Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)

Contributing to the development, review, updating and revision of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs)

A Draft Guide for CITES Parties

April, 2011

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ABS	Access and Benefit Sharing
BIP	Biodiversity Indicators Partnership
BP	Biodiversity Plan
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CITES-SV	CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013
COP	Conference of the Parties (to a convention)
EMG	Environment Management Group
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEB	Global Environmental Benefits
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IAS	Invasive Alien Species
IEG	International Environmental Governance
IPBES	Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
MA	Millennium Ecosystems Assessment
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MOU	Memorandum of Co-operation between the Secretariat of CITES (Washington, D.C., 1973) and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Nairobi, 1992)
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NDF	Non-detriment finding (CITES)
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NLP	National Legislation Project (CITES)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNU	United Nations University
WTO	World Trade Organization

Table of Contents

Nature of this practical Guide

1. Recent decisions at the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Nagoya in October 2010, have raised potential opportunities for the further implementation of the CITES Strategic Vision 2008-2013. The Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity are requested to update their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) by 2014 and, while doing so, to take into account synergies amongst the biodiversity-related Conventions, of which CITES is one.

2. When revising and updating their NBSAPs, Parties are therefore invited to consider integrating national and regional CITES activities that contribute to the effective implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, as well as the conservation and sustainable use of wild fauna and flora, as appropriate.

3. Recognizing the reciprocal benefits between the NBSAPs and the goals of CITES , the CITES Secretariat has prepared this practical "how-to" Guide for Parties which may wish to consider the inclusion of their CITES national and regional actions in the revised and updated NBSAPs. Such actions could include targets that contribute towards the effective implementation of the CITES Strategic Vision, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the overall conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, as appropriate.

4. Most importantly, activities identified in the NBSAPs of developing countries and countries with economies in transition will be better placed to attract financial resources, especially from Global Environment Facility (GEF), the financial mechanism of the CBD. The GEF provides financial resources to country-driven projects and activities that are aligned with COP decisions, the GEF biodiversity strategy and that are prioritized in NBSAPs.

5. This Guide is primarily intended for use by those institutions and staff responsible for the implementation of objectives and indicators under the CITES Strategic Vision as well as relevant national and regional targets and action plans. The primary target audience for this Guide is:

    –   CITES Management Authorities;
    –   CITES Scientific Authorities;
    –   CITES Enforcement Authorities; and
    –   Competent authorities and scientific institutions of non-Parties

    As well as:

    –   CBD Focal Points;
    –   GEF Operational Focal Points; and
    –   Other stakeholders, as required.

6. This guide is an attempt to gather pertinent information that may be required by the above-mentioned target audience in making decisions on how to integrate CITES targets into the NBSAPs. The guide is divided into 6 sections for ease of use.

Section 1 - Rationale

Mandate

7. The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), in adopting the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013, identified as a key component Goal 3: "*Contribute to significantly reducing the rate of biodiversity loss by ensuring that CITES and other multilateral instruments and processes are coherent and mutually supportive.*" Additionally, in Decision 14.38 (Rev. CoP 15), the Conference of the Parties has directed the Secretariat to "*continue to collaborate with the secretariats of other conventions, UNEP and other bodies in order to facilitate the harmonization of knowledge management and reporting.*" Finally, in Decision 15.10, the Conference has directed its Standing Committee to "*review the adopted post-2010 biodiversity targets and, if necessary, make adjustments to the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013, as appropriate*".

8. The Memorandum of Co-operation between the CITES and CBD Secretariats (1996) also states, that "the secretariats will consult their Contracting Parties with a view to encouraging integration and consistency between national strategies, plans or programmes under the Convention on Biological Diversity and plans or programmes under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora."

9. CITES Resolution Conf. 10.4 (Rev. CoP14) on Cooperation and synergy with the Convention on Biological Diversity also suggests that *"Parties, as appropriate to their national circumstances and to encourage synergy, take measures to achieve coordination and reduce duplication of activities between their national authorities for each Convention"*. Additionally, it calls upon Parties to *"explore opportunities for obtaining funding through the Global Environment Facility for relevant projects, including multilateral projects, which fulfil the eligibility criteria and guidance provided by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to the Global Environment Facility"*.

10. To further the mandates given to it by its Parties the CITES Secretariat, amongst other related activities, has been working with the secretariats of the five other biodiversity-related conventions to find ways in which there could be greater interaction and a more coherent and effective approach to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use at a national level. The CITES Secretariat has also been consulting the GEF Secretariat to explore synergies for funding.

Background

11. There are six key global biodiversity-related conventions: The Convention on Wetlands (known as the Ramsar Convention) adopted in 1971, the World Heritage Convention (WHC) adopted in 1972. the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) adopted in 1973, the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) adopted in 1979, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) adopted in 1992, and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, adopted in 2001.

12. Each of these conventions contributes to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. To meet their objectives, the six global conventions implement actions at global, regional and national levels and have developed similar approaches, tools and guidelines.

Relevant decisions adopted in Nagoya (CBD, CoP10)

13. Of particular interest for the purposes of this practical guide, are the recent decisions adopted at the 10th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD, (Nagoya, 2010) that are of direct relevance to the implementation of the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013 and other plans and programmes.

14. In Decision X/2, the CBD Conference adopted a Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets which it recognizes as "*a useful flexible framework that is relevant to all biodiversity-related conventions*". In paragraph 3) of the same Decision, the CBD Conference urges CBD Parties to develop national targets in line with the Strategic Plan and to update their national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), where appropriate.

15. Moreover, in subparagraph 3 (f), it urges CBD Parties to: Support the updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans as effective instruments to promote the implementation of the Strategic Plan and mainstreaming of biodiversity at the national level, taking into account synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions in a manner consistent with their respective mandates.

16 Furthermore, in paragraph 3 of Decision X/5 on Implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan, the CBD Conference invites CBD Parties to:

Involve national level focal points of all the biodiversity-related agreements, as appropriate, in the process of updating and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and related enabling activities.

17. Finally, in paragraph 7. c) of the same Decision, it requests the CBD Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to*: collaborate with the secretariats of other biodiversity-related*

conventions to facilitate the participation of national focal points of these agreements, as appropriate, in the updating and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and related enabling activities.

Box 1 Guidance on Integrating CITES Targets into the NBSAP Process

It might be useful for countries to explore the relationship between CITES and the CBD more fully when revising and updating the NBSAPs and possibly request the inclusion of a chapter on trade in biological resources in their NBSAPs. This chapter could be linked to a country's obligations to CITES and their CITES targets. Annex IV contains a set of suggested methods for mainstreaming CITES objectives into NBSAPs. Below are some suggestions as to how the CITES Management Authorities can participate in the seven-step process recommended for developing an NBSAP:

1: Identifying and Engaging Stakeholders: The CITES Management Authority could contact the CBD Focal Point and request to participate in the revision and update of the NBSAP. The CITES Management Authority could also propose to be on the committee/working group for NBSAPs.

2: Assessing National Biodiversity and its Links with Human Well-being: During this step, CITES-related drivers of biodiversity loss, the policies and legislation adopted to reduce biodiversity loss and the very strategic relationships between species and human well-being specific to CITES could be included in the stocktaking exercise. This will ensure that the update and revision will include CITES considerations in the future.

3: Developing a Strategy: A number of the 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets, particularly targets 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 17, 18, 19 and 20, are closely linked with the objectives of the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013. These can be linked during this stage and CITES objectives and indicators can be mainstreamed into the priorities and targets set by the country. Annex V on assessing policy options may provide useful guidance in this step.

4: Developing a Plan of Action: If CITES objectives and indicators have been included in the targets and priorities set by the country in stage 3, in stage four a set of activities and actions can be developed or taken from an existing CITES national action plan.

5: Implementing the NBSAP: Once the Action Plan has been developed, it has to be implemented within a certain timeframe. The CITES Management Authority could implement the activity stream related to CITES (noting that this activity stream could also be an existing CITES action plan that is already being implemented) within the framework of a wider and more mainstreamed biodiversity action plan.

6: Monitoring and Evaluating Implementation of the NBSAP: If a CITES national action plan is integrated into the NBSAP, its implementation can also be tracked during this stage.

7: Reporting: This is a requirement specific to the CBD, however, the CBD National Report could include the process followed to integrate and enhance synergies with the other biodiversity-related conventions to ensure the more effective and coherent implementation of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity at the national level. The CBD national report could also complement, contribute to or facilitate preparation of the CITES biennial report on measures taken to enforce the provisions of the Convention.

Section 2 Synergies between CITES and CBD

Vision and Objectives

18. The CITES Vision Statement is to "Conserve biodiversity and contribute to its sustainable use by ensuring that no species of wild fauna or flora becomes or remains subject to unsustainable exploitation through international trade, thereby contributing to the significant reduction of the rate of biodiversity loss". Similarly, the 3 main objectives of the CBD are:

    – The conservation of biological diversity;
    – The sustainable use of the components of biological diversity;
    – The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources.

19. The two Conventions share similar objectives and strong mandates from their respective COPs and thus provide a unique opportunity for the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013, including its objectives and indicators, to be incorporated within a country's NBSAPs through the process of reviewing, updating and revising them. This could enhance the ability to implement both CITES and CBD in a more sustained and coherent manner at the national level.

20 Target 17 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 states that by 2015, each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing, an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan.

21. The Parties to the CBD are also requested to include in the fifth national reports, due by 31 March 2014, an overview of the implementation of NBSAPs or other programmes and plans developed and adopted to implement the Convention. With the support of Japan and other donors, the CBD Secretariat is organizing a series of regional or sub-regional workshops in 2011-2012 to: assist Parties in updating their NBSAPs, including development of national targets; help facilitate national implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020; and translate the Strategic Plan into national targets and commitments.

22. More information on on-going joint work and the modalities used for this process can be found in Annex V.

Section 3 Guide to National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs)

What is an NBSAP in a nutshell?

23. Article 6 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) *requires each Contracting Party to develop an NBSAP (or equivalent instrument), and to integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into sectoral and cross-sectoral activities.*[1] Article 6 is one of only two mandatory commitments under the Convention along with Article 26, the obligation to submit periodic national reports on implementation. The NBSAP is intended to be a roadmap for each country to achieve the goals of the Convention, taking into account its national situation. The development of the NBSAP is an important pre-requisite for mainstreaming biodiversity and the three objectives of the CBD across all sectors of government through relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies. As of February 2011, 172 countries had adopted NBSAPs or equivalent instruments (approximately 89% of all CBD Parties). Additionally, regional organizations are urged to consider the development of regional biodiversity strategies and regional targets as a means of complementing and supporting national actions. Local-level activities by indigenous and local communities to support NBSAPs and the implementation of the three objectives of the Convention are also encouraged by the Convention.

---

[1]   *Module 1 An Introduction to National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans*

> **BOX 2: Convention on** Biological **Diversity: Article 6. General Measures for Conservation and** Sustainable **Use**
>
> Each Contracting Party shall, in accordance with its particular conditions and capabilities:(a) Develop national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity or adapt for this purpose existing strategies, plans or programmes which shall reflect, *inter alia*, the measures set out in this Convention relevant to the Contracting Party concerned; and (b) Integrate, as far as possible and as appropriate, the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies.

24. In 1995, UNEP, IUCN and the World Resources Institute (WRI) developed guidance material entitled *National Biodiversity Planning: Guidelines based on early experiences around the world.* In it, the authors recommended to the CBD Conference of the Parties a seven-step biodiversity planning process. Most countries followed this process in preparing their first NBSAPs and it remains valid today for updating and revising the NBSAPs. Lessons that have emerged from developing the previous NBSAPs[2] should be taken into account during the revision and update. The complete guidelines can be found in https://www.cbd.int/doc/training/nbsap/b2-train-prepare-update-nbsap-revised-en.pdf. These seven recommended steps for a biodiversity planning process and further guidance on NBSAPs can be found in Annex I of this document.

Section 4 Guide to the Global Environment Facility as it Relates to CITES and NBSAPs

25. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) is the financial mechanism for the CBD. The participants to the fifth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund decided that the programming of resources in the fifth replenishment period would cover four years (FY10 – FY14) of GEF operations and activities in six focal areas, including the biodiversity focal area, which is attached as Annex III.

Biodiversity Strategy for GEF-5

26. The goal of the biodiversity focal area is the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services. To achieve the goal, the biodiversity strategy has five objectives:

   – improve the sustainability of protected area systems;
   – mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes/ seascapes and sectors;
   – build capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;
   – build capacity on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing; and
   – integrate CBD obligations into national planning processes through enabling activities.

27. This provides a new opportunity for CITES objectives to be mainstreamed into national biodiversity plans. As reflected in paragraph 16, activities identified in the NBSAPs will be better placed to attract funding, especially from the GEF. Therefore, activities related to the protection of certain species of wild fauna and flora against over-exploitation through international trade could be included in the NBSAPs, if they are a priority for the country. Projects and programmes for sustainable use and conservation of species of wild fauna and flora that generate global environmental benefits identified during the revision of a country's NBSAP may be relevant for the further implementation of Resolution Conf. 10.4 (Rev. CoP14) and the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013, and alignment of its goals with GEF-funded activities.

---

[2]   *The United Nations University study Biodiversity Planning: an assessment of national biodiversity strategies and action plans*

Box 3: What is the GEF (from **the GEF website)**

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) unites 182 member governments — in partnership with international institutions, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector — to address global environmental issues.

An independent financial organization, the GEF provides grants to developing countries and countries with economies in transition for projects related to biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation, the ozone layer, and persistent organic pollutants. These projects benefit the global environment, linking local, national, and global environmental challenges and promoting sustainable livelihoods.

Established in 1991, the GEF is today the largest funder of projects to improve the global environment. The GEF has allocated $9.2 billion, supplemented by more than $40 billion in cofinancing, for more than 2,700 projects in more than 165 developing countries and countries with economies in transition. Through its Small Grants Programme (SGP), the GEF has also made more than 12,000 small grants directly to nongovernmental and community organizations, totalling $495 million.

The GEF partnership includes 10 agencies: the UN Development Programme; the UN Environment Programme; the World Bank; the UN Food and Agriculture Organization; the UN Industrial Development Organization; the African Development Bank; the Asian Development Bank; the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development; the Inter-American Development Bank; and the International Fund for Agricultural Development. The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel provides technical and scientific advice on the GEF's policies and projects.

The GEF also serves as financial mechanism for the following conventions:

-   Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
    United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
    Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)
    UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)

The GEF, although not linked formally to the Montreal Protocol on Substances That Deplete the Ozone Layer (MP), supports implementation of the Protocol in countries with economies in transition.

---

28. The Biodiversity Strategy for GEF-5 includes in its five strategic objectives many of the same targets and activities as identified in the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013. Three of the five objectives listed in Annex III directly support the activities of CITES and, if included as important actions within the NBSAPs, could be directly implemented with support from the GEF. Countries should ensure that CITES indicators and action plans which match the GEF objectives and targets are identified during the NBSAP revision for future financing consideration through the GEF.

Section 5 Operationally Integrating CITES Targets into the NBSAP Process and Potential Access to GEF Funds

29. The CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the GEF-5 Biodiversity strategy share the same goal: the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. In addition, the mandate given to Parties by the CBD COP, that is, to revise and update the NBSAPs and to involve national-level focal points of all the biodiversity-related agreements in the process, provides an opportunity for CITES Parties to integrate their targets as well as their national and regional activities into a wider biodiversity strategy and action plan.

National-Level Institutional Structure for CBD and GEF

30. The two conventions, CBD and CITES, and the GEF require national-level structures for the implementation of a Party's obligations and for the achievement of related strategies, goals and targets. In some cases, not all, the structures might overlap and synergies naturally occur.

However, in the cases where synergies do not naturally occur, the CITES Management Authorities could liaise with national CBD and GEF focal points to explore the possibilities of integrating relevant CITES activities into the national planning processes of the CBD and GEF.

31. **CBD national focal points:** The CBD COP has requested its Parties to designate a person or an institution to represent the Party between meetings of the Conference of the Parties in its routine dealings with the Secretariat about matters involving the Convention. At its eighth meeting, the COP formalized standard terms of reference, detailed in Box 3, for the CBD national focal points.

Box 3: Terms of Reference – National Focal Points of the CBD

(From CBD Decision VIII/10)

Recognizing that Parties determine the specific responsibilities of their national focal points, *notes* that the primary function of national focal points is to act as liaisons with the Secretariat on behalf of their Parties and in so doing, they are responsible for:

(a) Receiving and disseminating information related to the Convention;
(b) Ensuring that Parties are represented at meetings under the Convention;
(c) Identifying experts to participate in ad hoc technical expert groups, assessment processes and other processes under the Convention;
(d) Responding to other requests for input by Parties from the Conference of the Parties and the Secretariat;
(e) Collaborating with national focal points in other countries to facilitate implementation of the Convention;
(f) Monitoring, promoting and/or facilitating national implementation of the Convention.

---

32. The CBD national focal point is involved in the development of both the national report and the NBSAP, regardless of which institution at a country level prepares the documents. They are responsible for providing input to the COP on the national report and NBSAP. Further, they are responsible for facilitating the national implementation of the Convention. Therefore, CITES Management Authorities could contact the CBD national focal points in their respective countries and request to be identified immediately as stakeholders in the process of developing the NBSAPs.

33. **GEF Operational Focal Points:** The GEF requested its members to appoint two types of focal points: The GEF Political Focal Point (PFP) and the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP) to serve as liaison between the country and GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies. Box 4 describes the different roles of each of the focal points. With the introduction of the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR), which covers the biodiversity, land degradation and climate change focal areas, it is the responsibility of the GEF OFP to manage the resource envelope allocated to the country. This means the OFP is responsible for prioritizing the GEF proposals for submission for financing. The GEF OFP is key to the programming of GEF resources at a country-level and is required to endorse all project proposals submitted to the GEF.

34. During the fifth replenishment discussions, it was agreed that GEF will provide financial resources to all GEF recipient countries to undertake, on a voluntary basis, GEF National Portfolio Formulation Exercises (NPFEs) that could serve as a basis for seeking GEF support. The NPFEs are designed to enable the eligible countries set strategic priorities in all the GEF focal areas and to develop an indicative list of project concepts that could be developed for the GEF-5 period. NPFEs are currently on-going for the fifth replenishment period of the GEF (2010-2014).

35. The GEF OFP can request the GEF Secretariat for resources to conduct an NPFE and is tasked to be the coordinator of the exercise in his/her country. The NPFEs can be conducted at any time during the GEF 5 period at the request of the GEF OP.

Integration with NBSAPs

36. The initial step for CITES Management Authorities would be to contact the focal points for both the CBD and the GEF. This will allow CITES Management Authorities to explore the means by which they might participate in the NBSAP and NPFE national-level processes. The contact details of national CBD focal points can be found at www.cbd.int/information/nfp.shtml and contact details for the GEF OFPs can be found at http://www.thegef.org/gef/focal_points_list.

37. By participating in the NBSAP process, CITES authorities can ensure that relevant CITES activities are considered for inclusion in the revised and updated NBSAPs. Section III.4 of the guidelines for national biodiversity planning (see paragraph 22 above) lists the 7 steps that countries normally follow to develop their NBSAPs. The CITES Management Authority could request to be on the NBSAP committee/working group. This will allow for the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013 to be continuously integrated, mainstreamed and updated in the development and implementation of the NBSAP. Box 1 in Section 1 could guide this process.

The Global Environment Facility

38. Activities identified in the NBSAPs of developing countries and countries with economies in transition will be better placed to attract financial resources, especially from the GEF. Therefore, if CITES-related activities are included in the NBSAPs, it is more likely that countries can develop projects that can be funded through the GEF. However, the GEF is not a financial mechanism of CITES but of the CBD. Therefore, any CITES-specific activities that are not identified in the NBSAPs may have some difficulty receiving funding through the GEF.

39. GEF projects and programmes are developed in collaboration with a GEF Agency (a list of GEF Agencies is included in Box 2), which submits projects to the GEF Secretariat and is responsible for the disbursement of funds to a country for an approved project. GEF Agencies develop projects that fall within their comparative advantage. The comparative advantage of the Agencies can be accessed through the GEF website www.thegef.org

40. The GEF OFP has been mandated to track the list of project concepts developed in a country and to endorse any project submitted to the GEF for funding. The CITES Management Authority could get in touch directly with the GEF OFP in its country to get more information on the country NPFE, the project concepts already developed for biodiversity for GEF-5 and the possibility of using STAR allocations to develop CITES-related projects or activities identified in the NBSAPs.

Box 5: GEF National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE)

The GEF is in the process of carrying out NPFEs. Activities related to the protection of certain species of wild fauna and flora against overexploitation through international trade could be included in these NPFEs, if they are a priority for the country. Projects and programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of species of wild fauna and flora that generate global environmental benefits identified during the NPFE of a country may be relevant for the further implementation of Resolution Conf. 10.4 (Rev. CoP14) and the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013, and alignment of CITES-related goals with GEF-funded activities.

Section 6 Programming Suggestions for CITES Parties and the CBD Aichi Targets

---

CITES vision statement

Conserve biodiversity and contribute to its sustainable use by ensuring that no species of wild fauna or flora becomes or remains subject to unsustainable exploitation through international trade, thereby contributing to the significant reduction of the rate of biodiversity loss.

---

41. The CITES mandate is directly related to ensuring that international trade contributes to the sustainable use of wild fauna and flora and the reduction of the rate of biodiversity loss. The impact of trade on wild flora and fauna can be twofold: if sustainably managed, it could contribute to human wellbeing and the maintenance of or even an increase in species diversity, and if not managed well, trade can directly lead to severe loss of biodiversity and livelihoods of people who depend on ecosystem services to provide parts or all of their income.

42. Poor rural communities depend on ecosystem goods and services to support their livelihoods. These goods are used for food and other subsistence purposes to reduce hunger as well as to engage in trade in order to generate income. Many poor people are also engaged in the tourism industry, which is based on biodiversity, for their income.

43. Therefore, biodiversity must be mainstreamed into national development policies. The full value of ecosystem goods and services needs to be reflected in national accounting and budgetary allocation processes. The approach used in the study on the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) provides a powerful framework for development planning, priority-setting and resource allocation. Policies, legislation and institutional systems can be better aligned through national TEEBs.

44. Biodiversity is being lost at a rapid rate today. In the last century 60% of all ecosystem services have been degraded and the cost of the failure to halt biodiversity loss on land alone over the last 10 years is estimated to be approximately US$500 billion. Nearly 17,000 species of plants and animals are categorized as critically endangered, endangered or vulnerable according to IUCN criteria.

45. At the country level, in order to conserve biodiversity while increasing human well being and development, and reducing poverty, biodiversity needs to become part of a government's development policy. Likewise, development and poverty reduction need to be integral parts of environmental and biodiversity conservation policies and programs.[3]

---

[3] See Chapter 11 of the 2010 Environment Management Group report entitled *Advancing the Biodiversity Agenda: A UN system-wide contribution.*

National-Level Planning

46. In line with the spirit of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and Accra Agenda for Action[4], which support country ownership and national-level decision-making, the UN system is harmonizing its support to member States through the Common Country Assessments (CCAs), United Nations development assistance frameworks (UNDAFs), poverty reduction strategies and plans (PRSPs) and Delivering as One initiative. These actions will generate efficiency gains through the pooling of resources.

47. The above-mentioned mechanisms can be used by countries to plan and integrate their obligations under all biodiversity-related conventions to which they are party, as well as national NBSAP priorities and the post 2010-biodiversity targets, into national development plans for the implementation of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

48. More information on CCAs, UNDAFs, PRSPs and Delivering as One can be found through the UNDP Country Office or www.undp.org. Parties may also wish to refer to the *Draft Paper on Different Possible Financial Mechanisms to Raise Funds for the Implementation of the CITES Convention* commissioned by the CITES Secretariat and available on www.cites.org for more information.

Trade in Biological Resources and NBSAPs

49. The CBD Strategic Goals and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets correspond directly with the CITES objectives and mandates. To implement the CITES Strategic Vision 2008-2013 it might be useful to make a link with the CBD Strategic Goals and Aichi Targets. Annex I is a list of the five strategic goals and the 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Some CITES-related issues that might be introduced into the NBSAPs as they have a direct link to the Aichi Targets, include, but are not be limited to:

50. **Protection of Species and Development of Species Management Plans**: There are species that are of significance to a country which may be listed in one of the CITES Appendices. Countries should specifically include their interests or concerns related to these species into their NBSAPs, including the management of the species and its habitat, the nature and scope and product of any use (e.g. commercial or non-commercial, consumptive or non-consumptive, live or dead specimens or their parts or derivatives), , the safe transport of live specimens , the impacts of domestic or international trade, any possible risks of overexploitation, administrative, scientific, legal and institutional structures and capacity building required to conserve and sustainably use the species.

51. **CITES "Non-Detriment Findings"**: Policies, strategies and action plans which provide for capacity building to scientifically monitor the current status and levels of harvest for Appendix II species in order to ensure that those levels are not detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild, or to its role in the ecosystem, may possibly be included in the NBSAPs. These activities could be focused around: population status, distribution, population trends, harvest quotas, other biological and ecological factors, and trade information.

52. **Compliance Facilitation**: Some Parties have expressed the view that the development and use of an electronic permitting (marking and tracking) systems to trade in CITES specimens would greatly assist in the handling and processing of CITES applications, and the collation and dissemination of CITES trade information. An electronic permitting system can assist users of biodiversity products to comply with the provision of traceability of legal origin in the Convention. Parties may wish to include the development of such a system in their NBSAPs.

53. **Wildlife Trade Policy**: Wildlife trade policies should be developed and implemented in coordination with other government policies and relevant ministries and agencies. Reviews, as recommended by Resolution Conf. 15.2, of existing wildlife trade policies can also be included in the updating of the NBSAPs, especially in steps 1 through to 6 of the seven-step process for updating NBSAPs. The reviews can include, but are not be restricted to:

---

4   *Adopted in 2005 and 2008 respectively by 100 Ministers of developed and developing countries responsible for development and heads of international organization to increase efforts in the harmonisation, alignment and managing of aid for results, with a set of actions and indicators which can be monitored.*

- Preparing a systematic inventory of policy-related information and activities for the management and conservation of CITES-listed species;
- Taking stock of the main policy achievements and failures (what is working and what is not working);
- Developing indicators and criteria to identify and analyze the main reasons for achievements and failures;
- Consulting and involving relevant stakeholders in the evaluation of policy performance;
- Empowering national authorities by increasing their policy-related knowledge and skills; and
- Suggesting concrete ways of improving policy effectiveness and making more rational policy choices.

54. Trade policies can have either or both positive and negative impacts on biodiversity. If managed and implemented appropriately, they can improve conservation status or production and contribute to the long-term sustainability of biodiversity. However, if managed unsustainably, trade policies can lead to overexploitation, loss of habitat and healthy ecosystems, which provide both goods and services for trade. A sizeable amount of trade is related to biodiversity products or products and services derived from healthy ecosystems. CITES provides a legally binding regulatory regime that ensures "that no species of wild fauna or flora becomes or remains subject to unsustainable exploitation through international trade."

55. It might be useful for countries to explore this relationship more fully while revising and updating the NBSAPs and possibly request the inclusion of a chapter on trade in biological resources in their NBSAPs. This chapter could be linked to a country's obligations to CITES and their CITES targets.

56. Additionally, the four pillars of CITES: science, compliance, enforcement and knowledge, could be integrated into the policy framework that would be developed as part of the NBSAP.

57. Annex IV can further help with incorporating CITES targets into the NBSAPs and GEF projects.

Annex I Guiding Principles of the NBSAPs

The NBSAPs are intended to be developed in a participatory manner with contribution from a wide group of stakeholders, are a living process and should be updated periodically, can take various forms ranging from a single document to a number of interlinked documents (e.g. priorities, policies, instruments and programmes) and must be incorporated into the planning and activities of all sectors that can impact biodiversity. Buy-in from stakeholders is an important element in the implementation of the NBSAPs. The following guiding principals have been developed from guidance provided in COP decision IX/8 on NBSAPs[5].

Box A: Module 2 The Biodiversity Planning Process: How to Prepare or Update a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan

Guiding Principles

NBSAPs are **key implementation tools of the Convention**. They must **address all three objectives of the Convention:** - Conservation of biodiversity - Sustainable use of the components of biodiversity - Fair and equitable sharing of the benefits deriving from the utilization of genetic resources.

The NBSAP should **highlight, and seek to maintain the contribution of biodiversity and ecosystem services** to human well being (including having the basics for a good life, health, good social relations, security and freedom of choice and action), poverty eradication, and national development as well as the economic, social, cultural and other values of biodiversity.

The NBSAP is a **strategic instrument for achieving concrete outcomes**, and not a scientific study, review or publication that sits on a shelf. Its role is to identify and prioritize the **action required** in order to meet the objectives of the CBD at national level, and to devise a **plan of how to implement that action**.

In order to be effective, it is important that the NBSAP be **jointly developed, adopted, and owned by the full range of stakeholders involved**. For this the NBSAP process must be open, participative and transparent. It is also important that **high-level government support be secured** in the process of developing, updating and implementing the NBSAP.

The NBSAP **must include measures to mainstream biodiversity** into sectoral and cross-sectoral policies and programs. Conservation involves much more than protected area management and implementation of conservation actions; it necessarily requires mainstreaming. To an even greater degree, achieving sustainable use objectives will require mainstreaming.

Biodiversity planning is a long-term, cyclical and adaptive process. It will involve continual monitoring, evaluation, and revision, as progress is made, conditions evolve, and lessons are learned.

Seven Steps to Develop an NBSAP

1. **Identifying and Engaging Stakeholders:** This is a key step in developing an NBSAP - the involvement and buy-in of all possible stakeholders, including CITES authorities and the focal points for other biodiversity-related conventions. This step has already been undertaken to some extent in countries that have developed their NBSAPs, but in updating and revising the NBSAPs would require a re-visit and possible broadening of this first step. Most importantly, this stage will potentially identify a small, representative group of stakeholders willing to form part of the NBSAP committee/working group.

2. **Assessing National Biodiversity and its Links with Human Well-being:** This step is designed to "take stock" of the current status in the country today including the drivers of biodiversity loss. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment identified five key drivers of biodiversity loss: habitat conversion, overexploitation, pollution, climate change and invasive alien species. In this step, it is essential to identify the relationship between biodiversity and human well-being (including

---

5 *The full text of COP 9 Decision IX/8 can be found at: http://www.cbd.int/decision/cop/?id=11651*

livelihoods) in the country and how different policies can impact this relationship and reduce loss of biodiversity.

3. **Developing a Strategy:** In this step, a country can start developing a new or updating an existing national biodiversity strategy. The NBSAP committee/working group will have to agree on the principles that will guide the NBSAP and set priorities and targets for the upcoming NBSAP. The targets of the NBSAP will be the national targets established to correspond with the five goals of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and its 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets agreed upon at COP 10 (Annex II).

4. **Developing a Plan of Action:** The Action Plan is the means for implementing the strategy. Actions for achieving the goals, objectives and targets in the NBSAPs should be identified in this step. As indicated in box B of Annex I, Decision IX/8, paragraph 8, provides a good basis for developing the actions required to meet the priorities established in step 3.

5. **Implementing the NBSAP:** Once the Action Plan has been developed in Step 4, it has to be executed within an allocated time frame. To implement the NBSAP, many stakeholders can carry out activities at the same time on different fronts.

6. **Monitoring and Evaluating Implementation of the NBSAP:** A monitoring and evaluation plan should be built into the Action Plan at the start of the implementation stage. Implementation can be tracked through this plan. Most importantly lessons and practices can also be developed through the monitoring plan and iterative corrections can be made to implementation throughout the lifecycle of the NBSAP.

7. **Reporting:** CBD Parties are required to periodically present reports to the COP on measures undertaken to implement the Convention. The fifth national report is due on or before 31 March 2014 and as Chapter II, includes an overview of the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

Guidance provided by the CBD COP

The CBD COP has, periodically, provided guidance to the Parties on developing and updating NBSAPs. At its eight meeting in 2008, the COP provided key guidance on NBSAPs, summarized in Box B.

Box B[6]   Recent COP Guidance on NBSAPs- Decision IX/8 paragraph 8[7]

8. COP "... *urges* Parties in developing, implementing and revising their national and, where appropriate, regional, biodiversity strategies and action plans, and equivalent instruments, in implementing the three objectives of the Convention, to:

Meeting the three objectives of the Convention:

(a) Ensure that **NBSAPs are action-driven, practical and prioritized**, and provide an effective and up-to-date national framework for the implementation of the Convention; (b) Ensure that NBSAPs take into account the **principles in the Rio Declaration** on Environment and Development

(c) Emphasize the **integration of the three objectives of the Convention into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans**, programmes and policies; (d) Promote the **mainstreaming of gender considerations**; (e) Promote synergies between activities to implement the Convention and **poverty eradication**;

(f) Identify **priority actions at national or regional level, including strategic actions** to achieve the three objectives of the Convention; (g) Develop a **resource mobilization plans** in support of priority activities;

---

6   *Module 1 An Introduction to National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans*
7   *This is an abbreviated version of the Decision. The full text can be accessed at: http://www.cbd.int/nbsap/guidance.shtml*

Components of biodiversity strategies and action plans

(h) Take into account the **ecosystem approach**; (i) Highlight the **contribution of biodiversity and ecosystem services**, to poverty eradication, national development and human well being, as well as the economic, social, cultural, and other values of biodiversity (j) Identify the **main threats to biodiversity**, including direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity change, and **include actions for addressing the identified threats**; (k) As appropriate, **establish national, or where applicable, sub=national, targets**, to support the implementation of NBSAPs,;

Support processes

(l) Include and implement **national capacity-development plans** for the implementation of NBSAPs, making use of the outcomes of national capacity self-assessments; (m) Engage **indigenous and local communities, and all relevant sectors and stakeholders** (n) Respect, preserve and maintain **traditional knowledge**, innovations and practices;

(o) Establish or strengthen **national institutional arrangements** for the promotion, coordination and monitoring of the implementation of the NBSAPs, (p) Develop and implement a **communication strategy** for the national biodiversity strategy and action plan; (q) Address **existing planning processes in order to mainstream biodiversity** concerns in other national strategies, including, in particular, poverty eradication strategies, national strategies for the Millennium Development Goals, sustainable development strategies, and strategies to adapt to climate change and combat desertification, as well as sectoral strategies, and ensure that NBSAPs are implemented in coordination with these other strategies; (r) Make use of or develop, as appropriate, **regional, sub-regional or sub-national networks** to support implementation of the Convention; (s) Promote and support **local action for the implementation of NBSAPs**;

Monitoring and review

(t) Establish national mechanisms including **indicators**, as appropriate, and promote regional cooperation to **monitor implementation** of NBSAPs and progress towards national targets (u) **Review NBSAPs** to identify successes, constraints and impediments to implementation, and identify ways and means of addressing such constraints and impediments, including revision of the strategies where necessary;

(v) Make available through the **Convention's clearing-house mechanism NBSAPs,** including periodic revisions, and where applicable, reports on implementation, case studies of good practice, and lessons learned;"

Annex II Strategic Goals and Aichi Targets on Biodiversity

The Strategic Plan includes 20 headline targets for 2015 or 2020 (the "Aichi Biodiversity Targets"), organized under five strategic goals. The goals and targets comprise both: (i) aspirations for achievement at the global level; and (ii) a flexible framework for the establishment of national or regional targets. Parties are invited to set their own targets within this flexible framework, taking into account national needs and priorities, while also bearing in mind national contributions to the achievement of the global targets. Not all countries necessarily need to develop a national target for each and every global target. For some countries, the global threshold set through certain targets may already have been achieved. Others targets may not be relevant in the country context.

Strategic goal *A. Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society*

Target 1: By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.

Target 2: By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.

Target 3: By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio economic conditions.

Target 4: By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits.

Strategic goal B. Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use

Target 5: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced.

Target 6: By 2020 all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits.

Target 7: By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.

Target 8: By 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity.

Target 9: By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment.

Target 10: By 2015, the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.

Strategic goal C. Improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity

Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected

systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.

Target 12: By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.

Target 13: By 2020, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socio-economically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity.

Strategic goal D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services

Target 14: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.

Target 15: By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.

Target 16: By 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation.

Strategic goal E. Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity-building

Target 17: By 2015 each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan.

Target 18: By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels.

Target 19: By 2020, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied.

Target 20: By 2020, at the latest, the mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 from all sources, and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, should increase substantially from the current levels. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resource needs assessments to be developed and reported by Parties.

Annex III Biodiversity Strategy for GEF-V

43. Biodiversity is defined as —the variability among living organisms from all sources including, inter alia, terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species, and of ecosystems.[6] As   such, biodiversity is life itself, but it also supports all life on the planet, and its functions are responsible for maintaining the ecosystem processes that provide food, water, and materials to human societies. Thus the interventions identified in the biodiversity strategy are integral components of any effective approach for human adaptation to climate change.

44. Biodiversity is under heavy threat and its loss is considered one of the most critical challenges to humankind. The interim report of the global study, "The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity (TEEB)" reinforces the conclusion of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment that ecosystem services are being degraded or used unsustainably with severe socio- economic consequences for human societies and for the future of all life on the planet.[7]

45. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment identified the most important direct drivers of biodiversity loss and degradation of ecosystem goods and services as habitat change, climate change, invasive alien species, overexploitation, and pollution. These drivers are influenced by a series of indirect drivers of change including demographics, global economic trends, governance, institutions and legal frameworks, science and technology, and cultural and religious values.

46. The GEF-5 strategy will maintain coherence with the GEF-4 strategy and address a subset of the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss and focus on the highest leverage opportunities to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity. The ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP-9) acknowledged that the GEF-4 strategy served as a useful starting point for the GEF-5 strategy and requested GEF to build on it for the fifth replenishment based on the four year framework of program priorities developed by COP-9.[8] Refinements to the strategy's objectives are introduced based on COP-9 guidance, advances in conservation practice, and advice from the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the GEF.

47. The goal of the biodiversity focal area is the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services. To achieve this goal, the strategy encompasses the five objectives listed below:

    (a) improve the sustainability of protected area systems;
    (b) mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes/ seascapes and sectors;
    (c) build capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;
    (d) build capacity on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing; and
    (e) integrate CBD obligations into national planning processes through enabling activities.

With regard to the Programming for Replenishment Target[9], $4.2 billion has been provided as replenishment ($ 1.2 billion allocated to the biodiversity focal area, respectively, which will potentially leverage about $3 billion).

48. The GEF has been widely recognized as the world's most important facility for creating and improving the management of protected areas globally and the key catalyst to the global achievement of 10% of the world's terrestrial areas under protection. However, much more remains to be done, given the uneven distribution of protection within terrestrial ecoregions (some are well above the 10% target, others below) and with regard to conservation of the marine environment, where only 5.9% of the world's territorial seas and less than one-percent of the high seas are protected.

49. The achievements made by the global community with GEF support must be further consolidated through enhancing the sustainability of protected area systems such that they continue to deliver the global benefits of: (i) biodiversity (indirect use and option values, and existence values

---

[6]   Convention on Biological Diversity.
[7]   Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005, Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis, Island Press, Washington DC.
[8]   Decision CBD COP IX/31.
[9]   The results framework for the GEF-5 biodiversity strategy is outlined in Table 1 along with expected key outputs.

particularly with regards to threatened species); (ii) provision of ecosystem goods and services, including contributions to climate mitigation; and (iii) ecosystem-based adaptation. Therefore, an investment of $ 700 million will be made to improve the management effectiveness of protected areas covering an estimated 170 million hectares, thus continuing GEF's prioritization in helping countries implement their obligations under the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas. The additional investment in 170 million hectares of protected areas under effective management for biodiversity conservation would total about 14 % of the area of existing terrestrial protected areas in GEF-eligible countries or about 23 % of the area of existing marine protected areas in GEF-eligible countries.

50. Support to mainstreaming under targeted at $250 million is expected to lead to sustainable use and management of biodiversity in the productive landscapes or seascapes of about 60 million hectares.

51. Therefore, coverage of the portfolio as measured in an increase in surface area under improved biodiversity conservation and sustainable use (objectives one and two of the strategy), will reach approximately 230 million hectares under this replenishment scenarios.

52. Support to capacity building on biosafety (objective three of the strategy) at this replenishment level ($ 40 million) will allow those countries who have not yet implemented national biosafety frameworks to do so while dedicating the remaining resources to regional and thematic projects as outlined in the Council-approved biosafety strategy. Finally, initial capacity building support will be provided in access and benefit sharing ($40 million) in response to existing COP guidance and emanating from an agreed international regime at COP-10 (objective four of the strategy).

53. Consistent with the criteria identified below for special initiatives to be funded by the Focal Area Set-Aside (FAS), the biodiversity focal area will partner with the international waters focal area and set aside $25 million from the FAS to initiate a global pilot program focused on the protection of marine biodiversity in —Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction‖ (ABNJ). This investment will complement GEF's continued focus on increasing marine protected area coverage under national jurisdiction given that about 50% of the Earth's surface is considered the high seas, or marine areas beyond national jurisdiction. These offshore areas harbor about 90% of the Earth's biomass and host a diversity of species and ecosystems, many of which are yet to be discovered. As a result, protection of the high seas has become an emerging priority in biodiversity conservation. Although conservation and management of high seas marine protected areas pose a number governance challenges and legal issues, the GEF believes that it is important to begin learning how to implement and manage marine protected areas in the waters beyond national jurisdiction. The proposed pilot is consistent with CBD COP Decision IX/20.

54. The IPCC has been responsible both for the resolution of important scientific questions related to the nature and extent of the global warming problem, as well as for ensuring those contributions effectively permeate the policy debate at the highest levels. However, the science- policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services is fragmented inside and outside of the CBD, impeding a similar incremental process from occurring for the important problem of biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation. Policy making in biodiversity conservation and ecosystem management at all levels can be further strengthened if supported by credible, legitimate and salient scientific findings and recommendations which are provided by an intergovernmental science-policy platform, that builds on the GEF-funded Millennium Ecosystem Assessment findings. To address this need, CBD COP IX agreed to explore the establishment of an Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). The twenty-fifth session of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environmental Forum adopted Decision 25/10 on the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, which accords UNEP the mandate to continue to facilitate discussions on strengthening the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services. Supporting this emerging initiative could be undertaken through a contribution from the FAS.

Focal Area Set-Aside (FAS)

55. Countries will be able to access the focal area set-aside funds (FAS) to implement enabling activities for an amount up to $500,000 on an expedited basis. A total of $ 40 million will be available for this support through Objective Five of the strategy. Enabling activity support could be provided for revising National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) in line with the

CBD's new strategic plan to be adopted at COP-10, national reporting, and implementation of guidance related to the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM).

56. The remaining funds in FAS, after the contribution to the ABNJ program described above, will be used to address supra-national strategic priorities or to incentivize countries to make substantive changes in the state of biodiversity at the national level through participation in global, regional or multi-country projects. Projects supported with FAS funds will meet some or all of the following criteria: (i) relevant to the objectives of GEF's biodiversity strategy; (ii) support priorities identified by the COP of the CBD; (iii) high likelihood that the project will have a broad and positive impact on biodiversity; (iv) potential for replication; (v) global demonstration value; and (vi) contribute to global conservation knowledge through formal experimental or quasi-experimental designs that test and evaluate the hypotheses embedded in project interventions. An incentive system would operate for all regional projects whereby participating countries would receive resources from the FAS proportionate with the amount of resources dedicated to a project from their national allocation.

Table 1: Biodiversity Results Framework[10]

Goal: Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services.

Impacts: Biodiversity conserved and habitat maintained in national protected area systems.

Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity integrated into production landscapes and seascapes.

Indicators: Intact vegetative cover and degree of fragmentation in national protected area systems measured in hectares as recorded by remote sensing.

Intact vegetative cover and degree of fragmentation in production landscapes measured in hectares as recorded by remote sensing.

Coastal zone habitat (coral reef, mangroves, etc) intact in marine protected areas and productive seascapes measured in hectares as recorded by remote sensing and, where possible, supported by visual or other verification methods.

Objectives	Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Outcome targets for $4.2 billion Target	Core Outputs
Total Focal Area Allocation		$1.20 billion	
Sustainable Forest Management/REDD-plus		$130 million	
Objective 1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas. Indicator 1.1: Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool.

Outcome 1.2: Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures | $ 700 million

Eighty-percent (80%) of projects meet or exceed their protected area management effectiveness targets covering 170 million hectares of existing or new protected areas. Eighty-percent (80%) of projects meet or exceed their target for reducing the protected area management funding gap in protected area systems that develop and implement sustainable financing plans. | Output 1. New protected areas (number) and coverage (hectares) of unprotected ecosystems.

Output 2. New protected areas (number) and coverage (hectares) of unprotected threatened species (number).

Output 3. Sustainable financing plans (number). |

---

[10]   *Biodiversity tracking tools have been developed and are now in use for GEF projects in protected areas (objective one), biodiversity mainstreaming including invasive alien species management frameworks (objective two), and biosafety (objective three) and can be found at: http://gefweb.org/interior.aspx?id=230. A tracking tool for objective four on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing will be developed as the activities of the objective are finalized in response to the outcome of the current negotiations of the international regime on ABS.*

Objectives	Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Outcome targets for $4.2 billion Target	Core Outputs
	required for management. Indicator1.2: Funding gap for management of protected area systems as recorded by protected area financing scorecards.		
Objective 2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation. Indicator 2.1: Landscapes and seascapes certified by internationally or nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) measured in hectares and recorded by GEF tracking tool. Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks. Indicator 2.2: Polices and regulations governing sectoral activities that integrate biodiversity conservation as recorded by the GEF tracking tool as a score. Outcome 2.3: Improved management frameworks to prevent, control and manage invasive alien species Indicator 2.3: IAS management framework operational score as recorded by the GEF tracking tool.	$250 million Sustainable use and management of biodiversity in 60 million hectares of production landscapes and seascapes. Fifty-percent (50%) of projects achieve a score of six (6) (i.e., biodiversity conservation and sustainable use is mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation, regulations are in place to implement the legislation, regulations are under implementation, implementation of regulations is enforced, and enforcement of regulations is monitored) Eighty-percent (80%) of projects meet or exceed their target for a fully operational and effective IAS management framework.	Output 1. Policies and regulatory frameworks (number) for production sectors. Output 2. National and sub-national land-use plans (number) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation. Output 3. Certified production landscapes and seascapes (hectares).
Objective 3: Build Capacity for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB)	Outcome 3.1 Potential risks of living modified organisms to biodiversity are identified and evaluated in a scientifically sound and transparent manner Indicator 3.1: National biosafety decision-	$40 million Eighty-percent (80%) of projects meet or exceed their target for a fully operational and effective biosafety framework.	All remaining eligible countries (about 60-70 depending on programming for rest of GEF-4) have national biosafety decision-making systems in place.

Objectives	Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Outcome targets for $4.2 billion Target	Core Outputs
	making systems operational score as recorded by the GEF tracking tool		
Objective 4: Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing	Outcome 4.1: Legal and regulatory frameworks, and administrative procedures established that enable access to genetic resources and benefit sharing in accordance with the CBD provisions Indicator 4.1: National ABS frameworks operational score as recorded by the GEF tracking tool (to be developed)	$ 40 million Eighty-percent (80%) of projects meet or exceed their target for a fully operational and effective ABS framework.	Access and benefit-sharing agreements (number) that recognize the core ABS principles of Prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) including the fair and equitable sharing of benefits.
Objective Five: Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities	Outcome 5.1 Development and sectoral planning frameworks at country level integrate measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets. Indicator 5.1: Percentage of development and sectoral frameworks that integrate measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets.	40 Million 50% of parties that revise NBSAPs successfully integrate measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets into development and sectoral planning frameworks.	Number and type of development and sectoral planning frameworks that include measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets.

Annex IV Matrix for assessing policy options

Matrix for assessing policy response options		
Parameters	**Option review (High/ low/unknown)**	**Key questions**
Projected effect on wildlife trade (and wider conservation impact)		To what extent is a policy measure expected to have a positive effect on rendering trade more sustainable?
Level of complexity		Does the measure involve highly complex technical or administrative aspects in terms of introduction and implementation?
Cost of implementation and operation		This is needed to assess to assess cost-effectiveness
Expected positive social impacts		To what extent would the policy measure generate a more equitable distribution of costs and benefits of wildlife trade?
Expected positive economic impacts		To what extent will a measure affect harvest and trade economies?
Feasibility		To what extent is it feasible to introduce the measure?
Coherence with international conservation and development commitments		Would the policy measure be in line with international commitments such as the Addis Ababa Principles?
Institutional capacity to implement		Do national institutions have the knowledge, human resources and institutions in place to implement the measure?
Powerful opposition/ ease of introduction		Would policy measures be easy to introduce or would they generate opposition from powerful stakeholders?
Other factors of interest		What other factors would influence the choice of measure?

Annex V Synergies between CITES and CBD

On-Going Areas of Work

To implement the provisions of the Conventions, CITES and CBD share similar issues and areas of work. Most importantly, both the Conventions address international concerns about biodiversity loss. The Report on the Workshop on Promoting CITES-CBD Cooperation and Synergy in April 2004 stated: *CITES trade provisions provide a potential vehicle for managing trade in fauna and flora in the context of achieving CBD-related goals. Equally, CBD provides a potential vehicle for supporting the conservation and sustainable use of CITES-listed species. In a wider context, both Conventions can contribute to the target agreed by the World Summit on Sustainable Development of achieving by 2010 a significant reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss.*

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), adopted by world leaders in 2000, are set to be achieved by 2015, provide concrete, quantitative benchmarks for tackling extreme poverty and a framework for the international community to work together towards a common goal. The CITES and CBD Conventions both contribute to goal 7 to *ensure environmental sustainability*.

Some areas where joint work has already taken place or is on-going include: international environment governance (IEG), the Global Strategy on Plant Conservation, knowledge management, harmonized/streamlined reporting to the conventions, sustainable use (including the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines, CITES Article IV non-detriment findings, the Significant Trade process, adaptive management, policy measures and incentives), cooperation with the World Trade Organization, the link between CITES e-permitting and documentation needed for access and benefit sharing, community-based natural resource management, invasive alien species (IAS), bushmeat, compliance and enforcement, and the relationship between biodiversity and climate change.

Modalities for Joint Work

The modalities for the joint work are many. These include the existing Memorandum of Co-operation between the two convention secretariats, references to the respective conventions within various decisions and resolutions, the adoption of a specific resolution by the CITES CoP which is devoted to cooperation and synergy with CBD and the adoption by the CBD COP of Decisions X/2 and X/5 on the Strategic Goals and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the implementation of the goals and targets respectively *taking into account synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions in a manner consistent with their respective mandate*. Other modalities include meetings and activities of the Environment Management Group (EMG), the liaison group of the biodiversity-related conventions, meetings of the chairs of the scientific bodies of both conventions, UNEP, the Biodiversity Clearing-House Mechanism of the CBD, revision and implementation of NBSAPs and the agencies that are responsible for implementing the Conventions at an international, regional and national level.

At a national-level both conventions require a framework that includes: policy, legislation, administrative systems, monitoring, enforcement and compliance mechanisms, stakeholder participation and public information and awareness. The NBSAPs provide an opportunity for countries to develop systems that are complementary to both CITES and CBD. This can be achieved through more coordination at a national-level, more interaction, collaboration, information sharing and review of decisions between national focal points. A review of the legislation, as well as other policy instruments and mechanisms, and institutions might also be beneficial during the review and revision of NBSAPs in order to identify overlaps, gaps and synergies that might exist and to harmonize the various instruments and institutions such that they are complementary.

Parties to the two conventions may wish to further explore more cooperation amongst the biodiversity-related Conventions and to scope out areas for future joint work.

The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Service (IPBES)

The Millennium Ecosystems Assessment (MA), from 2001 to 2005, assessed the consequences of ecosystem change for human well-being. The MA follow-up process identified a need for a stronger international science-policy platform to enable emerging scientific knowledge to be translated into specific policy action at the appropriate levels. The current science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services comprises a number of national and international programmes, organizations, mechanisms, and processes.

Consultations towards an international mechanism for scientific expertise on biodiversity and the global strategy for following up the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment both reflect a general agreement on the need for an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services. This need was further strengthened by Decision IX/15 of the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), which welcomed the agreement of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to convene an ad hoc open-ended intergovernmental multi-stakeholder meeting to consider establishing an efficient science-policy interface on biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being. Consequently, the United Nations 65th General Assembly (UNGA) approved the creation of an Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and called on the UNEP Governing Council to take the necessary steps to set up the IPBES, including convening a plenary meeting to determine modalities and institutional arrangements for the planned body.

Throughout the discussions regarding the creation of the IPBES, both CITES and CBD have been closely involved. In the case of CITES, the role and needs of and relationship to, the scientific subsidiary bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions, such as the Animals and Plants Committees, have been frequently referred to. At its fifteenth meeting (Doha, 2010), the Conference of the Parties to CITES adopted Decision 12 which states that "*Without taking a* position *about the necessity for, or nature of, such a Platform, the Chairs of the Animals and Plants Committees and the Secretariat shall, subject to external funding, participate in discussions concerning a possible IPBES, to provide all necessary input into the process of IPBES and to ensure that the role of CITES receives due recognition. The Chairs of the Animals and Plants Committees and the Secretariat shall report to the Standing Committee to seek additional guidance.*" During the 10th meeting of the COP, CBD Parties welcomed the outcome of the third ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on IPBES, held in Busan, in June 2010 and its conclusion that IPBES should be established.

2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnerships (BIP) and Post-2010 Biodiversity Targets

The BIP Initiative led by UNEP-WCMC, is a global initiative to track progress towards achieving the "2010 biodiversity target" to significantly reduce the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010. The Partnership is a collaboration amongst more than 40 organizations and agencies, including UN agencies (UNEP, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), multilateral environmental agreements (CITES, CBD and Ramsar), intergovernmental organizations (IUCN), scientific research institutions and non-governmental organizations (such as BirdLife International and WWF International).

In CITES document CoP15 Doc. 10.1, para 5 d) it was reported that "*The Secretariat has sought to ensure that the profile of the Convention is maintained in the BIP in order to demonstrate the pertinence of CITES to the wider goal of conserving biodiversity and ensuring that it is* used *sustainably. It has kept the Animals and Plants Committees informed of developments and sought their input as this initiative has evolved. The Partnership hopes to obtain further funding to continue its work after 2010, in which case a stronger input from CITES will be needed.*"

Decision 15.11 of the CITES CoP states that the "*Secretariat shall continue to provide its services as a key indicator partner in the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, consulting the Animals, Plants and Standing Committees where necessary, and shall report on its work in this regard at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.*"

Further, Decision 15.10 of the CITES CoP states that the "*Standing Committee shall review the adopted post-2010 biodiversity targets and, if necessary, make adjustments to the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013 as appropriate.*"