**EU/MS comments on**
**Review of implementation of the Ecosystems Management Subprogramme**
**4th Annual meeting of the Sub-Committee of the CPR**

**Comments:**

- The implementation of the Ecosystems Management Subprogramme is of high importance for achieving the biodiversity-related SDGs- and the Aichi Biodiversity targets. E.g., we strongly support the holistic approach to oceans and UNEP's work with the Regional Seas Conventions (e.g. the Barcelona Convention).
- Generally, the EU+MS are satisfied with UNEP's work and acknowledge good results for most indicators determined in the 2016-17 PoW. Unfortunately, however, achieving the related Aichi Biodiversity targets and SDGs, including support to the idea of Land Degradation Neutrality, will require much greater effort by all;
- We would wish for a stronger link of the Subprogramme with SDG 15, taking into account the different aspects of ecosystems, such as land/soils next to biodiversity issues
- Land Degradation Neutrality' (LDN)-approach should be taken up by UNEP and its Subprogramme; for example by integrating it into work on soil degradation
- Integrated ecosystem management is a matter for all Countries and many organisations and stakeholders. For making a significant contribution (more than just "pieces of the puzzle"), UNEP needs to:
    - closely cooperate with others, including with the private sector;
    - build strategic partnerships,
    - build on synergies with the work by other MEAs, UNDP, UNCCD and other UN bodies, avoidance of duplications but combining efforts and
    - make use of its strength to bring countries together at the regional level.

  UNEP is correct that this needs major political will from countries;

- Protection of ecosystems is one of the objectives addressed by the Global Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. At CBD COP13 (December 2016), the CBD Secretariat was requested to prepare a detailed planning for the follow-up to this Strategic Plan, including options for fostering commitment and strengthening implementation. UNEP should provide a strong contribution to this process.

- It would be also useful that UNEP provides further details on how it deals with the unbalance between earmarked and non-earmarked funding. It would be important that non-earmarked funding goes as a priority to activities of the subprogram that are unfunded.