biodiversity and ecosystem services considerations into approaches such as integrated watershed management, integrated coastal zone management, and sustainable forest management can also be effective. Development of appropriate economic incentive measures and of methods, for accounting for the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national accounts, can help to make the case. The greater involvement of indigenous and local communities in the implementation of the ecosystem approach is also needed. The new Strategic Plan must clearly articulate the importance of the Ecosystem Approach and how it relates to the strategic objectives or goals of the Plan.

25. **The Plan should highlight the links between biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being, and emphasize the social and economic value of biodiversity and ecosystem services.**⁹ The overarching goals of the Plan should be to promote the health of ecosystems in the interest of human well-being, to reduce the risks to human well-being from biodiversity loss, and to ensure options for future generations are maintained. Healthy ecosystems promote human well-being through public health (including disease reduction), economic stability, and personal and national security.¹⁰ Maintaining ecosystem services is vital, especially in a world facing massive environmental and economical pressures. This requires that any post-2010 framework enables and supports the conservation of healthy ecosystems and the biodiversity upon which their continued functioning depends.¹¹ The Plan should draw upon, as appropriate, the framework and findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment,¹² and on the outcomes of the Study on the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB).¹³ Additional methodologies and tools to appropriately assess the value biodiversity may be needed.

⁷ Decision IX/9 (a).

⁸ Joint Submission by Birdlife International, Conservation International, IUCN-WCPA, The Nature Conservancy; World Wildlife Fund for Nature and the Wildlife Conservation Society.

⁹ Consultations in Nairobi; Bonn Workshop; Submissions from Canada and IUCN.

¹⁰ Submission of Canada.

¹¹ Bonn Workshop.

¹² Decision IX/9 (h), reinforced by Submission of Canada; Bonn Workshop.

¹³ Submission of Canada; Bonn Workshop.

26. **The Plan should highlight the importance of biodiversity for poverty eradication and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, taking into account that conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity should contribute to poverty eradication at local level and not harm the livelihoods of the poor and respect international human rights norms.**¹⁴ As the interim TEEB report highlights, biodiversity is disproportionately important for the livelihoods of poor people. The Bonn Workshop concluded that there is no chance for success in poverty eradication without well functioning ecosystems at all levels. However, conservation actions can also compromise poor people's livelihoods. The Steering Group on Linking Conservation and Poverty (SGLCP) is proposing the following principle for inclusion in the revised Strategic Plan and post-2010 biodiversity target: "In situations where conservation activities affect people at the local level, those activities should strive to contribute to poverty reduction and, at the very minimum, should do no harm." A clear conceptual framework could help clarify how implementation of the Convention could contribute to poverty eradication.

27. **The Plan should address the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss and integrate biodiversity and ecosystem services considerations into relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, programmes and strategies and planning processes**¹⁵ The Conference of the Parties has identified the need to address the threats to biodiversity, both direct¹⁶ and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss. This would involve the full operationalization of Article 7(c) and 8 (l) of the Convention: identifying threats to biodiversity, and managing or regulating them. Further progress on implementing the Convention will require more efforts in reaching out to, and collaborating with, other constituencies that influence the indirect and direct drivers of biodiversity loss. The Plan should facilitate dialogue among different sectors to mainstream biodiversity and to address linkages between sectors and the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, in order to contribute to the more effective implementation of the Convention, in particular to Article 6. Generally there is a need to have a plan which helps to more closely align economic and biodiversity interests by supporting the development of appropriate national and international policies. The anticipated agreement on access and benefit-sharing could help to accomplish this. The Conference of the Parties noted the need to link with the following sectors among others: international trade, finance, agriculture, forestry, tourism, mining, energy and fisheries (decision VIII/9). A corollary of this is that major strategic thrusts of the new Plan should relate to the promotion of the integration of biodiversity considerations into sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes (mainstreaming), and to the promotion of greater awareness among all sectors of society on the role that biodiversity and ecosystem services play in supporting human well-being. In short, this means more effective engagement of all stakeholders. Promoting the ecosystem approach, as discussed in paragraph 24 above, can be important ways to achieve integration.

28. **The new Plan should take into account and respond to the current context of global change and related challenges and opportunities.** It is important to look at what has changed in the world since the 2010-target was adopted and what is relevant to current and projected future world realities. This includes consideration of dominant and emerging issues, identification of challenges and arising opportunities. For example, not only is the reality of climate change now more widely accepted, response options – both adaptation and mitigation – are closely linked to biodiversity and ecosystem management.

¹⁴ Decision IX/9 (f).

¹⁵ Decision IX/9 (g); Several submissions; *Carta di Siracusa*.

¹⁶ The Conference of the Parties noted, in particular, the urgent need to address the following issues which the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment finds most significant at the global level in terms of their impacts on biodiversity and consequences for human well-being.:

- Land-use change and other habitat transformation;
- The consequences of over-fishing;
- Desertification and degradation in dry and sub-humid lands;
- The multiple drivers of change to inland water ecosystems;
- Increasing nutrient loading in ecosystems;
- The introduction of invasive alien species; and
- The rapidly increasing impacts of climate change.

Biodiversity can be part of adaptation and mitigation options, and, at the same time, these options can have positive or negative impacts on biodiversity and on human well-being, particularly of indigenous and local communities. In addition, other issues of global change are becoming more apparent (for example, the link between infectious diseases, biodiversity and ecosystems). The post-2010 Strategic Plan under the Convention must point the way for innovative biodiversity-based solutions to such broader concerns. This will require greater emphasis on maintaining ecosystem resilience and on promoting ecosystem restoration, where necessary and in particular where it contributes to these broader concerns. Finally, the current global financial crisis is already providing an opportunity to re-think basic economic assumptions and insert the principles of sustainability.¹⁷ The economic, food and climate change crisis should be seized as a learning opportunity to highlight the current over-use of natural capital and the need to invest in “ecological infrastructure”.¹⁸

29. **The new Plan should include a clear rationale for the targets and actions it proposes, based on scientific evidence.** A justification of the urgency and importance of the issue of biodiversity loss and its implications for ecosystem services and human well-being needs to be included. In this respect the new Strategic Plan needs to help support and further develop the science-policy interface. There is good evidence available from the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, GEO-4 and IPCC-4, and further evidence anticipated from GBO-3 and the ongoing TEEB study. Special attention should be devoted to the underlying socio-economic drivers, recognizing that all sectors of society have responsibility for the achievement of the targets. A more elaborated analysis could be provided in supporting documentation to explain and justify elements of the Strategic Plan. Ecosystem tipping points and their possible consequences for human well-being should be considered and provide justification for targets and effective policy responses, on the basis of the precautionary principle.¹⁹

30. **The new Plan should have a greater focus on the practical implementation of the Convention and include mechanisms to support implementation and the monitoring of implementation.**²⁰ Implementation and relevant enabling mechanisms need to be the focus in any revision of the Strategic Plan²¹ and should support national biodiversity strategies and action plans as effective tools for mainstreaming (see paragraphs 52–61 below. As further elaborated below (see paragraphs 53 and 54 below), this should include more focus on an evidence-based review of implementation, an enhanced clearing-house mechanism and strengthened financial mechanisms.

31. **The Plan, and the post-2010 target(s) in particular, should be developed on the basis of robust scientific evidence²² and experiences.** The science base is a key building block for the Plan and should be stronger and play a more significant role than was the case in the first Strategic Plan.²³ GBO-3 will play an important role to synthesize this information.²⁴ The development of the Plan should draw upon the successes and lessons learned from the implementation of the first Strategic Plan over the last decade.²⁵ Some of these lessons have been assessed in the reviews of the 4 goals of the Strategic Plan conducted by the Working Group on Review of Implementation, in the in-depth reviews of the programmes of work conducted by SBSTTA, and in GBO-2. More recent information is available in the fourth National Reports and from the conclusions of the regional workshops on national biodiversity strategies and action plans and Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Protected Areas, which will be synthesized for GBO-3. The new Strategic Plan should identify the common factors of success based on

¹⁷ Submission of Canada.

¹⁸ Bonn Workshop; *Carta di Siracusa*.

¹⁹ Athens consultations; Submission of CEEweb.

²⁰ Submissions of Canada, Qatar, IUCN.

²¹ Submissions of Qatar, IUCN.

²² Decision IX/9 (d, part).

²³ Consultation in Nairobi.

²⁴ Submission of Japan.

²⁵ Bonn Workshop; Submission of IUCN.

experience and promote mechanisms to replicate them to enable implementation at national, regional and global levels.^{26 27}

32. **The new Plan should address the gaps identified in previous reviews of implementation** to avoid repeating mistakes. Since the Strategic Plan was adopted, there have been several assessments that help identify gaps that need to be considered. The review of Goals 2 and 3 identified the following gaps as requiring priority attention (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/4, annex, recommendation 2/1): mainstreaming biodiversity; incorporation of the ecosystem approach; costs of biodiversity lost; engagement of indigenous and local communities; and inclusion of all relevant sectors and stakeholders.²⁸ Goals 1 and 4 of the Strategic Plan are scheduled to be assessed by the Working Group on Review of Implementation at its second meeting held in May 2010. The outcomes of these assessments should also be considered when the new Strategic Plan is developed.

33. **To allow for continuity, the new Plan should build upon the existing Strategic Plan and associated framework of goals, targets and indicators, with appropriate adjustments to improve clarity and focus.**²⁹ Given the amount of work dedicated to developing the 2010 framework for evaluation of progress (decision VIII/15) of focal areas, sub-targets and indicators, and to incorporating the sub-targets into the Convention's seven programmes of work, efforts should be made to ensure that the new Strategic Plan builds on this framework, adding specificity and accountability. In fact, the time since the Strategic Plan was developed in 2002 is relatively short (eight years by 2010), and the time since the framework of goals, targets and indicators was refined in 2006 (decision VIII/15) shorter still. Few countries have established national targets within this framework, and even fewer have had time to implement them. Moreover, none of the goals, objectives and targets have been fully met (see paragraph 45 below). Indeed the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment noted that most of the existing goals/objectives/targets will remain relevant post-2010.³⁰ There are various options for developing the new Plan on the basis of the existing one. For example, the framework of the 7 focal areas could be retained but refined by developing a more effective set of sub-targets, milestones and indicators.³¹

34. **The new Strategic Plan should also build upon the experience of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation.** Within the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (decision V/10) was the first initiative under the Convention to include specific measurable targets to drive its implementation. The existence of targets called for the establishment of a baseline for each one, so that progress could be measured. The first global progress report, the Plant Conservation Report (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/INF/25), was presented to the Convention on Biological Diversity at the ninth meeting of the Convention on Biological Diversity and, more recently, published as a brochure (see <http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/plant-conservation-report-en.pdf>). As a result of the focus on targets, success can be measured and areas of weakness in implementation, and those in need of future investment, clearly defined. It is imperative that the existing targets within functioning frameworks and work programmes, such as the GSPC and the programme of work on protected areas, are not lost in this process, as considerable energy has been used to develop them and to create momentum around their implementation. They should remain the key delivery mechanisms however be linked directly to the focal area targets of the Strategic Plan under the Convention on Biological Diversity, which may assist reporting and monitoring. The GSPC has several strong points, including specific measurable targets that

²⁶ Joint Submission by Birdlife International, Conservation International, IUCN-WCPA, The Nature Conservancy; World Wildlife Fund for Nature and the Wildlife Conservation Society.

²⁷ For example, the experience of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas suggests that common factors of success include the presence of: a) inter-agency and multi-stakeholder steering committees to coordinate implementation at national and regional levels; b) regional transboundary collaboration to share experience and lessons learned and plan transboundary approaches; c) funding incentives in the form of small (up to \$200,000) "Early Action Grants" to stimulate early action; and d) global inter-institutional collaboration between Parties, donors, and international NGOs, to coordinate support for implementation.

²⁸ Submission of Canada.

²⁹ Decision IX/9 with modifications in light of submissions.

³⁰ *Millennium Ecosystem Assessment*, volume 2, chapter 14, section 14.2.2.2.

³¹ Submission of IUCN.

stimulate action at global, regional and local levels across different sectors; specific measurable targets that give clear messages to increase public awareness; and programme-specific national focal points, lead partners and stakeholder networks to sustain and drive implementation.³²

35. **Like the existing Strategic Plan, the new Plan should be a short, focused document.** The 2002 Strategic Plan is a short document (five pages, including the appendix), and the framework for assessing progress adds only a few more pages. This relative brevity has been a strong point of the Plan. Arguably, this is especially important given the extensive length of many of the Convention's programmes of work and other decisions. The Conference of the Parties may thus wish to aim for a short document for the post-2010 Plan (for example, eight to twelve pages, including annexes).³³ All submissions agree on this point, however, achieving it while accommodating the many demands for additional points to be included, will be a challenge.

36. **For the Strategic Plan to be broadly endorsed, active engagement of all Parties and stakeholders is essential.**³⁴ Adequate time for meaningful discussions on proposed revisions prior to and at the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation will help achieve this.³⁵ The workshops and other processes outlined in section III will contribute to this. Further submissions from Parties would also be desirable, representing a broader geographical scope than has been the case to present. In preparing their submissions and national positions, the Conference of the Parties has encouraged Parties to facilitate dialogue among different sectors of government and society.³⁶ Consultations should involve indigenous and local communities, civil society and the private sector, as well as all levels of government (national/federal, state/provincial and district/municipal/local, as appropriate) in order to strengthen implementation. At the international level, other relevant organizations and agreements should be engaged through appropriate mechanisms. The road from now until the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and the International Year of Biodiversity will provide a number of opportunities. These need to be capitalized by emphasizing biodiversity's links with today's global issues. The opportunity of the high-level meeting of the General Assembly, in particular, should be seized to gather high-level support for the vision and mission (2020 biodiversity target) of the new Plan.

B. The vision and mission/post 2010 targets, and Strategic Objectives

37. **The updated and revised Strategic Plan should include a target for 2050 (long-term vision) and a target for 2020 (mission).** Some Parties have developed both shorter-term targets (or milestones) and longer-term targets (or vision) in their national biodiversity strategies and action plans.³⁷ The Conference of the Parties has recognized "the inertia in ecological systems and in the drivers of biodiversity loss and therefore the need for longer-term targets" (decision VIII/9). At the same time a long-term vision may serve to postpone needed actions at a time when if concerted action to reduce biodiversity loss is not taken quickly, major losses with serious consequences for human well-being are likely.³⁸ The Conference of the Parties therefore agreed that the new Plan should include both short-term targets or milestones and a long-term target or vision, developed on the basis of robust scientific

³² Submissions of IUCN, Plantlife International & BGCI.

³³ See UNEP/CBD/COP/9/14/Rev.1.

³⁴ Submission of the European Union.

³⁵ Submission of Canada.

³⁶ Decision IX/9 (4).

³⁷ For example, Japan has a 100-year vision.

³⁸ As biodiversity is lost and ecosystems are degraded, there is a risk of various thresholds ("tipping points") being passed, resulting in regime shifts in ecosystems and serious loss of ecosystem services. Examples include collapse of marine fisheries due to over-exploitation; conversion of forest basins to savannah-like systems due to deforestation combined with climate change and forest fires; and eutrophication of inland and coastal waters due to nutrient loading. While it is difficult (with precision, even impossible) to predict the point at which these thresholds occur, the scientific literature points to numerous examples that could occur before 2050. The GBO-3 and its supporting studies will provide a peer-reviewed assessment of these possible thresholds.

evidence.³⁹ Most submissions suggest that 2020 and 2050 are appropriate dates for such targets. The years 2050 and 2020 have also been consistently used in discussions on long-term and mid-term climate change targets. For consistency, a similar time frame could help Governments in linking their work on biodiversity and climate change.⁴⁰ The year 2020 is also the timeline promoted at the ninth meeting of the Convention on Biological Diversity to halt net deforestation and which was supported by Ministers from 67 countries. A long-term inspiring vision to 2050 would provide strategic long-term focus and planning guidance beyond 2020. Some also suggest a 2015 interim target to coincide with the 2015 targets of the Millennium Development Goals. 2025 has also been suggested as a short-term target date. Additional milestones could be established to guide progress towards the 2020 target, drawing upon the experience in the programme of work on protected areas under the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Plan should recognize that, without an absolute limit on environmental pressures, halting the loss of biodiversity will not be possible.

38. **The 2050 vision and 2020 biodiversity target(s) should be inspiring and relevant to stimulate action across a wide range of institutions, organizations and elements of society.** They should relate biodiversity to human well-being. Among the submissions, there are differences of views concerning the formulation of the vision and mission statements. Some argue for describing a desired future state (such as a healthy planet, maintenance of ecosystem services, resilience, etc.), while others argue for describing what needs to be done in terms of reducing/halting biodiversity loss and avoiding negative implications for human well-being. Others believe that the new Strategic Plan should be more focused on outcomes than on processes similar to the Global Strategy for Plan Conservation⁴¹ while others note the importance of keeping a positive tone and balancing the three objectives of the Convention⁴². In addition to the vision participants in Expert meeting on the development of post-2010 global biodiversity targets felt that a short headline statement could accompany the vision statement. However, there appears to be broad agreement on some possible elements (some of which might also be reflected in the mission statement). These might include: to ensure healthy ecosystems and a diversity of life on earth; to maintain ecosystem services in the interest of human well-being; to reduce the risks from biodiversity loss; to bring human activities in harmony with nature; and to maintain resilience to cope with change and ensure that options for future generations are maintained.

39. **The biodiversity target should be ambitious but realistic, and measurable, developed on the basis of robust scientific evidence.**⁴³ This was agreed at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. A post-2010 target should be clear and distinct enough so that policy makers and the public easily envisage concrete actions and the promotion of broad efforts by various sectors towards the achievement of its objectives, and so that progress towards its achievement can be concisely evaluated.⁴⁴ The Bonn workshop further proposes “that any post-2010 target should provide a sense of urgency and be ambitious, simple but essential, politically relevant, scientifically credible, inclusive, inspiring, user-friendly and implementable.” However, there are different points of view on how this should be carried out. The Nairobi brainstorming concluded that there is a need for a quantifiable target following 2010, which even if not perfect, needs to be a proxy by which we can measure progress and indicate gaps and needs. A target without explicit timeframes and milestones is uninteresting to politicians. Submissions from several Parties support this view, emphasizing the need for SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, time-bound) targets.⁴⁵ In this view, the Strategic Plan should be specific on how, by when and by whom, the targets/goals should be achieved -- the process and key steps to achieve the

³⁹ Decision IX/9 (d).

⁴⁰ This timeline has also been proposed by the United Kingdom's House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee in their report on the 2010 biodiversity target (10 November 2008).

⁴¹ Submission by Pro Natura - Friends of the Earth Switzerland

⁴² Submission of Brazil

⁴³ Decision IX/9 (d); several submissions, *Carta di Siracusa*.

⁴⁴ Submission of Japan.

⁴⁵ Submission by France and the EC on behalf of the EU.

long-term vision/target and short-term targets/goals, including accountability, should be made explicit. However, according to another submission,⁴⁶ there is a reluctance in many jurisdictions to set measurable, time-bound targets at the global level. According to this alternative view, qualitative targets and indicators are more effective at the international level, while prescriptive targets and indicators are more effective when they are set at national, subnational or local scales.

40. **The current target of reducing biodiversity loss appears unlikely to be achieved by 2010. Nevertheless, more ambitious targets, for example, to halt and/or reverse loss are being proposed for 2020.** Some propose a “positive” formulation for the new target although it appears to be difficult to find a formulation that is both positive and measurable. Some suggest a focus on biodiversity loss, others on maintaining services, still others on reducing drivers of loss. The following constitute some ideas of qualitative formulation suggested so far:

- (a) Reduce loss of biodiversity (and ecosystem services);
- (b) Halt loss of biodiversity (and ecosystem services);
- (c) Restore biodiversity and ecosystems;
- (d) Safeguarding healthy ecosystems and halting biodiversity loss;
- (e) Biodiversity is maintained and restored to secure a healthy planet and to deliver essential benefits for sustainable development and human well-being for all;
- (f) Prevent loss of biodiversity that has dangerous impacts on human well-being;
- (g) Maintain biodiversity and ecosystem services for human well-being;
- (h) Promote biodiversity and ecosystem resilience to change;
- (i) Reduce ecological footprint to sustainable levels (or, more positively, achieve “One Plant Living”).

41. It is envisaged that, while it is unlikely that a significant rate of biodiversity loss will not be achieved at the global level for all dimensions of biodiversity, it will likely be achieved for particular dimensions of biodiversity in particular regions (for example, on current trends we are likely to see, between 2002 and 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of Amazon deforestation). All scenarios examined in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment see continuing global biodiversity loss well beyond 2010. At the same time, as already noted, many countries are committed to achieving net zero deforestation by 2020, and in some parts of the world, forest areas are expanding. It is likely therefore that some areas will see continuing loss, while others will see a halt to loss, and still others a restoration of ecosystems. This more complex dynamic needs to be taken into account when setting targets. Moreover, avoiding the most dangerous consequences of biodiversity loss for human well-being will require a targeted response.

42. **A broad overall 2020 biodiversity target could be complemented by a small set of quantifiable sub-targets or goals and a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan.** In order to ensure measurability, monitoring and assessment of any post-2010 framework, the establishment of baselines, clear milestones and sub-targets, and an agreed set of indicators to measure are important. Given the multi-faceted nature of biodiversity, and the three objectives of the Convention, any overall target is likely to be broad. Thus a framework of goals and sub-targets is likely to be needed again to clarify the overall target and provide the necessary precision. For example participants in the Nairobi expert meeting on the development of post-2010 global biodiversity targets felt that targets related to the drivers of biodiversity loss, pressures on biodiversity, required responses, ecosystem services and human well-being and enabling measures could be developed. Further Japan suggests that as any biodiversity targets should be described in a succinct manner, essential elements could be contained in sub-targets but with clear links to the overall framework. While it has been possible for some countries to develop quantitative

⁴⁶ Submission of Canada.

national targets, it has proved difficult to determine quantified goals and targets in the overall 2010 framework at a global level. Quantitative targets were developed however in the more specific context of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation. Focusing on a particular and relatively well documented subset of biodiversity allowed for such precision. A set of specific sub-targets with timelines specific to given issues or biomes (for example, to halt deforestation; to restore marine fisheries; to restore critical wetlands; etc.) could be identified under the 2020 biodiversity target.⁴⁷ These could be linked to the focal areas and indicators of the 2010 Framework for Evaluation of Progress (decision VIII/15) however could replace the existing set of goals and sub-targets. The new sub-targets need to be measurable (i.e., a specific baseline should be defined as well as an indicator to measure progress). Key policy makers of different sectors should be involved in the process of defining sub-targets and special targets for the local, regional and national levels.⁴⁸ To insure that any possible 2020 biodiversity target is easily understandable the number of headline indicators should be kept small. During the International Expert Workshop on the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators and Post-2010 Indicator Development it was concluded that around 10-15 main indicators would be an appropriate number and that these could be complimented by secondary indicators where needed.

43. **Sub-targets for economic sectors could also be developed.** The framework of the Strategic Plan could include fields of action for the economic sectors setting out their role in achieving the overall biodiversity target(s), perhaps with sub-targets for each sector. The sub-targets could be generated by the sectors themselves to ensure their ownership over them, involving appropriate biodiversity expertise as well consulting with the communities that their operations and targets will affect. These sub-targets could perhaps be developed at the regional level, following the agreement by the Conference of the Parties on the overall framework.⁴⁹

44. **The Plan should include milestones or time-bound measures of progress.** The 2020 biodiversity target and sub-targets should have a set of measures of progress or ‘milestones’ -- perhaps on an annual or biannual basis -- against which Parties could assess their progress. They should be a combination of process-orientated and outcome-orientated measures. The measures should be integrated into an effective and user-friendly reporting system for Parties. The programme of work on protected areas under the Convention on Biological Diversity offers an illustration of the value of annual measures, as it has strong timelines which have provided Governments with a structured work plan to reach the ultimate goal of well-managed, comprehensive, financed and representative protected area systems by 2010 (on land)/2012 (in marine areas). As the programme of work on protected areas will be reviewed during the fourteenth meeting of Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and during the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the results of these reviews should be considered as the new Strategic Plan is developed.

45. **The Strategic Plan should provide a framework for the establishment of national, and, where possible, quantitative, targets, that Parties can implement according to their own priorities.** This was agreed at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and is further supported by submissions.⁵⁰ Given that implementation of the Convention occurs primarily at the national level, the establishment of targets at the national level, in line with the Framework provided by the Plan, is perhaps one of the most important functions of the Plan. The Strategic Plan needs to challenge national and subnational institutions to develop realistic targets relevant to the scale and specific context, and provide for the means necessary (see next section). The framework needs to be positive, inspiring and create an enabling framework that encourages collaboration and action.⁵¹ Allowing for some degree of flexibility

⁴⁷ Joint Submission by Birdlife International, Conservation International, IUCN-WCPA, The Nature Conservancy; World Wildlife Fund for Nature and the Wildlife Conservation Society.

⁴⁸ Bonn Workshop; Submissions of IUCN; Joint Submission by Birdlife International, Conservation International, IUCN-WCPA, The Nature Conservancy; World Wildlife Fund for Nature and the Wildlife Conservation Society.

⁴⁹ Athens consultations; Submission of CEEweb.

⁵⁰ Submission of Canada and Botswana

⁵¹ Submission of Canada.

for different countries to adapt the goals of the Strategic Plan, in accordance with their national contexts, could greatly facilitate achievement and successful implementation.⁵² National targets can be focused on national priorities and important aspects of biodiversity. Being more focused, they can also be quantitative. Brazil has developed a comprehensive set of national targets aligned with the framework of the Convention on Biological Diversity as well as with the GSPC. A few other Parties⁵³ have developed national goals and targets aligned with the GSPC framework, while other Parties⁵⁴ have developed relevant national targets that often pre-date the adoption of the framework of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Overall few countries have responded to the invitation of the Conference of the Parties⁵⁵ to develop national targets. Thus, in the development of the revised Plan, more attention might be given to monitoring and reporting against specific timelines which could then be reflected in the multi-year programme of work of the Conference of the Parties (see paragraph 63). Achievement against the national targets would need to be related to the global targets of the framework so overall progress towards collective goals could be assessed⁵⁶. However it was also felt by some that thought the strategic Plan should encourage the development of national level biodiversity indicators but this should not be the overarching goal of the new plan.

46. **The strategic goals could be reformulated to also include the guidelines of the current framework for evaluation, distinguishing between outcomes (“ends”) and strategic processes (“means”).** Strategic goals and objectives are at the heart of all strategic plans and should continue to be part of this one.⁵⁷ The current four strategic goals need to be more inspiring and at a higher level and should ensure that the link with human well-being is clear – that is to say, better linked to achievement of the overarching goal. The strategic goals should provide a framework that links the wide ranging consequences of biodiversity loss with all aspects of human well-being, provides a better understanding of biodiversity loss, develops the means to mainstream biodiversity and communicate its fundamental importance. They should also link directly to providing a framework to solve the issues identified in the “Issues” section. The SGLCP propose a new goal, focused on mainstreaming and including the objective of striving to contribute to poverty reduction, which pulls together these existing objectives. By making biodiversity conservation and development mainstreaming a goal, this would help to raise the profile of biodiversity mainstreaming and the priority it is given.

47. **The new Plan could be structured to provide a more coherent framework than the existing one.**⁵⁸ Although there is a link between the Strategic Plan (decision VI/26) and the framework for measuring progress and the programmes of work (decisions VII/30 and VIII/15), the flow and connection between these documents, including the process-focused goals of the Strategic Plan and the action-oriented sub-goals of the framework, are not explicit or clear.⁵⁹ Both goals and objectives would benefit from monitoring and evaluation. The Strategic Plan should clearly illustrate the flow and linkages from the strategic goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan to the more specific action plans and programmes of work to monitoring, evaluation and reporting.⁶⁰ IUCN considers that much of the current structure of the Strategic Plan (issue, mission, strategic goals and objectives, review) remains valid but perhaps the review section could be developed into a section on monitoring and evaluation and a new section could be added that deals with the issue of finance.

⁵² Submission of IUCN.

⁵³ Ireland, South Africa, United Kingdom.

⁵⁴ Netherlands, Sweden.

⁵⁵ Decisions VII/30, VIII/8, VIII/15, IX/8, IX/9.

⁵⁶ Submission of IUCN.

⁵⁷ Submission of Canada.

⁵⁸ Nairobi consultations, Submission of Canada.

⁵⁹ According to the submission by Canada, the strategic goals and objectives are a mix of means and ends, some of which are too broad and mostly difficult to measure (1.3, 2.4, 3.4, 4.3) others too evident (1.1) and unclear (1.3, 2.5).

⁶⁰ Submission of Canada.

48. **The list of obstacles could be improved.** The Strategic Plan includes, in an appendix, a list of obstacles to the implementation of the Convention. However, there are some shortcomings to the list that could be improved in a revision -- some of the obstacles listed being dependent on others. The current appendix listing obstacles could be refined and shortened⁶¹ drawing upon more recent experience with implementation. Further, the information in the appendix needs to be linked more effectively with the rest of the Strategic Plan. Mexico suggests updating the Plan in the light of experience in addressing two obstacles in particular -- climate change and the lack of integration of biodiversity considerations in other sectors. Brazil suggests that more research is also needed on some components of biodiversity, such as increased efforts in taxonomy through the Global Taxonomy Initiative and the Forest Peoples Programme suggests that the insufficient recognition of the role of indigenous peoples and local communities, the lack of political will to address the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss (including corruption), the limited translation of the Strategic Plan into local languages and a lack of synergy between local, national and international levels should be considered as obstacles as well.

49. **Consideration should be given to developing a section on “Guiding Principles”.** Canada suggests that a synthesis and shortened version of the guiding principles adopted under various decisions⁶² could replace the appendix on obstacles. These principles guide implementation of the Convention, and giving them a more visible profile in the Strategic Plan could guide implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan by a wider range of players.

50. **Further work may be needed to refine or develop indicators.** The framework of indicators for the 2010 target includes some 20 headline indicators, which are being developed through the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, coordinated by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP-WCMC). Some of these are well established, including those that have been incorporated into the MDG framework. Others are limited in geographic coverage and/or resolution or the availability of time series information. In some cases, the indicator methodology is yet to be developed. UNEP-WCMC leads a review of the use and effectiveness of the suite of indicators, which may suggest practical options for their refinement. The findings from this analysis will be reflected in the Global Biodiversity Outlook. Additional indicators – focusing on the drivers of biodiversity loss -- may be needed. Some stakeholders have proposed that indicators should be developed according to the Driver-Pressure-State-Impact-Response (DPSIR) or Pressure-State-Response (PSR) framework.⁶³

51. **The Strategic Plan should encourage universal membership of the Convention⁶⁴ and facilitate greater coherence among relevant MEAs and other agreements.** Ongoing discussions concerning international environmental governance suggest a need for further close collaboration among multilateral environmental agreements and with other international institutions. Ideally the updated Strategic Plan should encompass the main concerns of the biodiversity-related agreements and also contribute to synergy with other MEAs and relevant agreements. For the Convention to play its full role in this future institutional framework, universal membership will be critical.

C. Including means of implementation in the Strategic Plan

52. **The revised Strategic Plan should focus on implementation and relevant enabling mechanisms.⁶⁵** The success of the new Strategic Plan, particularly in developing countries, will depend upon on the availability of tools to help countries implement it.⁶⁶ The in-depth review of goals 2 and 3 of

⁶¹ Submission of Canada.

⁶² Including principles related to invasive alien species (decision VI/23), the incorporation of indigenous and local knowledge (decision VII/16), the use of the ecosystem approach (decision VII/11), sustainable use (decision VII/12), access and benefit sharing (decision VI/24), impact assessment (decision VIII/28) and incentive measures (decision VI/15).

⁶³ Athens consultations; Submission of CEEweb.

⁶⁴ Decision IX/9.

⁶⁵ Submissions of Canada, Qatar, IUCN.

⁶⁶ Submission of Brazil.

the Strategic Plan indicates that lack of capacity and human, financial and technical resources continue to be major constraints to the implementation of the Convention, and that this lack needs to be addressed in the updated and revised Strategic Plan as further elaborated in the following paragraphs. This should be done in a manner consistent with decision IX/8 and other relevant decisions, and that builds on the reviews of implementation to date. The role of other Secretariats in supporting implementation should be examined to see how the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity can play a greater enabling role.⁶⁷

53. The new Plan should allow for a more systematic evidence-based review of implementation of the Convention and elucidate better lessons learned and thereby improve overall performance in implementation. The Clearing-House Mechanism needs to be further developed, at global and national levels, in order to facilitate a more effective exchange of expertise, tools, guidelines, technologies and good practices among and within Parties. Possible changes in the roles of the Working Group on Implementation of the Convention and SBSTTA, and the possible need for alternative or additional supporting mechanisms, such as IPBES, should be examined in this regard. The role of voluntary peer review mechanisms should be explored.⁶⁸

54. The Plan must address the need for new and additional financial resources in accordance with Article 20 of the Convention,⁶⁹ including through the resource mobilization strategy. At its tenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties is committed to the adoption of targets and/or indicators for resource mobilization (decision IX/31), and these should be an integral part of the new Strategic Plan.⁷⁰ According to the third national reports, the most widespread constraints to the implementation of the Convention are “lack of financial, human and technical resources” and “lack of economic incentive measures”. If this chronic lack of resources, particularly in developing countries is not recognized the new Strategic Plan is unlikely to be effective.⁷¹ One submission⁷² identifies the failure to develop a strong financing mechanism that secures adequate and predictable sources for implementation of commitments made by Parties, as the biggest constraint for the Convention on Biological Diversity, and notes the contrast with the United Nations Framework Convention of Climate Change (UNFCCC).⁷³ Commenting that the Global Environment Facility (GEF), development aid finance and charitable contributions have proven insufficient, IUCN calls for a “Green Development Mechanism” to sustainably mobilize financial resource from countries that benefit from biodiversity conservation and channel these resources to countries and resource managers who conserve biodiversity and/or restore habitat. The development of such a mechanism was also mentioned in Brazil’s submission which also notes the need for a “fast-track” mechanism to access resources. One aspect of the UNFCCC clean development mechanism (CDM) is that it generates new and additional finance from the private sector and IUCN believes that the same is needed for biodiversity conservation. Building on the experience of the CDM mentioned previously, any such mechanisms should reward positive contributions to biodiversity conservation however also penalize biodiversity loss, be self-financing (requiring little/no government funding or voluntary donations), and help reduce the gap between rich and poor countries. An assessment of how the current CDM works in practice and its limitations could help to inform the development of a similar mechanism for the Convention. In addition a resource mobilization strategy could also include non-monetary issues as many

⁶⁷ Qatar recommends that the secretariat of Convention on Biological Diversity should closely study the operations the CITES secretariat which often plays a serious role in enabling implementation, noting that the legal status of both the secretariats is the same and that neither is an implementing body as such).

⁶⁸ Athens consultations.

⁶⁹ Decision IX/9.

⁷⁰ Submission of the European Union.

⁷¹ Submission by Brazil.

⁷² Submission of IUCN.

⁷³ Over the 5 years from 2004-08, the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) generated over US\$ 22 billion for investments in developing countries in a range of climate change mitigation activities, such as renewable energy supply, energy efficiency, fuel-switching, landfill gas capture, and controlled destruction of the most potent industrial greenhouse gases (based on figures from New Carbon Finance).

local communities could contribute to the implementation of the Strategic Plan through non-monetary means if they were empowered to do so. The development of payment for ecosystem services may also be an option for increasing resource availability.

55. **The revised and updated Strategic Plan should provide a useful framework for the updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans⁷⁴ and for their linking to broader national development strategies** such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, national strategies for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, sustainable development strategies, and related strategies on human rights and gender equality and strategies to respond to climate change and combat desertification, as well as to sectoral strategies. In this respect, the Plan should be consistent with the guidance adopted at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (decision IX/8) and facilitate its application. The updating and revision of national biodiversity strategies and action plans should be supported by exchange of information and experience, with the meaningful involvement of all stakeholders including indigenous and local communities and the provision of financial resources for capacity development. The protected areas programme of work support programme supported by GEF-UNDP may provide useful lessons in this regard.

56. **The Strategic Plan should provide a framework that is relevant at all levels of governance.** Action is needed at the subnational and local levels, as well as at national and international levels, to ensure implementation of the Convention. Since most land-use planning decisions are taken at subnational levels (including state/provincial, district/municipal, including city and local levels), the Strategic Plan should be relevant at those levels, and help guide spatial planning. A number of countries have developed State or provincial national biodiversity strategies and action plans.⁷⁵ and others have developed local biodiversity strategies or action plans.⁷⁶ The revised Strategic Plan needs to be a flexible framework that provides broad direction but that can be easily adapted to circumstances at the national, subnational and local levels and can be adapted to changing conditions and new evidence.

57. **The Plan should feature a broader range of partnerships, including stronger links with the UNFCCC, UNCCD and biodiversity-related conventions.** The updated Strategic Plan could be made more relevant to other constituencies if it would make explicit links between its goals and those of other international instruments and biodiversity-related conventions, capitalizing on synergies and possible joint work plans and initiatives. Existing work on synergies under the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio conventions and the Liaison Group of the Biodiversity-related Conventions could support this process.⁷⁷ The revised Strategic Plan should include the importance of better integration with the objectives of other international efforts such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and the World Health Organization, that should have mutually-supportive activities.⁷⁸ This is particularly important in the area of climate change, where the effects of decisions around mitigation and adaptation need to consider the consequences to biodiversity and the livelihoods of indigenous and local communities. Cooperation with the International Maritime Organization could also be helpful in controlling the spread of invasive alien species, through ballast water for example.

⁷⁴ Most Parties have developed NBSAPs. However, the Plan must also be relevant for those who have not.

⁷⁵ Canada, China, Colombia, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Federated States of Micronesia, Pakistan, Peru, United Kingdom. Canada reports that "implementation efforts include the creation of the Biodiversity Outcomes Framework, which is a federal/provincial/territorial framework for delivery of Canada's Biodiversity Strategy, and the preparation of several subnational biodiversity strategies and action plans, or equivalent strategies and plans (i.e. Saskatchewan, Northwest Territories, Ontario, Quebec). One province, Quebec, is preparing its third Strategy and Action plan. Several local and regional governments, including cities, have either developed biodiversity strategies and action plans or are incorporating biodiversity objectives into other planning processes. The number of local and regional governments taking this approach in Canada is continuing to increase".

⁷⁶ Canada, Japan, United Kingdom.

⁷⁷ Submission of IUCN.

⁷⁸ Submission of Canada.

58. **Regional organizations should be engaged to support implementation of the new Strategic Plan**⁷⁹ Regional organizations (such as the Gulf Cooperation, the Arab League and the Organization of the Islamic Conference) play important roles with respect to policy-setting and programme developments in natural resources management in the member countries. There should therefore be efforts to seriously involve these organizations in the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity in the region.

59. **There is a need to expand collaboration and partnerships, with international institutions, sectors, disciplines and organizations that make the decisions that affect biodiversity and human well-being.**⁸⁰ To do this, the Convention on Biological Diversity has to encourage participation in the activities of other organizations that promote human well-being. Asking other sectors to participate in biodiversity activities is one approach, but a more powerful approach is to also engage with other exercises to ensure that biodiversity protection and enhancement are included in their strategic goals. Partnerships between developed and developing countries as a means of sharing experiences and developing capacity could also be pursued.

60. **Communication needs to have a higher profile in the Strategic Plan.**⁸¹ This pertains to communicating the meaning of biodiversity, the importance and value of biodiversity to human well-being, the shared responsibility for biodiversity protection, the cost of inaction, the wide-ranging impacts of biodiversity loss and the necessity of incorporating biodiversity considerations into the goals and objectives of all organizations interested in human well-being, be they health-based, economic-based or natural resource-based.⁸² A communications strategy is needed that highlights an overarching and simple message that can be used to promote public engagement in biodiversity conservation.⁸³ There is a need to implement the CEPA priority actions at the national level, encouraging Parties to pay special attention to the need for CEPA materials and tools in local languages to raise the profile of biodiversity.⁸⁴

61. **The new Plan should provide for effective participatory national monitoring and reporting.** The in-depth review of goals 2 and 3 of the Strategic Plan suggests that greater efforts are needed to monitor implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and progress towards national targets, to allow for adaptive management and more effective implementation, and provide regular reports on progress. This is reflected in the consolidated guidance on national biodiversity strategies and action plans adopted in decision IX/8. Reports should continue to be prepared about every four or five years. An obstacle to moving forward on implementation is the lack of consistent, credible and regular observation and information systems to assess the state of biodiversity.⁸⁵ Recent efforts such as GEO-BON and GBIF are steps in the right direction. Reliable observation is critical to recognizing early warning signals, reducing the risk to biodiversity, ensuring maintenance of what remains, and providing links among reduction of stressors on biodiversity, human well-being and healthy biodiversity.

D. The multi-year programme of work of the Conference of the Parties

62. **The multi-year programme of work should operationalize the new Strategic Plan**⁸⁶ **and the Conference of the Parties should devote more attention to reviewing and supporting implementation in its future programme.** The multi-year programme of work should also allow for a more systematic evidence-based review of implementation of the Convention and the new Strategic Plan to elucidate better lessons learned and thereby improve overall performance in implementation. Possible changes in the role of Working Group on Review of Implementation, and the possible need for alternative

⁷⁹ Submission of Qatar.

⁸⁰ Submission of Canada.

⁸¹ Nairobi consultations Submissions of EU, Canada, MNHM; *Carta di Siracusa*.

⁸² Submission of Canada.

⁸³ Submission of IUCN.

⁸⁴ Submission of the European Union.

⁸⁵ Submission of Canada.

⁸⁶ Submission of the European Union.

or additional supporting mechanisms, should be examined in this regard. The multi-year programme of work will need to prioritize interaction with other mechanisms to ensure the exchange of information necessary to achieve synergy among the various multilateral instruments for the environment and sustainable development, and in order to leverage the necessary human, institutional and financial resources for the implementation of the Convention.

63. **The multi-year programme of work should include a process and mechanisms for the establishment of national targets and objectives in the framework of the new Plan and for reporting against these targets, as well as the global framework itself.** At the same time, efforts should be made to avoid any increases in the overall reporting burden on Parties and, if possible, to reduce it, as well as support efforts to harmonize national reporting efforts across Conventions. National reporting should be based on the application of the 2020 biodiversity framework for evaluation of progress at the national level and provide verifiable/quantifiable information. This would involve Parties applying indicators to measure the pressure, state and response to biodiversity loss at the national level.⁸⁷ In some developing countries resources would need to be made available for this to be accomplished. Regular reporting by the Executive Secretary to the Conference of the Parties on progress towards implementation should be mandated. Parties should agree on the reporting interval (e.g., every 4 or 5 years). Strategic Plans need to be living documents and should be reviewed and revised at regular intervals as well (e.g., every 10 years).⁸⁸

64. **The multi-year programme of work of the Conference of the Parties should reflect the focus and priorities of the updated and revised Strategic Plan** even though more attention should be given to implementation and relatively less to developing new guidance. Consistent with the priorities identified above, the multi-year programme of work might include provision for the Conference of the Parties to address the following clusters of issues, with appropriate preliminary work undertaken by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice:

- (a) Drivers of biodiversity loss (related to Articles 7 and 8(h));
- (b) Biodiversity and human well-being, including health and poverty eradication;
- (c) Ecosystem restoration, maintenance of ecosystem resilience, and adaptation to climate change and other global change phenomena (Article 8(f));
- (d) Economics, especially as related to sustainable use and incentive measures.

65. **The existing thematic programmes of work continue to be relevant for the period of the new Strategic Plan (2010-2020).** Tremendous time and energy would go into re-negotiating programmes of work should the new Strategic Plan require them to be changed. This time and energy would be better invested in implementation. The previous practice of pre-determined in-depth reviews has had mixed results. In practice, most programmes of work have demanded agenda time at the Conference of the Parties and SBSTTA, and indeed sometimes, because of the emergence of new issues and challenges, programmes of work, other than those programmed for in-depth review, have required more agenda time than “in-depth” issues. Moreover, it is not envisaged that major changes to the thematic programmes of work will be needed -- at least, such needs cannot be forecasted. It is therefore proposed that, rather than providing for in-depth reviews and revision of the programmes of work at pre-determined intervals, the new multi-year programme of work should allow for supplementary guidance to be developed only where such a need is identified through the ongoing review of implementation or through the need to respond to new issues. In addition, frequently there is a need not so much for new guidance approved by the Conference of the Parties, but rather for the translation of existing guidance into more technical and practical manuals or toolkits. These could be developed through technical expert mechanisms, for example via the CBD Technical Series, or through the identification of best practices through the Clearing-House Mechanism, rather than negotiated at significant expense through meetings of the

⁸⁷ Joint Submission by Birdlife International, Conservation International, IUCN-WCPA, The Nature Conservancy; World Wildlife Fund for Nature and the Wildlife Conservation Society.

⁸⁸ Submission of Canada.

Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice or of the Conferences of the Parties.⁸⁹

V. MAIN POINTS OF AGREEMENT, CHALLENGES AND OUTSTANDING ISSUES

66. The submissions and discussions on the updated Strategic Plan demonstrate broad agreement on many points. There are also differences of opinion on some areas and many challenges remain. This section attempts to summarize the main points of agreement and to highlight remaining challenges.

A. *Main points of agreement*

67. The updated and revised Strategic Plan is considered important, not only as a framework for action under the Convention itself, but also to facilitate outreach to a broader community that needs to be engaged for effective implementation of the Convention to occur. It is generally agreed that the Plan should highlight the links among biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being, including through the economic value of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and the importance for poverty eradication and the Millennium Development Goals. Moreover, the Plan should address the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss and integrate biodiversity considerations into relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, programmes and strategies and planning processes. The Plan should take into account and respond to the current context of global climate change, economic crisis and related challenges and opportunities while seeking to promote the sustainable use of biodiversity and ensuring that efforts to support biodiversity do not decrease.

68. It is emphasized that the revisions to the Strategic Plan requires the active engagement of all Parties and stakeholders on the basis of robust scientific evidence. The new plan should address the gaps identified in previous reviews of implementation and build upon the existing Strategic Plan and associated framework while improving the coherence between the information contained in these documents. Like the existing Strategic Plan, the new Plan should be captured in a short, focused document.

69. It is widely viewed that the Plan should include a long-term vision (or 2050 Target) and a shorter term mission (2020 biodiversity target), perhaps with an interim 2015 Target linked to the 2015 targets of the Millennium Development Goals. The short- and long-term targets should be inspiring and stimulate action across society. The 2020 Target should be ambitious however realistic and measurable, developed on the basis of scientific evidence. Generally, it is considered that the post-2010 target should not be less ambitious than the current target. In fact, even though the current target of reducing biodiversity loss appears unlikely to be achieved by 2010, more ambitious targets (for example, to halt and/or reverse biodiversity loss) are being proposed for 2020.

70. Many views suggest that the new Plan should have a greater focus on the practical implementation of the Convention and, in this context, should:

- (a) Include mechanisms to support implementation, capacity development and monitoring of implementation;
- (b) Address the need for new and additional financial resources, through the Resource Mobilization Strategy;
- (c) Prioritize communication and outreach;
- (d) Allow for a more systematic evidence-based review of implementation to elucidate better lessons learned; and

⁸⁹ Joint Submission by Birdlife International, Conservation International, IUCN-WCPA, The Nature Conservancy; World Wildlife Fund for Nature and the Wildlife Conservation Society.

(e) Provide a framework for the establishment of national, and, where possible, quantitative, targets, that Parties can implement according to their own priorities.

71. In order to be effective, all of this would need to be reflected in the multi-year programme of work of the Conference of the Parties.

B. Challenges and outstanding issues

72. While it is agreed that the new targets should be inspiring, visionary, easily understood, ambitious however realistic and measurable, no proposals have been made that meet all of these criteria. Even though it was agreed at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties that the 2020 target should be measurable, there are differing views as to whether or not the overall target should be, or can be, quantitative. At minimum, progress on any target needs to be verifiable.

73. A broad overall 2020 biodiversity target could be complemented by a set of quantified sub-targets. These might build upon the existing set of sub-targets (decisions VII/30 and VIII/15), or perhaps a smaller set might be agreed. While it may be possible to develop numeric targets for some issues this may be difficult for others and the means to achieve these targets will likely vary with national circumstances. The updating of the Strategic Plan provides the opportunity to ensure a more coherent relationship between the overall target, the sub-targets, indicators and the means to achieve the targets, including appropriate capacity-development activities.

74. Many of the views expressed in the submissions and consultations to date highlight points that are, in fact, already reflected – to a greater or lesser degree – in the current Strategic Plan. This suggests that the future Strategic Plan could build from the current plan. However, it also raises the question as to how to ensure that the updated Strategic Plan is more effective than the current one. For example, Parties were invited to develop national targets based on the 2010 framework but few have done so. Greater success this time might be facilitated by a more effective global framework of outcome-oriented targets, based on robust scientific evidence, complemented by process-oriented targets that would help ensure provision of the necessary support to Parties to develop such national targets and implement them. Such support would include capacity development, information exchange, and the provision of the necessary financial resources. The necessary follow-up processes would need to be included in the multi-year programme of work of the Conference of the Parties. For example, countries could report to the Conference of the Parties at its eleventh meeting on their national targets. Similarly, a road-map of the work to be conducted between the tenth and eleventh meetings of the Conference of the Parties could be developed and this could serve as a means of gauging progress. Such an approach would also imply a greater emphasis by the Conference of the Parties, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Working Group on Review of Implementation on supporting implementation.

VI. COMMENTS ON THE DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

75. The discussion document “Revision and updating of the Strategic Plan: possible outline and elements of the new Strategic Plan (UNEP/CBD/SP/PREP/2) was drafted with the above points in mind. Following the release of the document on 30 November 2009, an additional notification was issued and further submissions invited. Submissions were received from Parties and observers were received. In addition consultative workshops were organized in a number of regions (see para. 6 above).

76. While opinions differed on several specific issues, such as the wording and focus of the proposed vision, mission and targets, there was broad agreement on many of the more general issues. As far as possible the comments received have been incorporated into the documents prepared for the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation: “Examination of the outcome-oriented goals and targets (and associated indicators) and consideration of their possible adjustment for the period beyond 2010” (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/10) and “Updating and revision of the Strategic Plan for the post-2010 period” (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/3).

77. Parties that expressed an opinion on the process and approach used in gathering views of the future Strategic Plan and in preparing the possible outline considered that these were sound. Most of the Parties also agreed with the overall format being proposed, with some Parties noting that the proposed structure, content and wording of the Strategic Plan were in line with, and would therefore compliment, some national biodiversity policies and the Strategic Plans of other international organizations and agreements.

78. The majority of Parties expressed the need to have a balance between the three objectives of the Convention in the future Strategic Plan. Similarly, several Parties also expressed the need to have clear links between the future Strategic Plan and the current work programmes of the Convention as well as decisions of the Conference of the Parties.

79. Almost all Parties expressed the opinion that the new plan should focus on implementation. The need to have the Strategic Plan as a flexible framework to support implementation at the national level was also expressed as was the need to ensure that Parties had appropriate capacities to implement it.

80. A further point of similarity between the comments was on the need for specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time bound (SMART) targets to be able to gauge progress in implementing the new Strategic Plan. Almost all Parties were of the opinion that the Strategic Plan should be made as short and succinct as possible and that the number of targets should be kept to a minimum. Several Parties felt that 20 targets should be the absolute maximum number of targets included in the new plan. Several Parties also expressed the need to build from the existing framework and commented on the need to have targets based on rigorous science. The presence of the technical rationale in the revision and updating of the Strategic Plan: possible outline and elements of the new Strategic Plan (UNEP/CBD/SP/PREP/2) was seen as positive by several of the Parties in this regard.

81. While many of the Parties shared similar ideas and opinions on the more general elements of the proposed outline, there was a great deal of variation on more specific issues. This was particularly apparent in the comments on the possible targets, with Parties expressing differing opinions on the specific formulation of the targets as well as on the quantitative values being proposed. Similarly there were differing opinions on the specific wording and focus of the possible vision and missions being proposed and in several cases these opinions were counter to each other. Bearing this in mind, as far as possible, the specific comments on the wording of the Strategic Plan, and on the targets, have been taken into account in preparing the notes by the Executive Secretary on the examination of the outcome-oriented goals and targets, and associated indicators, and consideration of their possible adjustments for the period beyond 2010 (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/10) and on the draft Strategic Plan of the Convention beyond 2010 (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/3).
