

# IUCN's Key Messages

**Convention on Biological Diversity  
Twelfth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the  
Convention (COP12)  
6-17 October 2014, Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea**

## Introduction

The adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in 2010 gave the world a unified agenda to tackle the loss of biodiversity, the basis of life on earth. Supported by the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook, we are now reviewing progress in implementation of the Aichi Targets at a key moment - the midpoint of both the International Decade on Biodiversity and the Strategic Plan.

This document provides an overview of IUCN's key messages to COP12. Specific agenda items have been targeted:

- *Assessing progress in implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (Agenda items 11-14)*
- *The Financial Mechanism (Agenda item 15)*
- *Biodiversity and Sustainable Development (Agenda item 16)*
- *Marine and coastal biodiversity (Agenda item 21)*
- *Cooperation with other conventions, international organizations and stakeholders' engagement, including business (Agenda item 29)*

Other specific inputs including proposals for changes to the proposed decisions in UNEP/CBD/ COP/ 12 / 1/ Add.2 will be presented, as appropriate, during the meeting.

A separate document with IUCN's key messages to the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing (MOP1) has been prepared. Issues related to progress in meeting Aichi Target 16 are thus not included in this document.

For more information, please contact :

Dr. Jane Smart  
Global Director, Biodiversity  
Conservation Group  
Head, Species Programme  
IUCN Headquarters  
[jane.smart@iucn.org](mailto:jane.smart@iucn.org)

Mrs. Sonia Peña Moreno  
Senior Policy Officer-  
Biodiversity  
Global Policy Unit  
IUCN Headquarters  
[sonia.penamoren@iucn.org](mailto:sonia.penamoren@iucn.org)

Ms. Victoria Romero  
Policy Trainee  
Global Policy Unit  
IUCN Headquarters  
[victoria.romero@iucn.org](mailto:victoria.romero@iucn.org)

IUCN World Headquarters  
Rue Mauverney 28  
1196 Gland  
Switzerland  
Tel: +41 22 999 0000  
Fax: +41 22 999 0002  
[mail@iucn.org](mailto:mail@iucn.org)  
[www.iucn.org](http://www.iucn.org)

## ***Assessing progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (Agenda items 11-14)***

### ***Global Biodiversity Outlook 4 and Aichi Target Indicators***

- ✓ **It is now evident that most of the Aichi Targets are not on track for being met by 2020. IUCN reiterates the urgent call to accelerate implementation.**

The information in GBO4 on indicators of progress towards the Aichi Targets represents a phenomenal volume of work in knowledge generation. However, the indicators in GBO4 make clear that few of the Aichi targets are likely to be reached by 2020 given current rates of implementation. This information is, in effect, a call to governments and civil society to greatly accelerate the action needed to implement the Aichi Targets by 2020. IUCN makes many direct contributions towards such implementation, and stands by to support governments and civil society with knowledge, capacity-building and policy tools.

- ✓ **It is essential that Parties invest in, and support indicators underlying GBO4 to allow continuing reporting to 2020 and beyond.**

The knowledge products mobilized through the efforts of IUCN, its Members, Commissions, Secretariat, and partners deliver ~30% of the 55 indicators underlying GBO4. Specifically, seven indicators draw from changes in extinction risk over time documented in The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, one on changes over time in invasive species introduction, and nine on changes in protected area coverage over time documented in Protected Planet (one of these in combination with the species distribution data from The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, and two more in combination with the Key Biodiversity Areas knowledge product). Such contributions should be incorporated in their own right as indicators towards Target 19. An analysis of the costs of maintaining these knowledge products by IUCN, BirdLife International, and UNEP- WCMC- will be made available at this COP.

### ***National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs)***

- ✓ **Parties must complete the revision of their NBSAPs without delay ensuring that they contain SMART national level targets (set within the flexible framework) and that these are mapped against the global level targets.**

Parties have committed to develop or revise and update, as appropriate, their NBSAPs in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. They have also committed to establish national targets, using the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets as a flexible framework. As stated in UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/2 and reiterated through the GBO4 and UNEP/CBD/COP/12/10, although some Parties have made excellent efforts in the revision of their NBSAPs, overall progress is slow and would seem to be insufficient to result in the full implementation of the Aichi Targets. Efforts must be redoubled and sustained for all Parties to fulfill Aichi Target 17 by its deadline in 2015.

As evidenced in the database that the Secretariat of the CBD has been compiling (containing all targets submitted by Parties in their NBSAPs since COP10 - and which up to July 2014 contained 633 separate targets), few Parties have mapped these national targets to the global ones. The only way the Aichi Targets will be achieved and monitored at the global level is if the national level targets 'add up' to the equivalent of the targets set for the global level. IUCN congratulates the seven countries that have done so (Belgium, Brazil, Cameroon, France, Iraq, Japan, Switzerland) and strongly urges all Parties to follow suit.

- ✓ **The full participation and integration of all relevant stakeholders in the development and revision of NBSAPs is not only desirable but also a pre-requisite for the instrument's broad societal ownership and thus increased chances of successful implementation.**

NBSAPs are inclusive processes whereby all major stakeholders and rights-holders come together to make the decisions of where, when, and how biodiversity and ecosystem services should be conserved, used sustainably, and the benefits of this use shared equitably.

The majority of CBD Parties has already developed a NBSAP and is currently updating them. However, analysis of past NBSAPs and national reports to the Convention has revealed that many of the intended actions outlined in those documents have not been implemented. This has led to a failure to significantly reduce the rate of biodiversity loss (at a global scale) with consequences for both biodiversity and human well-being more generally.

One of the major reasons for shortfalls in implementation of NBSAPs is inadequate participation in biodiversity planning. Ensuring broad participation of all stakeholders in the NBSAPs revision process is thus essential in order to ensure buy-in across all sectors of society and hence, commitment of human, financial and other resources necessary to implement the actions proposed. IUCN together with the CBD Secretariat has carried out a study analyzing the participatory processes underlying the NBSAP revision in Antigua & Barbuda, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Fiji, Guatemala, Georgia, Iraq, Namibia and the Philippines which will be made available to Parties at this COP.

### ***Mid-term review on progress towards the Aichi Targets***

#### **Target 1**

- ✓ **Awareness is insufficient to make people change their behavior. To inspire change, science-based organizations stand a better chance aligning their messages with people's existing values.**

Emotions create empathy, which inspires change. Facts and figures alone do not shift attitudes. In order to reach a wider audience, IUCN's Commission on Education and Communication (CEC), relying on Conservation Psychology, is developing tools for professionals, including an online module, to effectively influence behavior and promote positive change. [www.frogleaps.org](http://www.frogleaps.org)

#### **Target 2**

- ✓ **The conceptual foundations and methodologies for ecosystem assessment and valuation are being developed and becoming well-established. It is time to enact the transition from case studies to their systematic application at all levels for decisions relating to development, investment and equity.**

Much of the conservation community, governments, and the private sector view nature as a stock of ecosystems that yields a flow of services that are essential for human well-being. The measurement of these stocks and flows and their valuation and integration into decision-making at all levels and across the public and private sectors is essential for guiding economic decision-making and sustainable development. Frameworks and tools like the System of Environmental Economic Accounts are available to support Parties integrate the value of natural capital in national policy making. IUCN and WBCSD Consortia are soon to develop and pilot test a Natural Capital Protocol, which aims to provide standardized approaches and tools for the measurement, valuation and accounting of natural capital in business and investment decision-making. IUCN has also launched a major initiative on the natural capital dependencies of local communities. IUCN strongly advocates that ecosystem measurement and valuation be used within an appropriate context; economic values should be considered alongside the broader values associated with biodiversity and ecosystem services and their implications for local livelihoods and cultural practices linked to biodiversity.

### Target 3

- ✓ **Operationalization of Target 3 depends on the removal of environmentally harmful subsidies alongside the identification and implementation of incentive schemes that reward the sustainable management of natural resources.**

IUCN welcomes the proposals for the modalities and milestones to operationalize Target 3 (that were presented in document UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/4/Add.1) and concurs that while tackling environmentally harmful subsidies is essential, this process must be based on good data and careful analysis and consideration of the distribution of costs and benefits of change, and the impacts on livelihoods of stakeholders, particularly indigenous and local communities. Exploring options for implementing positive incentive schemes, such as payments for ecosystem services (PES), biodiversity-based business, green markets, and community based natural resource management is strongly encouraged.

### Target 6

- ✓ **While developing longer-term instruments to measure biodiversity recovery, the focus must be on measuring action taken to reduce fishing pressure (where necessary) and to protect biodiversity directly.**

Monitoring a complex socio-ecological system like fisheries requires meaningful indicators collected on ecological, economic and social parameters. The statistical power of these indicators depends on natural and other sources of variability but also on time as many expected outcomes of management action will take years to materialize. Three main criteria need to be considered: (i) institutional progress (legal agreements, development of frameworks, formal management plans, etc.); (ii) corrective measures taken (reduction of fleets, improvement of user rights, development of protected areas); and (iii) Impacts and outcomes (stocks and habitats rebuilding, social and economic enhancement).

- ✓ **To better tackle the problem of by-catch and better mitigate the impact of fisheries on non-target species, a combination of traditional deterrent methods and economic incentives must be applied.**

Experience has shown that the problem of by-catch can be addressed successfully through: (i) top-down forcing of technical change; and (ii) provision of economic incentives for bottom-up innovation that is both ecologically and economically efficient. The first is traditional in conventional centralized management. The second is still in its very early stages of development but is an important source of potentially effective by-catch impact mitigation, complementary to conventional measures. The role of regional organisations (i.e. regional fishery management organizations (RFMOs) and regional seas organizations (RSOs)) is important to inform, decide and coordinate and must be strongly encouraged.

### Target 9 (Agenda item 22)

- ✓ **Identification and prioritisation of invasive species and their pathways of introduction are necessary for enhancing prevention and improving management of this threat. This should be reinforced by the exchange and sharing of invasive alien species information, expertise, experiences and best practice.**

Prevention of introduction of alien and potentially invasive species is the first line of defence and the most cost-effective way of managing the threat posed by the spread of invasive species between and within countries. Prioritisation of pathways of introduction is important in order to focus efforts and optimise resources. Development of standard terminologies and categorisations are key to carry out analyses at different scales, and comparing information on pathways gathered at the global, regional, and national level.

Eradication and effective management of invasive alien species when prevention fails are the next required options. To apply these responses, invasive species need to be prioritised, and ranking species by their impact is crucial. Combining data and information on the impacts caused by invasive species and on their pathways of entry, facilitates significant progress in the efforts to mitigate the impacts caused by this threat. To achieve this, it is important to improve key knowledge products on species and pathways, and enable interoperability among information systems on invasive species.

The IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) developed a framework that will set a global standard to describe pathways thereby facilitating their identification, prioritization and management. Complementing this initiative ISSG is developing a resource that provides extensive information on species and their known pathways as well as the tools available for national governments to manage them. The collaboration between IUCN Invasive Species Initiative, ISSG and the CBD Secretariat will continue in support of the implementation of Target 9.

## Target 11

- ✓ **Urgent action to advance progress on country commitments toward meeting Aichi Target 11 in all its aspects is needed. While the percentage coverage elements of the target are receiving most attention, other elements, most notably, effective management, conservation of areas of particular importance for biodiversity, and ecological representation, are fundamental to ensuring that protected areas become a key tool to halt biodiversity loss and provide ecosystem services.**
- ✓ **Protected areas are proven cost-effective and sustainable natural solutions to a range of environmental problems and social needs on land and sea, with many maintaining essential ecosystem services that underpin human welfare and livelihoods.**

Protected Planet (powered by the World Database on Protected Areas; WDPA) reports that 12.6% of the terrestrial realm and 7% of coastal waters are currently protected, still well short of the Target 11 of 17% and 10% respectively. Progress towards the marine protected area targets is far slower than for terrestrial targets. On management effectiveness, IUCN has assembled abundant evidence that protected areas conserve biodiversity when they are well managed. However, there is also clear evidence that nations are not investing in the management of protected areas. For example, recent research on vegetation loss in protected areas in South Asia has shown that rates of habitat conversion inside protected areas were indistinguishable from that on unprotected land. Similarly, research in Latin America has found a 250% increase in forest loss in protected areas in recent years. The additional complication for marine systems is that many nations are continuing to allow large-scale commercial first harvest within areas declared as marine protected areas (MPAs).

Protected areas are a significant contribution to sustainable development and need to be incorporated into national development policies. Research has highlighted the utility and importance of community engagement to successful protected areas: people support protected areas when they are involved in their governance and share equitably in the benefits. This can be achieved by shared governance and shared benefits models and by utilising a full range of IUCN protected area governance types including private protected areas and indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs). Target 11 needs significant and immediate action from Parties if it is going to be met. There is still little time to achieve it but only if there is increased political commitment worldwide.

## Target 12

- ✓ **Assessing species for The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species greatly contributes to Target 12; Parties are encouraged to support this work at the national level.**
- ✓ **Equally, developing and implementing multi-stakeholder species conservation recovery plans significantly contributes to the achievement of Target 12 and is strongly supported.**

Target 12 effectively breaks down into two components: 1) The knowledge about what is threatened, for which the most obvious tool is the global IUCN Red List of Threatened Species and the various national red lists (or equivalent); and 2) Targeted conservation action to bring about the recovery of species utilizing species action plans.

The IUCN Red List provides a global context on national situations, and provides information that is essential to enable Parties to identify the most important sites for conserving species, including their Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) sites, Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas, and other Key Biodiversity Areas. Parties should further enhance their work on national red lists, or start national red lists if they have not already done so. If Parties wish to be able to compare the findings of their national red lists, then it is important to standardize the methodology, and IUCN provides the most commonly used global standard for this. Parties are also encouraged to participate in IUCN's new National Red List Working Group, and to share their data on the National Red List website <http://www.nationalredlist.org/>.

Parties should undertake to achieve this target by developing and implementing multi-stakeholder species conservation recovery plans, taking note of the methodology developed by IUCN called "Strategic Planning for Species Conservation" [http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/scshandbook\\_2\\_12\\_08\\_compressed.pdf](http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/scshandbook_2_12_08_compressed.pdf). In particular, such plans should focus on the species most at risk of extinction, as identified in the global IUCN Red List and in national red lists.

Seeking support from the GEF to advance the implementation of this Target at a greater scale is something Parties should consider. The GEF currently supports [Save Our Species](#) (SOS). It is clear that the huge over-subscription of high-quality proposals to SOS and to the Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund, shows that the funding available for species recovery plans is particularly limited. Parties should thus also ramp up their own financial support to Target 12 by funding mechanisms such as SOS.

### Target 13

- ✓ **National and regional conservation strategies for Crop Wild Relatives (CWR) and crop landraces (LR) should be developed and included in National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs).**

IUCN recognizes that although significant efforts have been put into achieving Aichi Target 13, the need to develop policies to support enhanced plant genetic resource conservation and use continues to be of the utmost importance.

### Target 14

- ✓ **The provision of ecosystem services needs to benefit those managing and restoring them.**

Ecosystems provide substantial services to people and livelihoods. Approximately 25% cash and non-cash livelihood income is derived from forest ecosystem services. Security of rights (including tenure) to access and benefit (in a sustainable manner) from these services is key for both the sustainability of the resource and for women and men to benefit in a substantive manner. The management, restoration and benefit flows from ecosystems should empower at the lowest accountable body (principle of subsidiarity), and this should embrace gender equality and equity, as well as respecting and integrating the needs of indigenous and local communities.

### Target 15

- ✓ **Rural men and women, especially in the world's drier lands, must be the core of the solution to climate change in terms of their adaptive capacities and of being the owners (or at least having secure rights) of restored lands and their benefits.**

Rural men and women (and indeed urban people) depend on healthy and resilient ecosystems. Rangeland, especially grasses, restoration and management have the potential to sequester very large amounts of carbon (indeed more than forests, though less per unit area). But this needs to be done in a climate smart manner that takes into account IPCC recommendations for adaptation and mitigation and supports more resilient communities (diversity of livelihood options, security of access and tenure, institutions).

IUCN is actively collaborating with the CBD Secretariat to support the advancement of The Bonn Challenge, which calls for restoration by 2020 of at least 15% of degraded ecosystems, and the UNFCCC REDD+ goal to slow, halt and reverse forest cover and carbon loss.

✓ **Healthy ecosystems enhance resilience to disasters and climate change.**

Ecosystems provide many livelihood benefits and materials for emergencies, such as food, fruits, firewood, clean water, fibres, and medicines that contribute, and be a means for adaption, to the resilience of communities to disasters and climate change. Green spaces and their restoration –where needed- can indeed reinforce the role of nature in risk reduction and emergencies. Ecosystem-based Disaster Risk Reduction (eco-DRR) takes into consideration current and future livelihood needs, the requirements of ecosystems, and recognizes their role in supporting communities to prepare for, cope with, and recover from disaster situations, as well as help them manage the challenges posed by climate change. Parties are thus encouraged to fully embrace and support Eco-DRR.

**Target 18**

✓ **Efforts need to be significantly boosted to meet the capacity-building requirements for full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities at all relevant levels, and for the development and deployment of indicators that can be applied at country and local levels to respond to the requirements of Target 18.**

IUCN particularly focuses on work which responds to the need for enhancing capacities of indigenous peoples and local communities as well as other actors involved at all relevant levels, as an essential requirement to aptly reflect and act for their needs and aspirations as contributors towards the Convention's objectives. IUCN thus supports and encourages the need to engage early and effectively with indigenous peoples and local communities as well as ensuring the further development and operationalization of indicators on the status of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and of the application of customary sustainable use.

**Target 20**

✓ **Efforts to narrow and eliminate the gap in financial resources between what is required to implement the Strategic Plan and what is currently available should be met by increases in innovative and new sources of biodiversity finance to generate resources from a broader base as well as doubling international financial flows to developing countries.**

There has been significant progress in the mobilization of financial resources for biodiversity. However, the gap between what is required to implement the Aichi Targets and available finance for biodiversity persists. As recognized by the Quito Dialogue II, resource mobilization should embrace a number of approaches and tools, both market and non-market based, which aim at generating financial resources and creating incentives for the sustainable management of biodiversity. Parties should seek to establish biodiversity financing systems based on appropriate institutions, policies and policy frameworks to ensure the sustainability of financing streams and the avoidance of unexpected, negative effects. The private sector must be engaged and contribute to investing in biodiversity as an essential part of the natural capital it relies on. IUCN remains committed to working with its Members and partners in the quest for enhanced resource mobilization, and is strengthening its capacities in the area of conservation finance.



## ***The Financial Mechanism (Agenda item 15)***

- ✓ **Further efforts are needed to mobilize additional funding for biodiversity as well as measures to ensure that existing finance is deployed in a manner which maximizes the benefits to biodiversity.**

IUCN re-emphasizes the importance of adequate and timely financial resources for the implementation of the Convention. In this regard, the successful replenishment of the GEF as the financial mechanism of the Convention is welcome. Nevertheless, Parties should continue to identify other innovative ways of mobilizing resources in line with Aichi Target 20.

There is a significant convergence between the mission and objectives of IUCN as defined in the IUCN Programme 2013-2016, the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets, and the investment priorities under GEF-6. IUCN is committed to mobilize resources beyond its traditional network of development assistance agencies and as a newly accredited GEF Project Agency will mostly concentrate its efforts on critical drivers of biodiversity loss, and develop a portfolio of projects addressing habitat fragmentation and degradation, overexploitation or unsustainable use of natural resources, and invasive alien species. The GEF partnership will benefit from IUCN's large and diversified network, membership and also from its long standing and close relations with key donors in the conservation sector, which will positively contribute to bringing new and innovative co-financing targeting at achieving the CBD objectives.

## ***Biodiversity and Sustainable Development (Agenda item 16)***

- ✓ **The means of implementation established to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) must include an appropriate level of investment into conservation, restoration and sustainable management of biodiversity and ecosystem services as they are the foundation of sustainable development and the natural infrastructure for responding to current development challenges.**
- ✓ **The work undertaken under the CBD, especially the elaboration of indicators for the Aichi Targets, must become an integral part of the indicator framework to be adopted globally to track progress towards the achievement of the SDGs.**
- ✓ **To ensure policy coherence and mutual supportiveness between the process of implementation of the SDGs and the review and implementation of NBSAPs increased coordination at the national level is urgently needed.**

IUCN has called for the SDGs framework to be designed in a way to: emphasize the interconnectedness and linkages between the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development; include at least a stand-alone goal recognizing the importance of safeguarding biodiversity and ecosystem services as essential nature-based solutions in addressing some of the global development challenges; and build on existing relevant commitments already made by the international community, in particular the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

The outcome document of the Open Working Group on the Sustainable Development Goals (OWG) of the United Nations General Assembly (containing 17 goals and 169 targets) reflects some level of integration of the different dimensions of sustainable development throughout most of the goals and it is encouraging that many of the targets formulated build on the Aichi Targets (e.g. Goal 14 on oceans and 15 on biodiversity and ecosystem services). Nevertheless, the role of biodiversity and the ecosystem services it underpins in contributing to the eradication of poverty and the enhancement of human conditions in achieving sustainable development could still have been better reflected throughout the framework. The current emphasis negotiators in New York have placed on access to these services must be balanced with a stronger reference to the need for investments into protecting ecosystems or the natural infrastructure to ensure their continuous supply.

In order to ensure policy coherence at the national level for SDGs implementation, National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) should be included as one mechanism contributing to the



achievement of the SDGs. In turn, the SDGs should be acknowledged and included in revised NBSAPs as called for in Aichi Target 17.

### ***Article 8(j) and related provisions (Agenda item 19)***

- ✓ **The decision to use the term “indigenous peoples” within the Convention’s future decisions and secondary documents should be supported by Parties at COP12.**

IUCN has consistently used the term “indigenous peoples” in its own documents for a long time, while it also recognizes that many indigenous peoples or nations are usually made up of various indigenous communities. IUCN considers that all institutions and processes across the UN system, including in particular the CBD due its high relevance for indigenous peoples, as well as other international policy frameworks, should consistently use the terminological standards of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

### ***Marine and coastal biodiversity (Agenda item 21)***

#### ***Ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs)***

- ✓ **The scientific and technical evaluation of information contained in the reports of the seven additional regional workshops for describing ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) should be welcomed and steps to promote the use of this scientific information in national and international processes is encouraged.**

The scientific information regarding the description of areas meeting the EBSA criteria, especially once it is in the EBSA repository and information-sharing mechanism, can be of great value when carrying out marine spatial planning, developing representative networks of marine protected areas (MPAs), and applying other area-based management measures in marine and coastal areas. IUCN urges Parties to welcome such information (not merely note it), and to encourage States and competent organizations to use the information as it can make an important contribution to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

Stronger collaboration is encouraged between the CBD Secretariat and relevant organizations in facilitating the description of areas that meet the criteria for EBSAs through the expansion to new areas, as well as updates to areas where additional information may become available, including with respect to Key Biodiversity Areas encompassing marine Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas; important marine mammal areas, among others.

#### ***Impacts on marine and coastal biodiversity of anthropogenic underwater noise and ocean acidification***

- ✓ **It is essential to minimize direct and indirect impacts of human activity on marine and coastal biodiversity through efforts such as minimizing ocean noise impacts and building resilience through MPAs and by removing other stressors on coral reefs and other vulnerable ecosystems.**

Direct and indirect impacts of human activities on marine and coastal biodiversity need to be assessed, thoroughly studied and monitored. Minimizing such impacts is essential for the future health of the marine environment and maintaining ecosystem services. IUCN encourages competent bodies to take appropriate measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate the potential significant adverse impacts of anthropogenic underwater noise on marine and coastal biodiversity. IUCN also encourages international collaboration to improve the monitoring of ocean acidification. Effectively managed marine protected areas (MPAs) and better understanding of their connectivity are vital to building the resilience of coral reefs and other vulnerable ecosystems and should be further promoted.

## ***Cooperation with other conventions, international organizations and stakeholders' engagement, including business (Agenda item 29)***

### ***Business engagement***

- ✓ **Work to articulate the responsibility of the business sector in implementation of the individual Aichi Targets, through identifying key milestones in the lead up to 2020 and developing guidance for business to support implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, must be carried out.**

The active participation of the business sector is highly important and desirable if we are to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and sustainable development. Nevertheless, in general, the majority of companies around the world are not aware of the importance or the benefits of biodiversity to their dealings or of the positive effects of mainstreaming the values of biodiversity and ecosystem services into their business models and into supply chains.

Gaps exist with regard to reporting on business activities in relation to their contribution to the Convention's objectives as well as to the achievement of the Aichi Targets. Additional data, as well as a typology of action by business, are needed to help make informed decisions regarding business engagement. Identifying key milestones for businesses to map out their specific contributions to the Strategic Plan in the lead up to 2020 is also urgently needed.

### ***Engagement with subnational and local governments***

- ✓ **Subnational and local governments play a crucial role in supporting the implementation of the objectives of the Convention and the Strategic Plan; they nevertheless require increased and sustained support, both in terms of knowledge, capacity building and exchange of best practices, as well as financially.**
- ✓ **Further engagement with subnational and local authorities as well as other key stakeholders at the local level is necessary to raise awareness of the values of ecosystem services and to integrate these values in urban and regional planning and development.**

Following the global assessment "[Urbanization, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services: Challenges and Opportunities](#)", cities should facilitate for a rich biodiversity and take stewardship of crucial ecosystem services rather than being the cause of large ecological footprints. Cities and urbanized regions have to be fully engaged in implementing the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

Similarly, local and regional authorities have a major responsibility to contribute to halting biodiversity loss and thus contributing to the Aichi Targets. They must be made aware, through appropriate knowledge and information, of the values of biodiversity and of the solutions that nature provides to society's most pressing challenges. They must be equally encouraged to develop local biodiversity conservation strategies, to integrate biodiversity into local policies, to opt for nature-based solutions and to put in place indicators to monitor progress in integrating biodiversity into development, economic and other policies including climate change.

IUCN is committed to mobilize the biodiversity expertise of its large network for sustainable urban development, to promote nature-based solutions for cities and regions and help to establish the exchange of knowledge and experiences to support local and subnational authorities in implementing these solutions.

### ***Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)***

- ✓ **IPBES must equitably support all its functions, including by proportionally assigning sufficient financial resources to its policy, knowledge generation, and capacity-building functions alongside that of conducting assessments.**

While IPBES was established to deliver four functions: assessment, support to policy, knowledge generation, and capacity-building - the platform's assessment function has been allocated two-thirds of the five-year budget, with the remaining one-third to be divided among the rest. This situation is worrying and must be corrected. If IPBES is to support an effective science-policy interface, it must strengthen its attention to supporting policy, knowledge generation, and capacity-building.

IUCN is also worried that deliberations at the IPBES Meeting in Antalya, Turkey, from 9 to 14 December 2013, failed to address the crucially-important issues of stakeholder engagement and of strategic partnerships. This is of particular concern given that IUCN and ICSU had invested substantial efforts in developing a draft strategy for stakeholder engagement, in response to a request from the first IPBES plenary.

### ***Gender mainstreaming***

- ✓ **The [Environment and Gender Index \(EGI\)](#) is having a concrete impact and contribution to the advancement of the gender mainstreaming agenda across the board; it should be further promoted and its use encouraged.**

Full assessment of the different implications for men and women stemming from any policy action require the support of reliable data and consistent indicators. The EGI provides the first quantitative data on governments' performance translating the gender and environment mandates in the three Rio Conventions and the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) into national policy and planning.