



REPORT

INT

2012

THIS REPORT  
HAS BEEN  
PRODUCED IN  
COLLABORATION  
WITH:



Global Footprint Network  
Advancing the Science of Sustainability

ZSL

LIVING CONSERVATION

# Living Planet Report 2012

## Biodiversity, biocapacity and better choices

## **WWF**

WWF is one of the world's largest and most experienced independent conservation organizations, with over 5 million supporters and a global network active in more than 100 countries.

WWF's mission is to stop the degradation of the planet's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature, by conserving the world's biological diversity, ensuring that the use of renewable natural resources is sustainable, and promoting the reduction of pollution and wasteful consumption.

## **Zoological Society of London**

Founded in 1826, the Zoological Society of London (ZSL) is an international scientific, conservation and educational organization. Its mission is to achieve and promote the worldwide conservation of animals and their habitats. ZSL runs ZSL London Zoo and ZSL Whipsnade Zoo, carries out scientific research in the Institute of Zoology and is actively involved in field conservation worldwide.

## **Global Footprint Network**

The Global Footprint Network promotes the science of sustainability by advancing the Ecological Footprint, a resource accounting tool that makes sustainability measurable. Together with its partners, the Network works to further improve and implement this science by coordinating research, developing methodological standards, and providing decision-makers with robust resource accounts to help the human economy operate within the Earth's ecological limits.

## **European Space Agency**

The European Space Agency (ESA) is Europe's gateway to space. Its mission is to shape the development of Europe's space capability and ensure that investment in space continues to deliver benefits to the citizens of Europe and the world. ESA is an international organization with 19 member states. By coordinating the financial and intellectual resources of its members, it can undertake programmes and activities far beyond the scope of any single European country. The Agency's various programmes are designed to find out more about Earth, its immediate space environment, our solar system and the universe.

### **WWF International**

Avenue du Mont-Blanc  
1196 Gland, Switzerland  
[www.panda.org](http://www.panda.org)

### **Global Footprint Network**

312 Clay Street, Suite 300  
Oakland, California 94607, USA  
[www.footprintnetwork.org](http://www.footprintnetwork.org)

### **Institute of Zoology**

Zoological Society of London  
Regent's Park, London NW1 4RY, UK  
[www.zsl.org/indicators](http://www.zsl.org/indicators)  
[www.livingplanetindex.org](http://www.livingplanetindex.org)

### **European Space Agency**

ESA HQ Mario-Nikis  
8-10 rue Mario Nikis  
75738 Paris Cedex 15  
France

Design by millerdesign.co.uk

Cover photograph: KARI / ESA

ISBN 978-2-940443-37-6

# CONTENTS

---

## **FOREWORD AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| European Space Agency: Observing Earth from space | 4  |
| Earth needs more space by André Kuipers           | 5  |
| Keeping this a living planet by Jim Leape         | 6  |
| 7 billion expectations, one planet                | 8  |
| At a glance                                       | 12 |

---

## **CHAPTER 1: THE STATE OF THE PLANET**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| The Living Planet Index                  | 16 |
| The Ecological Footprint                 | 36 |
| Population, urbanization and development | 52 |
| The Water Footprint                      | 62 |

---

## **CHAPTER 2: WHY WE SHOULD CARE**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Linking biodiversity, ecosystem services and people | 70 |
| Forests   | 74 |
| Rivers  | 82 |
| Oceans  | 84 |
| Scramble for land                                   | 88 |

---

## **CHAPTER 3: WHAT DOES THE FUTURE HOLD?**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Climate change impacts                      | 92  |
| The use of scenarios                        | 98  |
| Projecting the Ecological Footprint to 2050 | 100 |
| Modelling natural capital in Sumatra        | 101 |
| The Living Forests model                    | 102 |

---

## **CHAPTER 4: BETTER CHOICES FOR A LIVING PLANET**

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| One Planet Perspective | 106 |
| Closing words          | 124 |

---

## **ANNEX: TECHNICAL NOTES AND DATA TABLES**

|                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| Annex 1: Living Planet Index        | 128 |
| Annex 2: Ecological Footprint       | 135 |
| Annex 3: Glossary and abbreviations | 146 |

---

## **REFERENCES**

153

**Contributors**

Editor in chief: *Monique Grooten*.

Lead editors: *Rosamunde Almond and Richard McLellan*.

Editorial team: *Nigel Dudley, Emma Duncan, Natasja Oerlemans and Sue Stolton*.

**Reviewers**

William F. Laurance, FAAAS (Distinguished Research Professor and Australian Laureate, Centre for Tropical Environmental and Sustainability Science (TESS) and School of Marine and Tropical Biology, James Cook University, Cairns, Australia; and Prince Bernhard Chair for International Nature Conservation, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands).  
Pita Verweij (Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, the Netherlands).

**Zoological Society of London (ZSL):**

Louise McRae and Ben Collen (section leads Living Planet Index); with Stefanie Deinet, Peter Hill, Jonathan Loh, Jonathan E. M. Baille and Victoria Price.

**Global Footprint Network (GFN):**

Gemma Cranston (section lead Ecological Footprint); with Mathis Wackernagel, Michael Borucke, Alessandro Galli, Kyle Gracey, Katsumori Iha, Joy Larson, Scott Mattoon, David Moore, Juan Carlos Morales and Pati Poblete.

**WWF:**

Neil Burgess, Antje Ahrends, Nirmal Bhagabati, Brendan Fisher, Emily McKenzie and Kirsten Schuyt (ecosystem services); Jessica Battle (marine); Carina Borgstrom-Hansson (cities); Ashok Chapagain (Water Footprint); Bart Wickel and Lifeng Li (freshwater); Elaine Geyer-Allely (population and development); Rod Taylor and Therese Tepe (forests); and Nicholas Sundt (climate change).

**With special thanks for review and additional contributions**

**from:** Naikoa Aguilar-Amuchastegui, Keith Allott, Jason Anderson, Victor Anderson, Simon Anstey, Alberto Arroyo-Schnell, Mike Baltzer, Adam Barlow, Eugenio Barrios, Andreas Baumueller, Karin Bilo, Gianfranco Bologna, Bruce Cabale, Sandra Charity, Boping Chen, Sarah Christie, Jason Clay, Carol Day, Adrian Dellecker, Kristina Van Dexter, Cristina Eghenter, Wendy Elliott, Helen Fox, Neva Frecheville, Erik Gerritsen, Aimee Gonzales, Johan van de Gronden, May Guerraoui, Lasse Gustavsson, Pablo Gutman, Chris Hails, Ray Hilborn, Reinier Hille Ris Lambers, Richard Holland, Jeff Hutchings, Colby Loucks, Andrea Kohl, Jim Leape, Lou Leonard, Aimee Leslie, Jonathan Loh, Imke Luebbeke, Gretchen Lyons, László Máthé, Anne Meikle, Sergy Moroz, Sally Nicolson, Stuart Orr, Anouk Pasquier, Helen Pitman, Mark Powell, Gerry Ryan, Anke Schulmeister, Alfred Schumm, Claudia Schweizer, Stephan Singer, Samantha Smith, Gerald Steindlegger, Paul Sunters, Jon Taylor, Michele Thieme, Samuel Turvey, Niall Watson, George White, Luke Wreford, Julia Young and Natascha Zwaal.

**European Space Agency:**

Robert Meisner (section lead); with Rosita Suenson, Bernhard von Weyhe, Nadia Imbert-Vier, Roberto LoVerde and Chiara Solimini.

# Living Planet Report 2012

## Biodiversity, biocapacity and better choices

## European Space Agency: Observing Earth from space

A new partner in the production of this year's *Living Planet Report*, the European Space Agency (ESA) is committed to finding out more about Earth, its immediate space environment, our solar system and the universe for the benefit of the planet and its inhabitants.

Coordinated by the directorate of Earth Observation Programmes, a growing fleet of satellites deliver a continual stream of essential information to understand and analyse the state of the planet, and monitor changes taking place.

ESA has been dedicated to observing Earth from space since the launch of its first weather satellite in 1977. While ESA continues to develop satellites to advance meteorology, the focus today is also very much on understanding how Earth works as a system and how human activity is affecting natural processes.

Satellites offer the only practical means of monitoring Earth as a whole. Sensitive spaceborne instruments gather precise data to unravel the complexities of our planet and track changes taking place, especially those associated with the effects of climate change.

Apart from benefiting European research requirements, this also ensures that decision-makers are equipped with the information to tackle the challenges of climate change, secure a sustainable future and respond to natural and human-induced disasters.

ESA's "workhorse" missions, ERS and Envisat, revealed new insight into many aspects of Earth. Each carrying a suite of instruments, these missions have led to a better understanding of air pollution and ozone holes, mapped the height and temperature of the sea surface, monitored the changing face of polar ice, and tracked the way land is used.

The Earth Explorer missions address urgent scientific questions such as Earth's gravity, ice-thickness change, the water cycle, the magnetic field, wind, the role clouds play in Earth's energy balance, and the carbon cycle.

In parallel, ESA develops missions called Sentinels to feed services for Europe's Global Monitoring for Environment and security programme. The data is used for a wide range of applications to manage the environment, such as monitoring biodiversity, natural resources, air quality, oil spills, volcanic ash, and to support humanitarian aid and emergency response in times of disaster.



# EARTH NEEDS MORE SPACE!

Looking out of my window and watching Earth from space comes with my job as an astronaut. Nevertheless, I feel I am privileged.

PromISSe is my second mission into space. This time I will live on the International Space Station for five months, unlike my first mission of 11 days in 2004. However, those 11 days in space changed my life. Seeing Earth from space provides a unique perspective. Our planet is a beautiful and fragile place, protected only by a very thin layer of atmosphere essential for life on our planet. And seemingly large forests turned out to be small and passed by very quickly. It was this perspective, and realization, that lie behind my motivation to become a WWF ambassador.

The European Space Agency is conducting research to provide information about the health of our planet. Some of the threats to a healthy planet are visible to the naked eye, while others are translated into figures stating how, where and why the world is changing. What I can see from space is reflected in the report in your hands.

In this ninth edition of the *Living Planet Report*, the key indices again show unsustainable pressures on the planet. We now know that the demands on natural resources like fish, timber and food are rocketing to a level that is impossible to replenish sustainably.

All I care about, and cherish, is on this one planet.

It is my home, the home of my family and friends, and the home of another 7 billion people. It is also the home of beautiful forests, mountains, savannahs, oceans, lakes and rivers and of all of the species living within. Our planet is beautiful, but our planet is also fragile.

We have the ability to save our home, to protect our planet. Not only for our own benefit but, above all, for generations to come. We have the solutions. Everyone can make a contribution by making better choices in how we govern, produce and consume. Taking better care of the planet is in our hands.

André Kuipers  
Astronaut, European Space Agency



# KEEPING THIS A LIVING PLANET

We are all familiar with the stark array of graphs – carbon emissions, deforestation, water scarcity, overfishing – that detail how we are sapping the Earth's resources and resilience. This 2012 edition of the *Living Planet Report* tells us how it all adds up – the cumulative pressure we're putting on the planet, and the consequent decline in the health of the forests, rivers and oceans that make our lives possible.

We are living as if we have an extra planet at our disposal. We are using 50 per cent more resources than the Earth can provide, and unless we change course that number will grow very fast – by 2030, even two planets will not be enough.

But we do have a choice. We can create a prosperous future that provides food, water and energy for the 9 or perhaps 10 billion people who will be sharing the planet in 2050.

We can produce the food we need without expanding the footprint of agriculture – without destroying more forest, or using more water or chemicals. Solutions lie in such areas as reducing waste, which now claims much of the food we grow; using better seeds and better cultivation techniques; bringing degraded lands back into production; and changing diets – particularly by lowering meat consumption in high income countries.

We can ensure there is enough water for our needs and also conserve the healthy rivers, lakes and wetlands from which it comes. Smarter irrigation techniques and better resource planning, for example, can help us use water more efficiently. Most fundamentally, we need to establish water management regimes that involve a broader range of stakeholders, and that manage river basins as the complex, richly diverse living systems that they are.

We can meet all of our energy needs from sources like wind and sunlight that are clean and abundant. The first imperative is to get much more out of the energy we use – increasing the efficiency of our buildings, cars and factories can cut our total energy use in half. If we make those savings, then it is possible to meet all of our needs from renewable sources, so long as we focus on driving those technologies into the economy and ending the \$700 billion in subsidies that keep us hooked on oil and coal.



20 YEARS AFTER THE  
MOMENTOUS EARTH  
SUMMIT, THIS IS A  
CRUCIAL OPPORTUNITY  
TO TAKE STOCK OF  
WHERE THE WORLD  
IS HEADING AND HOW  
WE'D LIKE OUR FUTURE  
TO TAKE SHAPE

June 2012 will see the nations of the world, businesses and a broad sweep of civil society representatives gather in Rio de Janeiro for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development. Twenty years after the momentous Earth Summit, this is a crucial opportunity to take stock of where the world is heading and how we'd like our future to take shape.

This can and must be the moment for governments to set a new course toward sustainability. It is also a unique opportunity for coalitions of the committed to step up – governments in regions like the Congo Basin or the Arctic, joining together to manage the resources they share; cities challenging and inspiring each other to reduce carbon emissions and create more liveable urban spaces; companies who are competitors in the marketplace nonetheless joining forces to drive sustainability into their supply chains and offering products that help customers use less resources; and pension funds and sovereign wealth funds investing in green jobs.

These solutions, and others articulated within this edition of the *Living Planet Report*, show that we all need to play a role in keeping this a living planet – with food, water and energy for all, and the vibrant ecosystems that sustain life on Earth.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jim Leape".

Jim Leape  
Director General  
WWF International

# 7 BILLION EXPECTATIONS ONE PLANET

Within the vast immensity of the universe, a thin layer of life encircles a planet. Bound by rock below and space above, millions of diverse species thrive. Together, they form the ecosystems and habitats we so readily recognize as planet Earth – and which, in turn, supply a multitude of ecosystem services upon which people, and all life, depend.

Ever-growing human demand for resources, however, is putting tremendous pressures on biodiversity. This threatens the continued provision of ecosystem services, which not only further threatens biodiversity but also our own species' future security, health and well-being.

This ninth edition of the *Living Planet Report* documents the changing state of biodiversity, ecosystems and humanity's demand on natural resources; and explores the implications of these changes for biodiversity and human societies. The report highlights that current trends can still be reversed, through making better choices that place the natural world at the centre of economies, business models and lifestyles.

Chapter 1 presents the state of the planet as measured by three complementary indicators. Including data from many more species' populations than previously, the Living Planet Index continues to show around a 30 per cent global decline in biodiversity health since 1970 (Figure 1). This trend is seen across terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems, but is greatest for freshwater species, whose populations show an average 37 per cent decline. The tropical freshwater index declined even more precipitously, by 70 per cent. Overall, the global tropical index declined by 60 per cent since 1970. In contrast, the index for temperate regions increased by 31 per cent over the same period. However, this does not necessarily mean that temperate biodiversity is in a better state than tropical biodiversity, as the temperate index disguises huge historical losses prior to the start of the analysis.


The Ecological Footprint shows a consistent trend of over-consumption (Figure 2). In 2008, the most recent year for which data are available, the footprint exceeded the Earth's biocapacity – the area of land and productive oceans actually available to produce renewable resources and absorb CO<sub>2</sub> emissions – by more than 50 per cent. The carbon footprint is a significant driver of this "ecological overshoot" – the term used to describe when, at a global level, the Ecological Footprint is larger than biocapacity.

## THE LIVING PLANET INDEX CONTINUES TO SHOW AROUND A 30 PER CENT GLOBAL DECLINE SINCE 1970


**Figure 1: Global Living Planet Index**  
(WWF / ZSL, 2012)

**Key**

- Global Living Planet Index
- Confidence limits



**Figure 2: Global Ecological Footprint**  
(Global Footprint Network, 2011)



A new analysis of consumption trends in BRIICS (Brazil, Russia, India, Indonesia, China and South Africa) countries as well as in different income and development groups, together with population and urbanization trends, underline the worrying potential for humanity's footprint to increase even more in the future.

The Water Footprint of Production provides a second indication of human demand on renewable resources. For the first time, this report includes an analysis of water availability throughout the year in the world's major river basins. This shows that 2.7 billion people around the world already live in catchments that experience severe water shortages for at least one month a year.

Chapter 2 highlights the links between biodiversity, ecosystem services and people. The impacts of human activities on three ecosystems – forests, freshwater and marine – are examined

in more detail, as well as specific analysis of ecosystem services they provide. Competing claims on natural resources such as commercial pressures on agricultural land in developing countries are also discussed.

The *Living Planet Report* offers a view on the planet's health. WWF also looks beyond the data to understand the human expectations and struggles, demands and contributions that are driving change on Earth. In this edition of the *Living Planet Report*, Kenyan farmer Margaret Wanjiru Mundia will help us do just that. Margaret will be introduced in Chapter 2. In contrast to this individual perspective, we also take a view of the world through extraordinary images from the European Space Agency (ESA).

Chapter 3 looks at what the future might hold. Possible effects of climate change are examined and various scenarios are presented, including for the Ecological Footprint. These analyses indicate that continuing with "business as usual" will have serious, and potentially catastrophic, consequences. In particular, continued increases in greenhouse gas emissions will irreversibly commit the world to a global average temperature rise of well over 2°C, which will severely disrupt the functioning of almost all global ecosystems and dramatically affect human development and well-being.

Clearly, the current system of human development, based on increased consumption and a reliance on fossil fuels, combined with a growing human population and poor overall management and governance of natural resources, is unsustainable. Many countries and populations already face a number of risks from biodiversity loss, degraded ecosystem services and climate change, including: food, water and energy scarcity; increased vulnerability to natural disasters; health risks; population movements; and resource-driven conflicts. These risks are disproportionately borne by the poorest people, even though they contribute relatively least to humanity's Ecological Footprint.

While some people may be able to use technology to substitute for some lost ecosystem services and to mitigate against climate change effects, these risks will only increase and become more widespread if we keep to "business as usual". Emerging economies risk not meeting their aspirations for improved living standards, and high-income countries and communities risk seeing their current well-being eroded.

Forward-thinking governments and businesses have begun making efforts to mitigate these risks, for example by promoting renewable energy, resource efficiency, more environmentally friendly production and more socially inclusive development. However, the trends and challenges outlined in this report show that most current efforts are not enough.



**FORWARD-THINKING  
GOVERNMENTS  
AND BUSINESSES  
HAVE BEGUN  
MAKING EFFORTS  
TO MITIGATE THESE  
RISKS BY PROMOTING  
RENEWABLE ENERGY**

So, how can we reverse declining biodiversity, bring the Ecological Footprint down to within planetary limits, and effectively reduce the pace of human induced climate change and reverse the damaging impacts? And how can we do this while ensuring equitable access to natural resources, food, water and energy for a growing number of people?

Chapter 3 provides some solutions that we already have at hand: Alternative future scenarios based on changed food consumption patterns and halting deforestation and forest degradation illustrate some of the immediately available options for reducing ecological overshoot and mitigating climate change. These are expanded in Chapter 4, which presents WWF's One Planet perspective for managing natural capital – biodiversity, ecosystems and ecosystem services – within the Earth's ecological limits.

In addition to large-scale conservation and restoration efforts, this perspective seeks better choices along the entire system of production and consumption that drive the preservation of natural capital, supported by redirected financial flows and more equitable resource governance. Implementing such a paradigm shift will be a tremendous challenge, involving uncomfortable decisions and trade-offs. But our scenarios show we can reduce the Ecological Footprint, and mitigate climate change trends, using current knowledge and technologies – and begin the path to healthy, sustainable and equitable human societies.

**ALL 193 MEMBER  
STATES OF THE  
UNITED NATIONS  
COMMITTED UNDER  
THE MILLENNIUM  
DEVELOPMENT GOALS  
TO END POVERTY,  
PROTECT BIODIVERSITY  
AND REDUCE  
GREENHOUSE  
GAS EMISSIONS**

#### **The *Living Planet Report* and Rio +20**

Some of the most significant international agreements addressing the challenges facing our planet were developed 20 years ago when the world's leaders met in Rio de Janeiro. Among other initiatives, they signed the Convention on Biological Diversity and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, and set in motion the process to develop the Convention to Combat Desertification. The underlying message of the meeting was reinforced when all 193 member states of the United Nations committed under the Millennium Development Goals to end poverty, protect biodiversity and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In June 2012, Rio +20 will be assessing what has happened since, and what fresh steps are needed to address urgent problems of environmental security, equity and resource management. The *Living Planet Report* provides important information to this pivotal meeting and delegates will be able to read a special conference summary ([www.panda.org/lpr](http://www.panda.org/lpr)).

# AT A GLANCE

## Chapter 1: The state of the planet

### Biodiversity has declined globally

- The global Living Planet Index declined by almost 30 per cent between 1970 and 2008.
- The global tropical index declined by 60 per cent during the same period.
- The global temperate index increased by 31 per cent; however this disguises huge historical losses prior to 1970.
- The global terrestrial, freshwater and marine indices all declined, with the freshwater index declining the most, by 37 per cent.
- The tropical freshwater index declined even more precipitously, by 70 per cent.

### Human demands on the planet exceed supply

- Humanity's Ecological Footprint exceeded the Earth's biocapacity by more than 50 per cent in 2008.
- In recent decades, the carbon footprint is a significant component of this ecological overshoot.
- Biocapacity per person decreased from 3.2 global hectares (gha) in 1961 to 1.8 gha per capita in 2008, even though total global biocapacity increased over this time.
- Rising consumption trends in high-income groups around the world and in BRIICS countries, combined with growing population numbers, provide warning signs of the potential for even larger footprints in the future.

### Many river basins experience water scarcity

- Examining scarcity on a monthly basis reveals many river basins that seem to have sufficient supplies based on annual averages are actually overexploited, hampering critical ecosystem functions.
- 2.7 billion people around the world live in catchments that experience severe water scarcity for at least one month a year.

## Chapter 2: Why we should care

### Our wealth, health and well-being are dependent on ecosystem services

- Many areas of high biodiversity also provide important ecosystem services such as carbon storage, fuel wood, freshwater flow and fish stocks. Human activities are affecting the continued provision of these services.

- Deforestation and forest degradation currently account for up to 20 per cent of global anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, including losses from forest soils.
- Only a third of the world's rivers that are longer than 1,000km are free flowing and without dams on their main channel.
- A nearly five-fold increase in global marine fish catch, from 19 million tonnes in 1950 to 87 million tonnes in 2005, has left many fisheries overexploited.
- The frequency and complexity of land use competition will rise as human demands grow. Throughout the developing world, there is an unprecedented rush by outside investors to secure access to land for future food and fuel production.
- The loss of biodiversity and its related ecosystem services particularly impacts the poor, who rely most directly on these services to survive.

## Chapter 3 What does the future hold?

### Scenarios present a variety of plausible future alternatives

- The past few decades have been warmer than any other comparable period for at least the last 400 years.
- Limiting the global average warming to 2°C above pre-industrial levels is likely to require emission reductions larger than 80 per cent below peak levels. If emissions continue to grow, large regions probably will individually exceed a 2°C increase in average annual temperatures by 2040.
- The declining Living Planet Index and rising Ecological Footprint emphasize the need for more sustainable policies. Scenarios can help us make better informed choices for the future.
- Scenarios highlight the importance of conserving biodiversity to protect ecosystem services.

## Chapter 4 Better choices for a living planet

### There are solutions for living within the means of one planet

- Natural capital – biodiversity, ecosystems and ecosystem services – must be preserved and, where necessary, restored as the foundation of human economies and societies.
- WWF's One Planet perspective proposes how to manage, govern and share natural capital within the Earth's ecological limits.
- 16 "better choices" from a global One Planet perspective are highlighted, together with priority objectives for realizing these goals.

# CHAPTER 1: THE STATE OF THE PLANET

This image captures the meticulously planned cultivated landscape of the autonomous communities of Aragon (west) and Catalonia in northeastern Spain. Many agricultural crops can be seen growing including wheat, barley, fruits and vegetables. The circular shape of many of the fields indicates central-pivot irrigation is being employed; a well drilled in the centre of each circle supplies water to a rotating series of sprinklers.



# THE LIVING PLANET INDEX

The Living Planet Index reflects changes in the state of the planet's biodiversity, using trends in population size for vertebrate species from different biomes and regions to calculate average changes in abundance over time. It includes data from more than 9,000 different wildlife monitoring schemes collected in a wide variety of ways – ranging from counting the number of individual animals, to camera trapping, to surveys of nesting sites and animal traces.

Main image: Researcher and a polar bear, Svalbard, Norway.

Below: Rangers attach a ring tag to a baby brown booby.

Camera trap photo of a Sumatran rhinoceros, Borneo.

Whale shark tagging, Donsol, Sorsogon, Philippines.



© Jurgen Freund / WWF-Canon



© WWF-Malaysia / Raymond Alfie




© Jurgen Freund / WWF-Canon




# MONITORING GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY

Given the complexity of global biodiversity, it is very difficult to provide a complete picture of its overall health. But much as a stock market index measures the state of the market by tracking changes in market capitalization of a selection of companies, changes in abundance (i.e., the total number of individuals in a given population) across a selection of species can be used as one important indicator of the planet's ecological condition.

The Living Planet Index suggests that across the globe, vertebrate populations were on average one-third smaller in 2008 than they were in 1970 (Figure 3). This is based on trends in the size of 9,014 populations of 2,688 mammal, bird, reptile, amphibian and fish species – many more than in previous editions of the *Living Planet Report* (WWF, 2006b; 2008b; 2010a).



VERTEBRATE POPULATIONS IN THE GLOBAL LPI WERE ON AVERAGE ONE-THIRD SMALLER IN 2008 THAN THEY WERE IN 1970



**Figure 4: Turning population trends into the Living Planet indices**

Each population in the Living Planet Index is classified according to whether it is located in a temperate or tropical region, and whether it predominantly lives in a terrestrial, freshwater or marine system. These classifications are specific to the population rather than to the species, so some species are included in more than one index. For example, species with both freshwater and marine populations, such as salmon, or migratory species found in both tropical and temperate zones are recorded separately. No populations are double counted. These groups are used to comprise the temperate and tropical indices, as well as terrestrial, freshwater and marine indices, which together calculate the global Living Planet Index (Figure 4). There are more populations in the temperate index than there are in the tropical index. Therefore, to avoid biasing the global index toward population trends in temperate zones, the tropical and temperate indices are given equal weight in the global index (more details on this are included in Annex 1).

In addition, each terrestrial and freshwater species' population is classified to a realm according to its geographic location. Realm indices are calculated by giving equal weight to each species, with the exception of the Palearctic realm where, for the first time in this analysis, each family is given equal weight. This was done to reduce bias toward bird species, for which there are many more population records compared to other species in this realm.


## Exploring the Living Planet Index

The Living Planet Index is a composite indicator that measures changes in the size of wildlife populations to indicate trends in the overall state of global biodiversity. Trends within a particular population only show what is happening to a species within a particular area. To create a robust index, comprehensive population data are collected for as many species and populations as possible from around the world. While some populations increased during the time they have been monitored, others have decreased. On average, however, the magnitude of population decreases exceeded that of the increases, so overall the index shows a global decline.

**Figure 5: Northern bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*), Western Atlantic Ocean**

Unsustainable levels of fishing have caused a catastrophic decline in this population since the 1970s. Because bluefin tuna has a very high commercial value, fishing pressure has continued and, as a result, the species as a whole is in danger of extinction.


Note: Data are from International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) cited in Safina and Klinger, 2008.



**Figure 6: European otter (*Lutra lutra*), Denmark**

After suffering serious population declines in the 1960s and '70s, improved water quality and control of exploitation helped a recovery in Denmark from 1984 to 2004, as well as in several other countries.



Note: Data are from Normander et al., 2009.



**Figure 7: Wandering albatross (*Diomedea exulans*), Bird Island, South Georgia, South Atlantic Ocean**

This population has been in steady decline since 1972. The primary cause is believed to be incidental mortality from entanglement in longline fishing equipment. One proposed measure to protect this species is to design and implement longlines that mitigate this bycatch.

Note: Based on unpublished data from the British Antarctic Survey long-term monitoring programme 2012.




© naturepl.com / Doug Perrine / WWF-Canon

## Tropical and Temperate Living Planet Indices

The tropical Living Planet Index declined by just over 60 per cent from 1970 to 2008, while the temperate Living Planet Index increased by 31 per cent over the same period (Figure 8). This difference holds true for mammals, birds, amphibians and fish; for terrestrial, marine and freshwater species (Figures 9-11); and across all tropical and temperate biogeographic realms (Figures 16-20).

Due to the lack of published data prior to 1970, historic changes to biodiversity cannot be captured in the Living Planet Index and so all indices are set to an equal value of one in 1970. However, as described in more detail in the following pages, there has been considerable variation in population trends both between individual species and species that share the same broad habitats.



Recent average population increases do not necessarily mean that temperate ecosystems are in a better state than tropical ecosystems. The observed temperate Living Planet Index trend is the result of four intertwined phenomena: a recent baseline; differences in trajectory between taxonomic groups; notable conservation successes; and recent relative stability in species' populations. If the temperate index extended back centuries rather than decades, it would very likely show a long-term decline at least as great as that of the tropical index in recent years. Conversely, a long-term tropical index would likely show a much slower rate of change prior to 1970.

Populations of some temperate species have increased in recent years due to conservation efforts. These include US wetland birds (BirdLife International, 2008), UK breeding birds, seabirds and overwintering birds (Defra, 2010), and certain cetacean populations, such as the western Arctic population of Bowhead

**Figure 8: The tropical and temperate Living Planet indices**

The tropical index is calculated from terrestrial and freshwater populations from the Afrotropical, Indo-Pacific and Neotropical realms and from marine populations between the Tropics of Cancer and Capricorn. The temperate index is calculated from terrestrial and freshwater populations from the Palaearctic and Nearctic realms, and marine populations found north or south of the tropics. The global tropical index shows a decline of around 61% between 1970 and 2008. The global temperate index shows an increase of around 31% over the same period (WWF/ZSL, 2012).


**Key**

- Temperate Living Planet Index
- Confidence limits
- Tropical Living Planet Index
- Confidence limits

whales (*Balaena mysticetus*), which was estimated at 1,000-3,000 individuals at the end of commercial whaling but has since recovered to an estimated 10,545 individuals in 2001 (Angliss and Outlaw, 2006).

## The Terrestrial Living Planet Index

The global terrestrial Living Planet Index declined by 25 per cent between 1970 and 2008 (Figure 9a). The terrestrial index includes 3,770 populations from 1,432 species of birds, mammals, amphibians and reptiles from a broad range of temperate and tropical habitats, including forests, grasslands and drylands. The tropical terrestrial index declined by almost 45 per cent, while the temperate terrestrial index increased by about 5 per cent (Figure 9b).



**Figure 9: The terrestrial Living Planet Index**


(a) The global terrestrial index shows a decline of around 25% between 1970 and 2008; (b) The temperate terrestrial index shows an increase of about 5%, while the tropical terrestrial index shows a decline of around 44% (WWF/ZSL, 2012).

**Key**

- Global terrestrial index
- Confidence limits

**Key**



- Temperate terrestrial index
- Confidence limits
- Tropical terrestrial index
- Confidence limits



## The Marine Living Planet Index

The marine Living Planet Index declined by more than 20 per cent between 1970 and 2008 (Figure 10a). The marine index includes 2,395 populations of 675 species of fish, seabirds, marine turtles and marine mammals found in temperate and tropical marine pelagic, coastal and reef ecosystems. Approximately half of the species in this index are commercially used.



Marine ecosystems exhibit the largest discrepancy between tropical and temperate species: the tropical marine index shows a decline of around 60 per cent between 1970 and 2008, while the temperate marine index increased by around 50 per cent (Figure 10b). There is evidence that temperate marine and coastal species experienced massive long-term declines over the past few centuries (Lotze *et al.*, 2006; Thurstans *et al.*, 2010); therefore the temperate




marine index started from a much lower baseline in 1970 than the tropical marine index. The relative increase in temperate marine populations since then is likely a reflection of slight recovery from historic lows.

## The Freshwater Living Planet Index

The freshwater Living Planet Index declined more than for any other biome. The index includes 2,849 populations of 737 species of fish, birds, reptiles, amphibians and mammals found in temperate and tropical freshwater lakes, rivers and wetlands. Overall, the global freshwater index declined by 37 per cent between 1970 and 2008 (Figure 11a). The tropical freshwater index declined by a much greater extent, 70 per cent – the largest fall of any of the biome-based indices – while the temperate freshwater index increased by about 35 per cent (Figure 11b).





## Case study: Tigers

Tiger (*Panthera tigris*) numbers are at an all time low. The Living Planet Index for tigers suggests that there has been a rapid decline in tiger populations: on average, a 70 per cent reduction in the last 30 years.

Forced to compete for space in some of the most densely populated regions on Earth, the tiger's range has also declined to just 7 per cent of its former extent (Sanderson *et al.*, 2006). Tigers are listed as Endangered on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN, 2011), and estimates endorsed by the Global Tiger Recovery Programme suggest there are only between 3,200 and 3,500 adult tigers remaining in the wild (Global Tiger Initiative, 2011).

The species is threatened by poaching, retaliatory killings, habitat loss and depletion of its prey base throughout its range. The most pronounced population declines reported in recent years are those located outside of protected areas (Walston *et al.*, 2010). Populations are more stable, and even increasing, where conservation efforts have been most intensive. Many conservation organizations, including WWF and ZSL, are concentrating efforts in the last remaining, most important habitats as the best chance of reversing dramatic declines in the short term. Overall, global efforts aim to double the wild tiger population to at least 6,000 by 2022.

- Monitored sites
- Priority Conservation Areas
- Current range

**Figure 12: Tiger population trends, range and conservation priorities**

(a) Current tiger distribution and recent population trends. Shaded areas denote the current range (light green) (IUCN, 2011); and priority conservation areas (dark green); the red points show the midpoint of each monitored population (time period and survey area varies between studies; the midpoints in Sumatra, Malaysia and South China represent the entire subspecies monitored from several sites), and the graphs show population changes for five of the tiger subspecies. The two trend lines on the graph for the Bengal tiger estimate in India show the result of two different survey methods; (b) A Living Planet Index for tigers. The index shows the average change in the size of 43 populations from 1980 to 2010 (with equal weight given to each of the six subspecies). The baseline is set to an index value of 1 in 1980 due to insufficient population data from the 1970s (WWF / ZSL, 2012).

## Case study: River dolphins


Freshwater cetacean populations are declining rapidly. These dolphins and porpoises live in some of the world's largest rivers, including the Ganges, Indus, Yangtze, Mekong and Amazon, which are also home to an estimated 15 per cent of the planet's people.

Infrastructure development, such as dams, levees and barrages; entanglement in fishing nets; boat strikes; overexploitation of fisheries; and pollution have all contributed to rapid declines in many obligate dolphin (i.e., those that only live in rivers and lakes) populations over the past 30 years, with the likely functional extinction of one species, the Yangtze river dolphin or baiji (*Lipotes vexillifer*) (Turvey *et al.*, 2007; Figure 13). Populations of Irrawaddy dolphin (*Orcaella brevirostris*), found in both marine and freshwater habitats, have also declined. The increasing trend for the Indus river dolphin (*Platanista minor*) may be due to recovery following a ban on hunting, or immigration of dolphins from surrounding areas (Braulik, 2006); however more information is needed on this and all freshwater cetacean species to gain a better understanding of their overall status. Nevertheless, current knowledge indicates that urgent action is needed to prevent these charismatic and still little-understood animals from becoming extinct.



**URGENT ACTION IS NEEDED TO  
PREVENT THESE CHARISMATIC AND  
STILL LITTLE-UNDERSTOOD ANIMALS  
FROM BECOMING EXTINCT**

## Example population trends




**Figure 13: Freshwater cetacean population trends and ranges**  
Current range of freshwater cetacean species and population trends for six species. The shaded area denotes the current range (IUCN, 2011); graphs show example population trends from each species.

## Case study: Atlantic cod

Rapid declines in Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) fisheries are well documented (e.g., Roberts 2007). As a commodity in world trade, this species has been heavily exploited for several centuries (Thurstan *et al.*, 2010). Its economic importance also means that more population information is available than for most species, allowing trends in Atlantic cod stocks to be tracked back to the 1960s. Historical data for some areas go back even further; data from the Nova Scotian Shelf, Canada, for example, were collected in the 1800s.


The Living Planet Index for Atlantic cod suggests that populations have declined by an average of 74 per cent over the past 50 years (Figure 14a). Losses have been greatest in the Northwest Atlantic. The biomass of the Scotian Shelf stock is less than 3 per cent of the pre-industrial fishing level (Rosenberg *et al.*, 2005 and Figure 14c). Most assessments of changes in fish stock abundance do not take long-term historical data into account. Yet this is important because commercial fishing has been taking place for hundreds of years (Rosenberg *et al.*, 2005) and knowledge of historic baselines can aid in setting appropriate targets for recovery. Species like cod were once far more abundant; attempts to rebuild these fisheries should therefore reflect how stocks once were, not just how they appear most recently.



**74%**  
ATLANTIC COD HAS  
DECLINED BY AN  
AVERAGE OF 74 PER  
CENT OVER THE PAST  
50 YEARS



**Figure 14a: Living Planet Index for Atlantic cod**  
The index shows the average change in the size of 25 stocks between 1960 and 2010. The baseline is set to an index value of 1 in 1960 and the final index value in 2010 is 0.26, suggesting an average 74% decline. (WWF/ZSL, 2012)




**Population trend**


- Decline
- Stable
- Increase

**Figure 14b: Atlantic cod population trends**

Atlantic cod distribution and rate of population change. The purple shaded area denotes the probability of occurrence throughout its range (created using AquaMaps: Aquamaps, 2010); circles show the midpoint of each stock monitored with the colour denoting the rate of population change. The length of the time-series ranges from 11 to 50 years between 1960 and 2010.



**Looking back in time**



**Figure 14c: Biomass estimates for Atlantic cod on the Scotian Shelf**  
The blue dot and blue dashed line shows the 1852 stock estimate, with blue shading showing confidence limits; the black dashed line is the estimated carrying capacity of this marine ecosystem from late 20th century data; and the solid blue line on the right shows total biomass estimates from 1970 to 2000 for adult cod, far lower than the historical highs (figure reproduced based on Rosenberg *et al.*, 2005 and personal communication with Andrew Rosenberg and Karen Alexander).

## Biogeographic realms

Biodiversity trends at a regional level can give insights into how animal populations are faring in different parts of the world.

Terrestrial and freshwater populations are assigned to five biogeographic realms (Figure 15), three of which are largely tropical (Indo-Pacific, Afrotropical and Neotropical) and two largely temperate (Palearctic and Nearctic). The Living Planet Index includes species' populations in the Antarctic, however due to a lack of data from this region, it is not yet possible to construct an index for that region alone.

Temperate realms show stable trends, while tropical realms exhibit rapid decline. The Palearctic and Nearctic indices show little change between 1970 and 2008 (Figures 16 and 17). The latter is likely due in part to effective environmental protection and conservation efforts since 1970. Individual populations in the Palearctic realm fared differently: Some, such as seabirds and wintering water birds, increased (for example, some UK wild bird populations: Defra, 2010), while others, such as saiga antelope (*Saiga tatarica*) (Milner-Gulland *et al.*, 2001) and amphibians in central Spain (Bosch and Martinez-Solano, 2006), underwent large-scale decline. The water bird trend may be due in part to better environmental protection since 1970. However, as most data come from Europe, with comparatively little data from northern Asia, trends from individual countries could provide a different picture.

In contrast, the Afrotropical index declined by 38 per cent; the Neotropical index by 50 per cent; and the Indo-Pacific index by 64 per cent (Figures 18, 19 and 20). These declines reflect large-scale forest and other habitat loss across these realms, driven by logging, growing human populations, and agricultural, industrial and urban developments (Craigie *et al.*, 2010; Norris *et al.*, 2010; MEA, 2005; FAO, 2005; Hansen *et al.*, 2008). Tropical forest cover declined most rapidly in Southeast Asia between 1990 and 2005, with an estimated 0.6–0.8 per cent loss per year (FAO, 2005; Hansen *et al.*, 2008). The decline in the Neotropical index also reflects catastrophic declines in amphibian numbers, caused in many cases by the spread of fungal disease.



© Michel Roggo / WWF-Canon







Rio Negro Forest Reserve, Amazonas, Brazil. Flooded forest during rainy season. Aerial view of floating vegetation.

## Biodiversity trends around the world

### What is a biogeographic realm?

Biogeographic realms are regions characterized by distinct assemblages of species. They represent large areas of the Earth's surface separated by major barriers to plant and animal migration – such as oceans, broad deserts and high mountain ranges – where terrestrial species have evolved in relative isolation over long periods of time.

**Figure 15: Global biogeographic realms**



# THE ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINT

The Ecological Footprint tracks humanity's demands on the biosphere by comparing humanity's consumption against the Earth's regenerative capacity, or biocapacity. It does this by calculating the area required to produce the resources people consume, the area occupied by infrastructure, and the area of forest required for sequestering CO<sub>2</sub> not absorbed by the ocean (see Galli *et al.*, 2007; Kitzes *et al.*, 2009 and Wackernagel *et al.*, 2002).


Lights of Chicago city burn brightly, consuming large amounts of electricity, Illinois, United States.



# MEASURING HUMAN DEMAND

National Footprint Accounts (NFAs) track resources for each individual country, which together make up the global Ecological Footprint. They include crops and fish for human food and other uses; timber; and grass and feed crops for livestock. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are currently the only waste product tracked (Figure 21).

Biocapacity quantifies nature's capacity to produce renewable resources, provide land for built-up areas and provide waste absorption services such as carbon uptake. Biocapacity acts as an ecological benchmark against which the Ecological Footprint can be compared. The Ecological Footprint does not directly include water use; however this is intrinsic to biocapacity – as lack of water, or polluted water, has a direct impact on the availability and state of biocapacity. Both the Ecological Footprint and biocapacity are expressed in a common unit called a global hectare, where 1 gha represents a biologically productive hectare with world average productivity. In 2008, the Earth's total biocapacity was 12.0 billion gha, or 1.8 gha per person, while humanity's Ecological Footprint was 18.2 billion gha, or 2.7 gha per person. This discrepancy means it would take 1.5 years for the Earth to fully regenerate the renewable resources that people used in one year.



**Figure 21: Global Ecological Footprint by component, 1961-2008**


The largest component of the Ecological Footprint is the carbon footprint (55%). At a national level the carbon footprint represents more than half the Ecological Footprint for one-quarter of the countries tracked. It is the largest component for approximately half the countries tracked (Global Footprint Network, 2011).

## Key

- Built-up land
- Fishing
- Forest
- Grazing
- Cropland
- Carbon

# Exploring the Ecological Footprint

Every human activity uses biologically productive land and/or fishing grounds. The Ecological Footprint is the sum of these areas, regardless of where they are located on the planet (Figure 22).




## What does “ecological overshoot” mean?

Humanity’s annual demand on the natural world has exceeded what the Earth can renew in a year since the 1970s. This “ecological overshoot” has continued to grow over the years, reaching a 50 per cent deficit in 2008. This means that it takes 1.5 years for the Earth to regenerate the renewable resources that people use, and absorb the CO<sub>2</sub> waste they produce, in that same year.

How can this be possible when there is only one Earth? Just as it is possible to withdraw money from a bank account faster than to wait for the interest this money generates, renewable resources can be harvested faster than they can be re-grown. But just like overdrawing from a bank account, eventually the resource will be depleted. At present, people are often able to shift their sourcing when this happens; however at current consumption rates, these sources will eventually run out of resources too – and some ecosystems will collapse even before the resource is completely gone.

The consequences of excess greenhouse gases that cannot be absorbed by vegetation are already being seen, with rising levels of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> causing increased global temperatures, climate change and ocean acidification. These impacts in turn place additional stresses on biodiversity and ecosystems and the very resources on which people depend.



**Figure 23: Trends in Ecological Footprint and biocapacity per person between 1961 and 2008**

The decline in biocapacity per capita is primarily due to an increase in global population. More people have to share the Earth's resources. The increase in the Earth's productivity is not enough to compensate for the demands of this growing population (Global Footprint Network, 2011).

**1.5 YEARS  
TO GENERATE  
THE RENEWABLE  
RESOURCES USED  
IN 2008**

## Biocapacity and Ecological Footprint trends


The Ecological Footprint is driven by consumer habits and the efficiency with which goods and services can be provided. The growing biocapacity deficit – defined as when a population uses more biocapacity than can be supplied and regenerated in a year – is driven by the combination of high consumption rates that are increasing more rapidly than improvements in efficiency (increasing people's footprint); and populations growing faster than the biosphere's capacity (driving down biocapacity per person).

**Figure 24: Factors driving Ecological Footprint and biocapacity (Global Footprint Network, 2011)**

### Biocapacity factors

**Bioproduction area:** The area available of cropland, grazing land, fishing grounds and forests.

**Bioproduction per hectare:** An area's productivity can vary each year and depends on factors such as ecosystem type, management and health, agricultural practices and weather. Productivity can be enhanced to achieve more biocapacity, however this often comes at the cost of a larger Ecological Footprint. For example, energy-intensive agriculture and heavy reliance on fertilizer may increase yields, but requires increased inputs and generates higher CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.



### Ecological Footprint drivers

**Population growth:** The growing number of consumers is a strong driver behind the increasing global footprint. The human population is forecast to reach 7.8–10.9 billion people by 2050, with a medium estimate of just over 9.3 billion (UN, 2010). Population size also affects the biocapacity available to each person.

**Consumption of goods and services per person:** Different populations consume different quantities of goods and services, primarily based on their income level.


**Footprint Intensity:** The efficiency with which natural resources are converted into goods and services affects the size of the footprint of every product consumed. This varies between countries.

## Mapping the Ecological Footprint


National trends for Ecological Footprint have changed over the years and generally increased. Figure 25 shows the average Ecological Footprint per person per country in 1961 (when National Footprint Accounts started) and again in 2008.

**Figure 25: Changing Ecological Footprint per person**

Global map of national Ecological Footprint per person in (a) 1961 and (b) 2008 (Global Footprint Network, 2011).



1961




2008

Gha per capita

|                   |
|-------------------|
| < 1               |
| 1 - 2             |
| 2 - 3             |
| 3 - 5             |
| 5 - 8             |
| Insufficient data |

## Different countries have different footprints


An individual's Ecological Footprint varies significantly depending on a number of factors, including their country of residence, the quantity of goods and services they consume, the resources used and the wastes generated to provide these goods and services. If all of humanity lived like an average Indonesian, for example, only two-thirds of the planet's biocapacity would be used; if everyone lived like an average Argentinean, humanity would demand more than half an additional planet; and if everyone lived like an average resident of the USA, a total of four Earths would be required to regenerate humanity's annual demand on nature.



## How much of a country's footprint is determined by individuals?


The size of a person's Ecological Footprint depends on development level and wealth, and in part on the choices individuals make on what they eat, what products they purchase and how they travel. But decisions undertaken by governments and businesses have a substantial influence on the Ecological Footprint too. For example, individuals generally have no direct control over the size of the built-up land footprint. The same is true for the way in which a country produces its electricity or the intensity of its agricultural production. This "inherited" part of the Ecological Footprint can be influenced through mechanisms such as political engagement, green technology and innovation, and other work toward large-scale social change. Governments and businesses therefore play an important role in reducing the Ecological Footprint of each person.

World average Ecological Footprint per person was




## Different countries, different biocapacities

Some countries with high biocapacity do not have a large national footprint. Bolivia, for example, has a per capita footprint of 2.6 gha and a per capita biocapacity of 18 gha. However it is worth noting that this biocapacity may well be being exported and utilized by other nations. For example, the Ecological Footprint of a citizen of United Arab Emirates (UAE) is 8.4 gha, but within the country there is only 0.6 gha of biocapacity available per person. The residents of UAE are therefore dependent on the resources of other nations to meet their needs. As resources are becoming more constrained, competition is growing; the disparity between resource-rich and resource-poor nations is highly likely to have strong geopolitical implications in the future.



**Figure 28: Top 10 national biocapacities in 2008**


Ten countries accounted for more than 60% of the Earth's total biocapacity in 2008. This includes five of the six BRIICS countries: Brazil, Russia, India, Indonesia and China (Global Footprint Network, 2011).



## A focus on emerging economies: BRIICS countries

The rapid economic expansion of Brazil, Russia, India, Indonesia, China and South Africa – the so-called BRIICS group – merit special attention when looking at the Ecological Footprint and the pressure on biocapacity. High population growth in the BRIICS group along with increasing average consumption per person are contributing to an economic transformation. As a result, the BRIICS economies are expanding more rapidly than those of high-income countries. This growth will bring important social benefits to these countries. The challenge, however, is to do this sustainably.




Figure 30 highlights BRIICS countries' consumption trends by showing the Ecological Footprint associated with the direct expenditure of an average individual or resident (also known as "household consumption") broken down into five categories: food, housing, transport, goods and services. (More information about the Consumption Land Use Matrix – or CLUM – models on which these figures are based can be found in the glossary at the back of this report). Citizens of lower-income BRIICS countries have a far larger proportion of their footprint associated with direct expenditure on food than they do on other categories. In Brazil, India and Indonesia, food accounts for more than 50 per cent of the total household footprint. The remaining portion is split almost equally among goods, transportation and housing. As the BRIICS nations become wealthier, and the average Ecological Footprint increases, consumption patterns increasingly mirror high-income countries. South Africa and China, for example, are moving toward a more equal split between each of the consumption categories, indicative of industrialisation and increased income.



**Figure 30: Breakdown of the per capita household Ecological Footprint as a percentage of the USA in 2008 in BRIICS countries – based on the Ecological Footprint associated with the direct household expenditure on food, housing maintenance and operations, personal transportation, goods, and services (Global Footprint Network, 2011).**

*Breakdown of per capita Ecological Footprint*

- Food
- Housing
- Transportation
- Goods
- Services



# POPULATION, URBANIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT


The growing human population will clearly impact on biodiversity and the size of humanity's Ecological Footprint. However the impact of population on the state of the planet is not just about absolute numbers: Each person's consumption of goods and services, as well as the resources used and waste generated in providing these goods and services, also play a role.

Nanjing Road, Shanghai, China.



# POPULATION, DEVELOPMENT AND URBANIZATION

Human population dynamics are a major driving force behind environmental pressure. One aspect of this is the overall size of the global population, which has more than doubled since 1950 – to 7 billion in 2011 and is forecast to reach just over 9.3 billion people by 2050 (UN, 2010; median estimate). Much of this increase is projected to come from countries with high fertility – primarily in Africa and Asia, but also in Latin America and North America (UNFPA, 2011; Figure 31).



## Population, income and Ecological Footprint

On a global scale, both population and the average per capita footprint have increased since 1961. However, the relative contribution of each to the overall increased Ecological Footprint is different in different regions (Figure 33).

The largest per capita increases between 1961 and 2008 were in the European Union and the Middle East/Central Asia, which increased by 1.2 and 1.1 gha per person, respectively. Despite North America having a smaller increase (0.6 gha per person), it maintained the highest regional footprint over this period (7.1 gha per capita).

**Figure 31: Regional and global population growth between 1950 and 2100**

Projected population by region, medium variant between 1950 and 2011 (UNFPA, 2011). In 2011, the global population reached 7 billion people. Based on estimated birth rates, Asia will remain the most populous region during the 21<sup>st</sup> century, but Africa will gain ground as its population more than triples, passing from 1 billion in 2011 to 3.6 billion in 2100. Africa's population has been growing at 2.3% per year, more than double the rate of Asia's population (1% per year). The rate of population growth is expected to slow after 2050. Note that in this figure, Asia includes the Middle East and Oceania is displayed separately.


### Key

- Oceania
- Northern America
- Latin America & The Caribbean
- Europe
- Asia
- Africa



**Figure 32: Global geographic groupings**

In the Asia-Pacific region, the footprint grew by 0.6 gha per person, but more significantly the population doubled from 1.6 billion people in 1961 to 3.7 billion in 2008. Similarly, although the average per person footprint in Africa decreased by 0.07 gha per person between 1961 and 2008, rapid population growth led to a much larger overall footprint, over triple the value of 1961.




**Figure 33: Ecological Footprint by geographic grouping, in 1961 and 2008**

Change in the average footprint per person and population for each of the world's regions (Figure 32). The area within each bar represents the total footprint for each region (Global Footprint Network, 2011).

### Key

- Northern America
- EU
- Other Europe
- Latin America
- Middle East/ Central Asia
- Asia-Pacific
- Africa




## People with different incomes have different footprints

The per capita Ecological Footprint of high-income nations dwarfs that of low- and middle-income countries. High-income countries have historically had the most rapid increase in per capita footprint. This was principally due to growth in the carbon component of the per capita footprint – by 1.6 times between 1961 and 1970.


In contrast, middle- and low-income countries had demanded less than the average per capita biocapacity available globally, until 2006 when middle-income countries exceeded this value.

Middle-income countries include many of the world's emerging economies, including the BRIICS countries: Brazil, Russia, India, Indonesia, China and South Africa. Overall, population has more than doubled since 1961, while the footprint per person has increased by 65 per cent, largely associated with increased industrialization. Although population growth is slowing in some places, further population increases, together with a rise of middle class consumption patterns in emerging economies, have the potential to increase humanity's global footprint dramatically in the near future.

The citizens of low-income countries have, on average, a smaller footprint today than they had in 1961 – a reduction of 0.01 gha per person. However, rapid population growth in these countries (4.3 times, since 1961) has led to an overall 323 per cent increase in the total Ecological Footprint of low-income countries since 1961.



**Figure 35: Changes in the Ecological Footprint per person in high-, middle- and low-income countries between 1961 and 2008**  
The black line represents world average biocapacity in 2008 (Global Footprint Network, 2011).



**Figure 34: Countries in high, middle and low income categories**

Key

- High Income
- Middle Income
- Low Income

**THE ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINT OF LOW-INCOME COUNTRIES HAS INCREASED BY 323 PER CENT SINCE 1961 DUE TO RAPID POPULATION GROWTH**



## THE LIVING PLANET INDEX FOR LOW-INCOME COUNTRIES HAS DECLINED BY 60 PER CENT

The Living Planet Index shows that declines in biodiversity are greatest in low-income countries. The analyses presented earlier in this report show strong geographic differences in biodiversity loss, particularly between tropical and temperate regions. To demonstrate that these differences are not only geographic or biophysical in nature, species' population data (except for marine populations in international waters) were divided into three country income categories (see "Country Income Categories" in Annex 3).

The Living Planet Index for high-income countries shows an increase of 7 per cent between 1970 and 2008 (Figure 36). This is likely to be due to a combination of factors, not least of which being that these nations are able to purchase and import resources from lower-income countries, thereby simultaneously degrading the biodiversity in those countries while maintaining the remaining biodiversity and ecosystems in their own "back yard".

In stark contrast, the index for middle-income countries has declined by 31 per cent, and most alarmingly the index for low-income countries has declined by 60 per cent. The trend in low-income countries is potentially catastrophic, not just for biodiversity but also for the people living there. While everyone depends ultimately on the biodiversity that provides ecosystem services and natural assets, the impact of environmental degradation is felt most directly by the world's poorest people, particularly by rural populations, and forest and coastal communities. Without access to land, clean water, adequate food, fuel and materials; vulnerable people cannot break out of the poverty trap and prosper.

**Figure 36: Living Planet Index by country income group**  
The index shows a 7% increase in high-income countries, a 31% decline in middle-income countries and a 60% decline in low-income countries between 1970 and 2008 (WWF/ZSL, 2012).



## Expanding cities, increasing footprints


More than 50 per cent of the global population now lives in urban areas. This figure is expected to increase, as the world is rapidly urbanizing, particularly in Asia and Africa. Urbanization usually comes in tandem with increasing income, which in turn leads to growing Ecological Footprints, particularly through growth in carbon emissions (Poumanyvong and Kaneko, 2010). For example, the average Ecological Footprint of a Beijing resident is nearly three times larger than the China average (Hubacek *et al.*, 2009).

Globally, urban residents are already responsible for more than 70 per cent of the fossil fuel related CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. However, well planned cities can also reduce direct carbon emissions by good management of the density and availability of collective transport. For example, per capita emissions in New York City are 30 per cent less than the United States average (Dodman, 2009).

According to forecasts, the global urban population will almost double to 6 billion by 2050 (UNFPA, 2007) and US\$350 trillion will be spent globally on urban infrastructure and usage over the next three decades. If this investment follows “business as usual”, this growth will appropriate more than half of humanity’s carbon budget for the next 90 years – in just 30 years (WWF, 2010b; Höhne and Moltmann, 2009).


### The growth of small cities

Cities with fewer than 1 million inhabitants already account for more than 60 per cent of urban dwellers globally (UNFPA, 2007). Figure 37 shows that the bulk of urban population growth will not occur in well-known and mature megacities such as Beijing, London, Los Angeles, Mexico City and Mumbai (all with more than 10 million people). Instead, it will occur in smaller cities (fewer than 1 million). For example, the population of Gaborone, the capital of Botswana, rose from 17,700 in 1971 to more than 186,000 in 2007. By 2020, its population is expected to exceed 500,000.



**Figure 37: Projected urban population growth rates by city size (2009-2025)**

Source: UN Population Division; Booz & Company analysis (WWF, 2010b).




## IN 2050, TWO OUT OF EVERY THREE PEOPLE WILL LIVE IN A CITY (UN, 2009)

TODAY'S URBAN POPULATION:

**3,307,905,000**

**Figure 38: The number of people living in cities in each country of the world in 2010, together with the percentage of the population in countries with large urban populations.**

In the developed world, the proportion of people living in cities is typically higher than 75%, and often exceeds 85%. The largest urban population in the developed world is in the USA (246 million). However, in China, even though the proportion of people living in cities is under 50%, the total number of urban dwellers is greatest (559 million). In India, by comparison, the number is 329 million (UN population division). (Figure drawn by the World Business Council for Sustainable Development in WBCSD, 2012, based on data from the UN Population Division UN, 2010)




## Ecological Footprint and sustainable development

Is a high level of consumption necessary for a high level of development? Currently the most widely used indicator for development is the United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) Human Development Index (HDI) which – by combining per capita income, life expectancy and educational attainment – compares countries' economic and social development (UNDP, 2009). For the latest report see, UNDP, 2011). The world's average HDI has increased by 41 per cent since 1970, reflecting large improvements in life expectancy, school enrolment, literacy and income.

Some low-income countries are able to increase their HDI at a relatively fast rate, primarily because they have such a small HDI in the first place and can rapidly capitalize on many improvements that can be implemented. However, some low-income nations are stagnated at their current HDI level (for example, Zimbabwe). The tendency is for the transitional economies to have the largest improvements in their HDI. Figure 39 below shows the HDI of each country plotted against its Ecological Footprint.

Like all averages, the HDI conceals disparities in human development in individual countries and does not take into account other important variables, such as inequality.



**Figure 39: The Ecological Footprint for each country versus the Human Development Index, 2008**

The dot representing each country are coloured according to their geographic region and are scaled relative to its population. The shading in the background of this figure and in figure 40 indicates the HDI thresholds for low, medium, high and very high human development and are based on UNDP, 2010 (Global Footprint Network, 2011).

**Key**


- Northern America
- EU
- Other Europe
- Latin America
- Middle East/ Central Asia
- Asia-Pacific
- Africa

World average biocapacity per person in 2008

Meets minimum criteria for sustainability

**Figure 40: The Ecological Footprint for each country (in 2008) versus the Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index (in 2011)**

The Inequality-adjusted HDI (IHDI) accounts for inequality in each of the three dimensions of the HDI – education, life expectancy and income per capita – by “discounting” the average value of each one according to its level of inequality. Therefore, although the general shape of this graph is the same as in Figure 39, many countries have moved to the left. Countries with less human development tend to have greater inequality in more dimensions – and thus see larger losses in their HDI value. Note: The development thresholds are the same in both this figure and Figure 39 to make it easier to compare the two of them. The IHDI values shown here are from 2011 – for more information see UNDP, 2011 (Global Footprint Network, 2011).





## THE WATER FOOTPRINT

The Water Footprint provides a global indicator of both direct and indirect freshwater use. The focus on freshwater is important because it is scarce; making up only 2.5 per cent of the water on the planet, 70 per cent of which is locked up in the ice and snow of mountainous regions, the Arctic and Antarctic. Whereas the Ecological Footprint calculates the amount of biocapacity (global hectares) needed to sustain a population, the Water Footprint of Production represents the volume of freshwater (in cubic metres per year,  $m^3/y$ ) used directly or indirectly to produce goods and services.

Crops on a farm are watered using irrigation equipment.


# THE WATER FOOTPRINT

The average global Water Footprint between 1996 and 2005 was over 9,000 billion m<sup>3</sup> per year; with agricultural production accounting for 92 per cent of this total. Although out-of-sight, rainwater stored in soil (Green Water Footprint) was by far the largest Water Footprint component (74 per cent), while blue water resources accounted for 11 per cent (Hoekstra and Mekonnen, 2012). The Water Footprint can be presented as a single number, or be broken down into its different components (Figure 41).

**Figure 41: Three ways of presenting the Water Footprint**

(a) In total and broken down into its three components; (b) Calculated for specific areas, such as a river basin, and (c) during different times in the year (adapted from Chapagain A.K. and Tickner, 2011; global Water Footprint data from Hoekstra and Mekonnen, 2012).


## a. Total Water Footprint of global production (9087 billion m<sup>3</sup>/yr)



## b. Water Footprints can be calculated for different locations (e.g., x, y, z)



## c. Water Footprints can now be calculated for different times of the year




AT LEAST 2.7 BILLION PEOPLE LIVE IN RIVER BASINS THAT EXPERIENCE SEVERE WATER SCARCITY DURING AT LEAST ONE MONTH OF THE YEAR

## Blue Water Footprint Versus Blue Water Availability



At least 2.7 billion people live in river basins that experience severe water scarcity during at least one month of the year. To provide a more refined insight into water availability and demand than is generally considered, a recent study (Hoekstra *et al.*, 2012) has analysed the monthly Blue Water Footprint of 405 major river basins, in which 65 per cent of the global population reside. A precautionary approach was taken based on natural flows (the estimated flow through the river basin before any water is taken out), and the presumed environmental flow requirement (the amount of water needed to maintain the integrity of freshwater ecosystems), assumed to be 80 per cent of monthly natural run-off (Richter *et al.*, 2011).

If more than 20 per cent of the natural flow is being used by people, then the Blue Water Footprint is greater than the amount of blue water available and water stress will occur. Figure 42 shows the number of months during the year in which blue water scarcity exceeded 100 per cent in the world's major river basins between 1996 and 2005; meaning that, during these months, more than 20 per cent of the natural flow is being used by people.




Water scarcity depends on the amount of water available and levels of consumption in a river basin, not only the absolute size of the Blue Water Footprint. For example, even though the Blue Water Footprint is not particularly large in eastern European and Asian river basins in February or March, these basins (including the Dniepr, Don, Volga, Ural, Ob, Balkhash and Amur) experience high water scarcity in these months as the river flows are low during this period (Figure 43).

Industrial and domestic water supply is impacted if water flows cannot be maintained. In the Yellow and Tarim river basins in China, the most severe water scarcity is in early spring, when run-off is low and water demand for irrigation is high. South Africa's Orange and Limpopo river basins experience water scarcity in September and October, and the Mississippi River basin in the US in August and September, when the Blue Water Footprint is highest and run-off is lowest (Hoekstra *et al.*, 2012). A careful water allocation mechanism that takes into account current and predicted future water uses and environmental requirements on monthly basis, not on the basis of annual averages, is therefore necessary.



**Figure 43: Water scarcity in the world's major river basins in February and June**


Light blue shading indicates low water scarcity, meaning that presumed environmental flow requirements are not compromised and monthly run-off is unmodified or only slightly modified; bright blue shading indicates moderate water scarcity (i.e., the Blue Water Footprint is 20-30% of natural run-off) and environmental flow requirements are not fully met; dark blue shading indicates significant water scarcity (i.e., the Blue Water Footprint is 30-40% of natural run-off); purple shading indicates severe water scarcity (i.e., the Blue Water Footprint exceeds 40% of natural run-off). The differences in water scarcity in the two months for many river basins highlights the importance of understanding water scarcity at monthly time scales (Hoekstra *et al.*, 2012).



Recently, for the first time, the Water Footprint Network has been able to estimate the Blue Water Footprint at a high spatial resolution (at 5 by 5 arc minutes, which is a grid of about 9km by 9km at the equator and decreasing gradually toward the poles), on a monthly basis. This detail of data on water availability throughout the year at river basin level provides water planners and users with an important planning tool to ensure they make the most of this vital renewable resource. One example is given here and more can be found in Hoekstra *et al.*, 2012.

## Tigris-Euphrates Basin


The Tigris-Euphrates River Basin extends over four countries: Turkey, Syria, Iraq and Iran. Almost all of the run-off in the two rivers is generated in the highlands of the northern and eastern parts of the basin in Turkey, Iraq and Iran. Precipitation in the basin is largely confined to the winter months of October to April, with high waters occurring from March to May – as snow melts in the highlands. The typical low water season occurs from June to December. The basin faces severe water scarcity for five months of the year (June to October). Most of the Blue Water Footprint (52 per cent) is due to evaporation of irrigation water in agriculture, mostly for wheat, barley and cotton.



**Figure 44: Water scarcity over the year for the Tigris-Euphrates Basin (monthly average for the period 1996-2005)** The river run-off is divided into four zones – green, bright blue, dark blue and white – based on presumptive environmental flow requirements. The actual Blue Water Footprint is plotted over this hydrograph as a solid thick red line. If the line falls in the green zone, the water scarcity is low, meaning that there is no abstraction from the environmental quota. However, if it moves up into the bright blue, dark blue or white zones, water scarcity becomes moderate, significant or severe in that part of the year.

## CHAPTER 2: WHY WE SHOULD CARE

A satellite image features the heart-shaped northern tip of the western half of the Large Aral Sea (or South Aral Sea) in Central Asia. Once the world's fourth-largest inland body of water, the Aral Sea has been steadily shrinking over the past 50 years since the rivers that fed it were diverted for irrigation. In 2005, a dam was built between the sea's northern and southern sections to help improve water resource management and reverse the man-made environmental disaster. The dam allowed the river to feed the northern Aral, which has begun to recover. It hasn't solved the entire problem though, as the southern section is expected to dry out completely by 2020. The whitish area surrounding the lakebed is a vast salt plain, now called the Aralkum Desert, left behind by the evaporating sea. It comprises some 40,000 sq km zone of dry, white salt and mineral terrain. Each year violent sandstorms pick up at least 150,000 tonnes of salt and sand from Aralkum and transport them across hundreds of kilometres, causing severe health problems for the local population and making regional winters colder and summers hotter.




# LINKING BIODIVERSITY, ECOSYSTEM SERVICES AND PEOPLE

Biodiversity is vital for human health and livelihoods. Living organisms – plants, animals and microorganisms – interact to form complex, interconnected webs of ecosystems and habitats, which in turn supply a myriad of ecosystem services upon which all life depends. Although technology can replace some ecosystem services and buffer against their degradation, many cannot be replaced.

Understanding the interactions between biodiversity, ecosystem services and people is fundamental to reversing the trends outlined in Chapter 1 and achieving the better choices presented in Chapter 4 – and so safeguarding the future security, health and well-being of human societies.

All human activities make use of ecosystem services – but can also put pressure on the biodiversity that supports these systems.

Recent scientific analyses (Naidoo *et al.*, 2008; Larsen *et al.*, 2011; Strassburg *et al.*, 2010) show a measurable correspondence between ecosystem services and biodiversity, while global analyses such as The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB), the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) and the Stern Report underline how humanity is wholly reliant on well functioning ecosystems to supply essential services (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005a; b; c; Stern, 2006; TEEB, 2010).



**Figure 45:**  
Interconnections between people,  
biodiversity, ecosystem health and  
provision of ecosystem services



## MARGARET'S STORY

For many people living in the industrialized and urban regions, “nature” is a place to visit. Food comes from shops, and water from the tap. But for a large part of the planet’s population, the connection to nature and its services is more direct. The livelihood opportunities of Margaret Wanjiru Mundia, a farmer in central Kenya, depend directly on the natural environment surrounding her. But her needs are the same as those of city dwellers. And all of these needs find their origin in what nature provides. Can understanding Margaret’s challenges and hopes help us better understand the risks and opportunities facing our planet?


# FORESTS: CARBON STORAGE AND CLIMATE

The carbon storage service provided by the world's forests is vital for climate stabilization. The amount of carbon stored in different forests varies: Tropical forests store the most carbon, with current estimates suggesting the above-ground biomass stores of these forests is 247 Gt C (Chavez *et al.*, 2008; Lewis *et al.*, 2009; Malhi *et al.*, 2006; UNEP, 2010), which is five times more than the current global carbon emissions of 47 Gt per year (UNEP, 2010). Almost half of this above-ground carbon is in the forests of Latin America, 26 per cent in Asia, and 25 per cent in Africa (Saatchi *et al.*, 2011) (see Figure 46).

The vast northern boreal conifer and broadleaved forests are also important carbon stores (Potapov *et al.*, 2008). Temperate forests have been decimated over the centuries, but are now expanding in Europe and the United States, and so are building carbon stores (FAO, 2010a). In some parts of the world, forests grow on peatlands, where there can be more carbon in the soil than in the forest (Malhi *et al.*, 1999).

Recognizing the importance of forests in climate stabilization, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is currently negotiating a mechanism known as REDD+ to address some of the impacts addressed in the previous section. If agreed, REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Degradation and Deforestation) would provide a strong incentive for developing countries to conserve their forests while safeguarding against

**DEFORESTATION AND FOREST DEGRADATION DRIVE CLIMATE CHANGE**  
**CLIMATE CHANGE IN TURN CAN DAMAGE FORESTS AND THE SERVICES THEY PROVIDE**



**Figure 46: Regional patterns of forest above-ground biomass in tropical forests**


This map illustrates regional patterns and provides methodologically comparable estimates of forest above-ground biomass (circa 2000) for 75 tropical countries (Saatchi *et al.*, 2011).

Above ground biomass (Mg/ha)

|           |
|-----------|
| 0 - 25    |
| 26 - 50   |
| 51 - 75   |
| 76 - 100  |
| 101 - 150 |
| 151 - 200 |
| 201 - 250 |
| 251 - 300 |
| 301 - 350 |
| 351 - 400 |
| >400      |

biodiversity loss, ensuring the livelihoods of forest dependent peoples and investing in low carbon paths to sustainable development (WWF, 2011c). The proposed REDD+ policy mechanism needs to contain important safeguards to ensure that carbon conservation does not harm biodiversity and that livelihoods for people are not compromised by REDD+ actions to conserve forest carbon.

Conservation actions aimed at conserving carbon in forests include avoiding forest fragmentation; preventing conversion of old-growth natural and semi-natural forests into industrial agricultural and tree farms (plantations); encouraging sustainable use and responsible forest management; conserving forests within protected areas; improving forest connectivity; managing natural disturbance regimes such as fires; preventing and when necessary controlling invasive species; and slowing climate change.



**Figure 47: Generalized model of forest transition that outlines some of the challenges associated with REDD+ in different countries**

This figure presents an empirical model of forest cover change over time in response to economic development. Different REDD+ challenges are also highlighted; starting from the need to reduce forest degradation and deforestation in the early stages of forest transition (Stage 1) and even more importantly as deforestation proceeds (Stage 2). Following deforestation, forest cover tends to regrow or is replanted and climate benefits mainly arise from continued conservation, carbon stock enhancement and afforestation and reforestation (Stage 3). (Modified from Wertz-Kanounnikoff and Kongphan-apira, 2009. Note that Meyfroidt and Lambin, 2011, contest that forest transitions follow generic pathways. They state that countries do not follow a predictable sequence of forest cover change).

## Overlaying carbon and biodiversity

The world's forests are being cleared and degraded through various human activities, releasing greenhouse gases, especially CO<sub>2</sub>, into the atmosphere. Globally, around 13 million ha of forest were lost each year between 2000 and 2010 (FAO, 2010a). Deforestation and forest degradation currently account for up to 20 per cent of global anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the third-largest source after coal and oil (IPCC, 2007a). This makes forest conservation a vital strategy in global efforts to drastically cut greenhouse gas emissions.


Recognizing areas that have important biodiversity and ecosystem services values can help to identify where conservation is important for society and economic development. In the case of carbon storage, Strassburg *et al.*, 2010 used global data sets on terrestrial biodiversity and carbon storage to map and investigate potential synergies between management aimed at both carbon and biodiversity conservation. A strong association between carbon stocks and species' richness suggests that such synergies are high but unevenly distributed. Many areas of high value for biodiversity could be protected by carbon management policies, and others could receive complementary funding due to their carbon stock. However, not all high-biodiversity regions would benefit from carbon-focused conservation, and some areas important for biodiversity could come under increased pressure if forest carbon conservation is implemented without considering biodiversity.

Such studies have important policy implications. They provide guidance on places where ecosystem services should be sustained alongside biodiversity because of the importance of ecosystem services for society and economic development. More specifically, conserving the carbon content of tropical forests and working to reduce tropical deforestation and degradation, is a major global strategy for the UNFCCC and its REDD+ policy mechanism.

### Definitions of deforestation and degradation

WWF uses the following definition of degradation: "Secondary forest that has been lost through human activities; its structure, function, and species' composition or production normally associated with the forest type expected at that site. Hence, degradation delivers a decreasing supply of goods and services from the given site and maintains only limited biodiversity." (Source: Convention of Biological Diversity).

There are different estimations of the percentage contribution of deforestation and degradation to global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions: for example, 20% (IPCC, 2007); 12% of total anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and 15% if peat degradation is included (van der Werf *et al.*, 2009).



© Roger Leguen / WWF-Carriacou

Matécho forest near Saül in the centre of French Guiana. Tree distribution showing disturbances, old and new. The gaps will be filled in once new trees, such as those in the foreground, are growing.

# FORESTS: PROVIDERS OF WOOD FUEL

In addition to climate regulating services, the world's forests provide essential provisioning services for billions of people, including the supply of fuel, timber, fibre, food and medicines. Across much of the developing world, for example, the primary way in which people cook and keep warm is by burning woody biomass from their local environment. The two regions most dependant on wood fuel are Asia and Africa, which together account for 75 per cent of global use (World Resources Institute, 2011).

In Africa, 80–90 per cent of rural energy comes from wood fuel obtained within a few kilometres of people's homes (Chomitz *et al.*, 2007). More than 70 per cent of the urban population rely on wood fuel for cooking, mainly charcoal (DeFries *et al.*, 2010; Mwampamba, 2007; WWF, 2011b). Charcoal is an increasingly popular wood fuel among urban dwellers. Produced from natural woodlands and forests, and transported to towns for sale, millions of tonnes of charcoal enter cities in developing countries every year. Much of this charcoal production is unsustainable (Ahrends *et al.*, 2010), leading to net deforestation and forest degradation, additional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, and thus to climate change, as well as significant biodiversity loss. Although wood can be a sustainable resource, this level of demand, coupled with growing populations, is having a major impact on forests throughout the continent.

## Case study: Wood fuel impacts on biodiversity

Forest degradation is expanding in waves from Africa's major cities, leading to significant forest degradation and loss of forest biodiversity.

In Tanzania, for example, logging has advanced 120km from Dar es Salaam in just 14 years, depleting all high-value timber trees within 200km of the city. This first wave of degradation was followed by a second that removed medium-value timber, and a third that consumed the remaining woody biomass for charcoal production.

Moving away from the city at a speed of around 9km per year, these degradation waves have severely impacted biodiversity and ecosystem services. Forests close to the city contain 70 per cent fewer tree species (Figure 48) and store 90 per cent less carbon per hectare than less disturbed forests 200km away (Ahrends *et al.*, 2010).

**75%**  
ASIA AND AFRICA  
TOGETHER ACCOUNT  
FOR 75 PER CENT  
OF GLOBAL USE OF  
WOOD FUEL




The progressive removal of high-value trees and the increasing distance travelled to locate fresh supplies suggest a “logging down the timber value” scenario akin to the “fishing down the food web” pattern observed in the oceans. A lack of affordable alternatives for charcoal and rising demand for construction timber means that in the absence of sustainable fuel sources, forest degradation will continue to expand from Africa's growing cities.

**Figure 48: Waves of forest degradation spreading out from Dar es Salaam (DES) between 1991 and 2005**


Map of the degradation waves of dominant forest use in the study area in 1991 and 2005. Charcoal burning has moved a road distance of 30km from DES in this time period, and medium-value timber logging has moved 160km (Ahrends *et al.*, 2010).


### Key

- Dominant forest use charcoal burning
- Dominant forest use logging of low/medium-value timber
- Dominant forest use logging of high-value timber



**Figure 49: Biodiversity impact of logging around Dar es Salaam**  
The impact on biodiversity, indicating how species richness increases with distance from DES. Forests further away from the city are less impacted by logging and cutting for charcoal production and so are more species rich than those closer to it (Ahrends *et al.*, 2010).





## ENERGY TO BURN

Margaret occupies an interesting spot on the spectrum of energy use. Like 2.7 billion others, she cooks and heats water with wood and charcoal. She is planting trees on her property to ensure a source of fuel wood. Margaret also has a small solar panel that allows her to read her Bible and charge her mobile phone.

Could renewable energy leapfrog fossil fuels in developing nations, in the same way that mobile phones leapfrogged landlines, providing people like Margaret with energy security, a healthier smoke-free kitchen and reducing the pressure on nearby forests?



# RIVERS: IMPACTED BY INFRASTRUCTURE

Freshwater ecosystems occupy approximately 1 per cent of the Earth's surface yet are home to around 10 per cent of all known animal species (Abramovitz, 1996; McAllister *et al.*, 1997). By virtue of their position in the landscape, these ecosystems connect terrestrial and coastal marine biomes and provide services vital to the health and stability of human communities, including fisheries, water for agricultural and domestic use, hydrological flow regulation, navigation and trade, pollution control and detoxification services (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005c). But numerous pressures, including land use change, water use, infrastructure development, pollution and global climate change, working individually and collectively, are impinging on the health of rivers and lakes around the world.

The rapid development of water management infrastructure – such as dams, dykes, levees and diversion channels – have left very few rivers entirely free flowing. Of the approximately 177 rivers greater than 1,000km in length, only around a third remain free flowing and without dams on their main channel (WWF, 2006a). While clearly this infrastructure provides benefits at one level, such as hydropower or irrigation, there is often a hidden cost to aquatic ecosystems and the wider ecosystem services that they provide.

In order to sustain the wealth of natural processes provided by freshwater ecosystems – such as sediment transport and nutrient delivery, which are vital to farmers in floodplains and deltas; migratory connectivity, vital to inland fisheries; and flood storage, vital to downstream cities – it is imperative to appreciate the importance of free flowing rivers, and developing infrastructure with a basin-wide vision.

OF THE APPROXIMATELY  
177 RIVERS GREATER  
THAN 1,000 KM IN  
LENGTH, ONLY  
AROUND A THIRD  
REMAIN FREE FLOWING



© Michel Gunther / WWF-Canon

The Yangtze River is home to some of China's most spectacular natural scenery, a series of canyons the Qutang Gorge, Wuxia Gorge and Xiling Gorge, collectively known as the Sanxia, or Three Gorges. Coursing over a distance of 6,380 kilometers, the mighty Yangtze is the longest river in China and the third longest in the world after the Amazon in South America and the Nile in Africa. It is also a cradle of ancient Chinese civilization.

# OCEANS: SOURCE OF FOOD, ENERGY AND MATERIALS

The world's oceans provide critical services for billions of people, but are threatened by overexploitation, greenhouse gas emissions and pollution. Oceans supply fish and other seafood that form a major source of protein for billions of people, and provide seaweed and marine plants used for the manufacture of food, chemicals, energy and construction materials. Marine habitats such as mangroves, coastal marshes and reefs, form critical buffers against storms and tsunamis and store significant quantities of carbon. Some, especially coral reefs, support important tourism industries. Ocean waves, winds and currents offer considerable potential for creating sustainable energy supplies. These services have a huge value in terms of direct food production, providing incomes and by preventing loss and damage to property, land, human life and economic activities.

Over the past 100 years, however, the use of the sea and its services has intensified, from fishing and aquaculture, to tourism and shipping, oil and gas extraction and seabed mining.

## Fisheries: Impacts on marine ecosystems

The consequences of increased fishing intensity have been dramatic for the marine environment. Between 1950 and 2005, "industrial" fisheries expanded from the coastal waters of the North Atlantic and Northwest Pacific southward into the high seas and the Southern Hemisphere.

Improved fishing technology allowed deep-sea trawling, purse seining and long-lining in waters several kilometres deep, reaching populations that are long lived, late maturing and very sensitive to overfishing. One-third of the world's oceans and two-thirds of continental shelves are now exploited by fisheries, with only inaccessible waters in the Arctic and Antarctic remaining relatively unexploited.


A nearly five-fold increase in global catch, from 19 million tonnes in 1950 to 87 million tonnes in 2005 (Swartz *et al.*, 2010), has left many fisheries overexploited (FAO, 2010b). In some areas fish stocks have collapsed, such as the cod fisheries of the Grand Banks of Newfoundland (FAO, 2010b). Catch rates of some species of large predatory fishes – such as marlin, tuna and billfish – have dramatically declined over the last 50 years, particularly in coastal areas of the North Atlantic and the North Pacific (Tremblay-Boyer



OCEAN ACIDITY HAS  
INCREASED BY 30%  
SINCE THE INDUSTRIAL  
REVOLUTION

*et al.*, 2011). This continuing trend also applies to sharks and other marine species.

Targeted fishing of top predators has changed whole ecological communities, with increasing abundance of smaller marine animals at lower trophic levels as a consequence of the larger species being removed. This in turn has an impact on the growth of algae and coral health.



### Key

- [Blue square] At least 10% PPR extraction
- [Orange square] At least 20% PPR extraction
- [Red square] At least 30% PPR extraction


*PPR is a value that describes the total amount of food a fish needs to grow within a certain region.*

**Figure 51: The expansion and impact of world fishing fleets in a) 1950 and b) 2006**

The maps show the geographical expansion of world fishing fleets from 1950 to 2006 (the latest available data). Since 1950, the area fished by global fishing fleets has increased ten-fold. By 2006 100 million km<sup>2</sup>, around 1/3 of the ocean surface, was already heavily impacted by fishing. To measure how intensively these areas are fished, Swartz *et al.*, (2010) used the fish landed in each country to calculate the primary production rate (PPR) of each region of the ocean. PPR is a value that describes the total amount of food a fish needs to grow within a certain region. In the areas in blue, the fleet extracted at least 10% of this energy. Orange indicates a minimum of 20% extraction and red shows least 30%, highlighting the most intensively and potentially overfished, areas. WWF and the Sea Around Us project collaborated to produce an animated map showing these changes over time and also the expansion of the EU fishing fleet, see [http://www.wwf.eu/fisheries/cfp-reform/external\\_dimension/](http://www.wwf.eu/fisheries/cfp-reform/external_dimension/)

# GIVE TO GET

As competition for land increases, it is all about improving efficiency and preventing negative impacts on the natural environment. In many cases there are win-win solutions for people and nature. In April 2010, Margaret reoriented her farm and implemented basic conservation measures to improve soil and water retention. Her yields shot up, while run-off into the Turasha River dropped. Her neighbours have taken note, and are making the same changes on their land. With increased productivity, the same farms are supporting more people. Margaret, a farmer with virtually no safety net, took a chance on change. It's time for others to be as brave.



# SCRAMBLE FOR LAND: COMPETING CLAIMS AND COMMERCIAL PRESSURE

Land use decisions are invariably complex, involving many stakeholders with different priorities. Productive land may be simultaneously in demand by communities (e.g., homelands and sacred sites), or for food production, forest products, biodiversity conservation, urban development or carbon storage. Renewable energy demands add an extra dimension, through use of land for bioenergy feedstock production. The situation is further complicated by the interdependence between the production and consumption of key resources such as food, fibre, energy and water. Agriculture requires land, water and energy; water extraction and distribution require energy; and energy production often requires water (World Economic Forum, 2011). All require ecosystem services, and one land use decision can affect the provision of many different services. Moreover, the poorest and most vulnerable people are most affected by the consequences of poor land use choices, while being the least able to influence such decisions.

The frequency and complexity of land use competition is expected to rise as human demands grow.

## Scramble for land: Food and fuel

Throughout the developing world, external investors are scrambling to secure access to agricultural land for future food production. Since the mid-2000s, it is estimated that an area almost the size of Western Europe has been transferred in land allocation deals. The latest rush for farmland was triggered by the food crisis of 2007–08, but long-term drivers include population growth; increased consumption by a global minority; and market demands for food, biofuels, raw materials and timber (Anseeuw *et al.*, 2012).

Recent research shows that deals reported as approved or under negotiation worldwide amounted to a total of 203 million hectares: 134 million hectares of this total are located in Africa; 43 million hectares in Asia and 19 million hectares in Latin America. Of these, deals for 71 million hectares have so far been cross-referenced, confirming the unprecedented scale of the land rush over the past decade (Anseeuw *et al.*, 2012).

The best agricultural land is often targeted for this acquisition. The rural poor are frequently being dispossessed of

THE POOREST AND  
MOST VULNERABLE  
PEOPLE ARE MOST  
AFFECTED BY THE  
CONSEQUENCES OF  
POOR LAND-USE  
CHOICES

AN AREA ALMOST THE  
SIZE OF WESTERN  
EUROPE HAS BEEN  
TRANSFERRED IN LAND  
ALLOCATION DEALS  
SINCE MID-2000

5.2 MILLION  
HECTARES OF LAND IN  
PAPUA NEW GUINEA  
HAS BEEN ACQUIRED  
FOR LONG-TERM  
LEASES

land and water resources they have held under customary tenure. Many cases show how the resource base of rural livelihoods is being squeezed through the loss of access to grasslands, forests and marshlands that are customarily held as common property. The poor are bearing disproportionate costs, but reaping few benefits, largely because of poor governance. The land rush is also leading to extensive conversion of natural ecosystems with accompanying losses of ecosystem services and biodiversity (Anseeuw *et al.*, 2012).

## Case study: Papua New Guinea

In the last five years, 5.2 million hectares of land in Papua New Guinea has been acquired for long-term leases – termed Special Agricultural and Business Leases (SABLs). These now encompass 15 per cent of the country's land area. Nearly all of these leases have been handed to foreign investors or multinational corporations – mostly for logging and oil palm plantations. Under existing SABLs, around 2 million hectares of forests are allowed to be legally cleared. In a number of cases, the leases appear to have been granted without the free and prior consent of a majority of the traditional landowners, which is a legal requirement in Papua New Guinea. In response to a growing domestic and international outcry, the government declared a temporary moratorium on SABLs, but this offers only a temporary respite to one of the most serious and immediate threats to the country's forests and biodiversity (Laurance, 2012, in press).

The sheer pace of change demonstrated by this example underlies an urgent challenge: to stop dispossession and land allocations that do not serve a genuine public interest; to legally recognize the rights of the rural poor; and to steer toward more equitable models that give a key role to existing land users (Anseeuw *et al.*, 2012).

### The Land Matrix

The Land Matrix is an online public database of large-scale land deals. It is facilitated by a partnership of organizations with an interest in promoting transparency and accountability in decisions over land and investment through open data. The Land Matrix aims to provide a permanent observatory to which any user can contribute information. [www.landportal.info/landmatrix](http://www.landportal.info/landmatrix)

# CHAPTER 3: WHAT DOES THE FUTURE HOLD?

The Sun shining down upon the Earth as photographed by an astronaut from the International Space Station.



# THE EMERGING IMPACTS OF RISING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Average global surface temperatures were 0.8°C warmer during the first decade of the 21st century than during the first decade of the 20th century, and the most pronounced warming has been over the past 30 years. According to the National Research Council (NRC) of the US National Academies, “the past few decades have been warmer than any other comparable period for at least the last 400 years, and possibly for the last 1,000 years or longer” (National Research Council, 2010).

The principle culprits driving the long-term global warming trend are rising atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), from fossil fuel use. Additional lesser amounts of greenhouse gases have come from deforestation and from other land use and land cover changes. Emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> from fossil fuel use have been rising since the Industrial Revolution (i.e., since the mid-1700s); and by the 1950s, the atmospheric concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> had risen from pre-industrial levels of 284 parts-per-million (ppm) to 300 ppm – the highest level in at least 800,000 years (Luthi, 2008). By 2010, emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> from fossil fuels had risen to the highest level in history: 9.1 billion tonnes of carbon (Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 2011), and atmospheric concentrations followed suit, reaching 388.5 ppm that year (and 390.5 ppm in 2011) (NOAA/ESRL).

**“WARMING OF THE CLIMATE SYSTEM IS UNEQUIVOCAL ... MOST OF THE OBSERVED INCREASE IN GLOBAL AVERAGE TEMPERATURES SINCE THE MID-20TH CENTURY IS VERY LIKELY DUE TO THE OBSERVED INCREASE IN ANTHROPOGENIC GREENHOUSE GAS CONCENTRATIONS ... ANTHROPOGENIC WARMING OVER THE LAST THREE DECADES HAS LIKELY HAD A DISCERNIBLE INFLUENCE AT THE GLOBAL SCALE ON OBSERVED CHANGES IN MANY PHYSICAL AND BIOLOGICAL SYSTEMS” (IPCC 2007A).**

# CO<sub>2</sub>

BY 2010, EMISSIONS OF CO<sub>2</sub> FROM FOSSIL FUELS HAD RISEN TO THE HIGHEST LEVEL IN HISTORY



THE VOLUME OF ARCTIC SEA ICE DROPPED TO A RECORD LOW IN 2011

## Warming oceans

CO<sub>2</sub> levels would have increased even more, were it not for the fact that about one quarter of CO<sub>2</sub> is being absorbed by the global grasslands and forests, and another quarter by the oceans. The result has been a 30 per cent increase in the acidity of the oceans relative to pre-industrial levels. At the same time, oceans have absorbed 80-90 per cent of the heating from rising greenhouse gas concentrations over the last half-century, driving up ocean temperatures (National Research Council, 2010). Sea surface temperatures affect a range of climate variables including air temperatures and humidity, precipitation, atmospheric circulation and storm attributes. The warmer oceans also expand, accounting for 50-60 per cent of the sea level rise observed since the mid-1800s (National Research Council, 2010). In the 20th century, the rate of sea level rise – 2.1mm per year – was faster than for any century in 2,000 years (Kemp *et al.*, 2011).

The rising temperatures of both the atmosphere and oceans are altering worldwide weather patterns. Colder temperatures are increasingly edged-out by warmer temperatures. Heat waves are becoming more common and intense. Precipitation patterns are changing and heavy precipitation events are becoming more frequent. There are changes in the frequency and severity of droughts. Storm tracks and intensity are changing, including a rise in the intensity of tropical storms over the North Atlantic Ocean (IPCC, 2007a).

## Biodiversity impacts


In 2007 the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) concluded with “very high confidence” that “recent warming is strongly affecting terrestrial biological systems”; and stated with “high confidence” that “observed changes in marine and freshwater ecological systems are associated with rising water temperatures, as well as related changes in ice cover, salinity, oxygen levels and circulation” (IPCC, 2007a).

Some of the most dramatic and important impacts are evident in the Arctic, where the warming has been particularly pronounced (see box overleaf). The Arctic holds a vast quantity of land-ice (concentrated in Greenland), as does the Antarctic and other regions with glaciers, such as the Himalayas. Rising temperatures are shrinking the amount of ice – releasing immense quantities of freshwater into the oceans, and contributing to rising sea levels (National Research Council, 2010).

Impacts in the far northern latitudes, including the Arctic, are of particular concern. Dieback of boreal forests, along with thawing permafrost and methane deposits, could release large quantities of greenhouse gases. Similarly, more frequent severe droughts in the Amazon region – as occurred twice over the last decade (2005 and 2010) – can shift carbon from the Amazon's forests to the atmosphere (see box below) (Davidson *et al.*, 2012; Lewis *et al.*, 2011; Ma *et al.*, 2012; Xiao *et al.*, 2011; Schuur and Abbott, 2011).

### Arctic rapidly warms, sea ice precipitously declines

Surface temperatures have been rising rapidly in the Arctic since the late 1970s and were at a record high in 2011 (Figure 52). In addition there has been a precipitous decline in Arctic sea ice, which dropped to the second lowest extent in the satellite record in September 2011 – just short of the record set in 2007. At the same time the sea ice is thinning and the volume of Arctic sea ice dropped to a record low in 2011. The decline is unprecedented for the past 1,450 years (Kinnard, 2011). The rapid sea ice decline has negatively affected people living and working in the Arctic, as well as wildlife. The decline in sea ice combined with rising sea surface temperatures also is affecting weather patterns from the Arctic to the mid-latitudes (USGCRP, 2009; Jaiser, 2012).



*Figure 52: Surface temperature trends in the Arctic*



TWO RECENT AMAZON DROUGHTS DEMONSTRATE A MECHANISM BY WHICH REMAINING INTACT TROPICAL FORESTS OF SOUTH AMERICA CAN SHIFT FROM BUFFERING THE INCREASE IN ATMOSPHERIC CARBON DIOXIDE TO ACCELERATING IT

### Extreme droughts in the Amazon

Scientists are concerned that climate change may bring increasingly arid conditions (along with more frequent extreme droughts) to the Amazon, resulting in net carbon losses from the region's forests to the atmosphere (Davidson *et al.*, 2012; Lewis *et al.*, 2011; Zhao and Running, 2010). Those concerns were highlighted in 2005 when a “once in a century” drought affected the Amazon, with impacts so severe the government declared a state of emergency for much of the area. The drought resulted in a massive release of 0.8-2.6 Gigatons (billion metric tonnes) of carbon to the atmosphere. This can be compared to global emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> from fossil fuels in 2005 of 7.4 Gigatons of carbon (Lewis *et al.*, 2011).

In 2009, WWF identified the prospect of more frequent extreme droughts in the Amazon and the related rainforest dieback as being among the “tipping points” that could be passed in coming decades as climate changes, with “significant impacts within the first half of this century” (Lenton *et al.*, 2009). The very next year, in 2010, another extraordinary drought afflicted the region, this time with perhaps even greater emissions, estimated at between 1.2 and 3.4 Gigatons of carbon. “The two recent Amazon droughts demonstrate a mechanism by which remaining intact tropical forests of South America can shift from buffering the increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide to accelerating it,” said researchers in the 4 February 2011 issue of *Science*. “If drought events continue, the era of intact Amazon forests buffering the increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide may have passed.” (Lewis *et al.*, 2011).

## A matter of degrees: Future impacts tied to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions

The IPCC in 2007 projected a warming of about 0.2°C per decade over the following two decades with subsequent warming increasingly depending on specific emissions scenarios (IPCC 2007). The NRC reported in 2011 that limiting the ultimate global average warming to 2°C above pre-industrial levels likely would require that atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations be stabilized at around 430 ppm. Stabilizing concentrations “for a century or so” at that level – or at any level – will require emissions reductions larger than 80 per cent below peak levels, but the NRC says that “even greater reductions in emissions would be required to maintain stabilized concentrations in the longer term” (National Research Council, 2011).

With concentrations already exceeding 390 ppm and emissions at record levels, warming is likely to exceed 2°C in the long term unless a sharp and sustained decline of at least 80 per cent in emissions by 2050 compared to 1990 is underway before 2020. If emissions continue to grow, large regions probably will individually exceed a 2°C increase in average annual temperatures by 2040. Under “business as usual” emissions scenarios, the 2°C warming is likely to be reached globally by 2060 or earlier, and temperatures will continue rising well beyond that time (Joshi *et al.*, 2011; Rogelj *et al.*, 2011).

**“THE WORLD IS ENTERING A NEW GEOLOGIC EPOCH, SOMETIMES CALLED THE ANTHROPOCENE, IN WHICH HUMAN ACTIVITIES WILL LARGELY CONTROL THE EVOLUTION OF EARTH’S ENVIRONMENT. CARBON EMISSIONS DURING THIS CENTURY WILL ESSENTIALLY DETERMINE THE MAGNITUDE OF EVENTUAL IMPACTS AND WHETHER THE ANTHROPOCENE IS A SHORT-TERM, RELATIVELY MINOR CHANGE FROM THE CURRENT CLIMATE OR AN EXTREME DEVIATION THAT LASTS THOUSANDS OF YEARS.” (NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, 2011).**

**THE IPCC CONCLUDES THAT DURING THIS CENTURY “IT IS VERY LIKELY THAT HOT EXTREMES, HEAT WAVES AND HEAVY PRECIPITATION WILL BECOME MORE FREQUENT” AND THAT “IT IS LIKELY THAT FUTURE TROPICAL CYCLONES (TYPHOONS AND HURRICANES) WILL BECOME MORE INTENSE, WITH LARGER PEAK WIND SPEEDS AND MORE HEAVY PRECIPITATION.” (IPCC, 2007A).**

The rising global temperatures and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations will bring dangerously disruptive changes to both the oceans and climate. Researchers warned in March 2012 that “the current rate of (mainly fossil fuel) CO<sub>2</sub> release stands out as capable of driving a combination and magnitude of ocean geochemical changes potentially unparalleled in at least the last ~300My [million years] of Earth history, raising the possibility that we are entering an unknown territory of marine ecosystem change.” (Honisch *et al.*, 2012). Sea levels could rise 0.75-1.9 meters above 1990 levels by 2100 (Vermeer and Rahmstorf, 2009). Increases in the frequency and severity of floods and droughts are likely (IPCC, 2007a).

The IPCC describes in unambiguous terms and with high confidence the implications for ecosystems: “During the course of this century the resilience of many ecosystems (their ability to adapt naturally) is likely to be exceeded by an unprecedented combination of change in climate, associated disturbances (e.g., flooding, drought, wildfire, insects, ocean acidification) and in other global change drivers (especially land-use change, pollution and over-exploitation of resources), if greenhouse gas emissions and other changes continue at or above current rates ...” (IPCC, 2007c).

These and other impacts on systems and sectors are summarized in Figure 55 for a range of average global temperature increases relative to 1980-1999 temperatures (which were already 0.5°C above pre-industrial levels).


# WHAT DOES THE FUTURE HOLD?

## THE USE OF SCENARIOS

Scenarios are a recognized planning tool for generating different models of how the world “might” look in the future. They are used to improve understanding of the future consequences of today’s actions, against a range of possible outcomes.

Scenarios are not predictions or forecasts; they simply represent a variety of future alternatives. They are not intended to illustrate preferable developments or undesirable progressions, but instead to describe possible futures. They can be used to further our understanding of how systems evolve, develop, behave and interact, as well as the potential impacts of specific policies.

The IPCC has produced scenarios that contrast the climate impacts of a future of slow economic growth with reliance on traditional technologies, against a future of high economic growth and the rapid spread of new, more efficient technologies. As can be seen in Figure 53, under these scenarios, future global temperature increases, and the impacts of climate change, are very different. In the same way, scenarios can suggest how the Ecological Footprint and ecosystem service delivery might change in the future, and can highlight the choices needed to ensure a sustainable existence.



**SCENARIOS CAN BE USED TO FURTHER UNDERSTANDING OF HOW SYSTEMS EVOLVE, DEVELOP, BEHAVE AND INTERACT**

**Figure 53: Illustrative examples of global impacts projected for climate changes (and sea level and atmospheric carbon dioxide where relevant) associated with different amounts of increase in global average surface temperature in the 21st century (IPCC 2007c)**

The solid lines link impacts, dotted arrows indicate impacts continuing with increasing temperature. Entries are placed so that the left-hand side of the text indicates the approximate onset of a given impact. Quantitative entries for water stress and flooding represent the additional impacts of climate change relative to the conditions projected across the range of Special Report on Emissions Scenarios (SRES) scenarios A1FI, A2, B1 and B2 (for more information about these scenarios see IPCC 2007, and for the sources used to create this figure, see 2007c). Adaptation to climate change is not included in these estimations. All entries are from published studies recorded in the chapters of the Assessment. Confidence levels for all statements are high.

<sup>1</sup> Significant is defined here as more than 40%


<sup>2</sup> Based on average rate of sea level rise of 4.2mm/year from 2000 to 2080

# PROJECTING THE ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINT TO 2050

According to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), demand for food, feed and fibres could grow by 70 per cent by 2050 (FAO, 2009). This has considerable implications for land use and natural ecosystems, and also for the size of humanity's Ecological Footprint.

The Ecological Footprint Scenario Calculator uses footprint data between 1961 and 2008 as a baseline, and projects the size of each component of the footprint in 2015, 2030 and 2050 (Moore *et al.*, 2012; WBCSD, 2010). The calculator uses data and projections from other scenario models for population, land use, land productivity, energy use, diet and climate change, and translates them into corresponding trends in Ecological Footprints and biocapacity. The datasets and parameters used in the "business as usual" scenario are included in the figure legend below.

The "business as usual" scenario for humanity's Ecological Footprint shows more and more pressure being placed on the planet. By 2050 humanity would require an equivalent of 2.9 planets to support the "business as usual" assumptions (Figure 54).



# MODELLING NATURAL CAPITAL IN SUMATRA

Scenarios can help outline the choices where investment in natural capital can enhance human development and conservation.




New software called InVEST, developed by WWF and partners, allows comparisons of important areas for biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services provision. This enables ecosystem services to be better integrated into the operational work of WWF and its partners.

InVEST was recently used in Sumatra, Indonesia, to map the co-occurrence of important areas for tiger conservation, the stock of terrestrial carbon and erosion prevention across the landscape. High quality tiger habitat overlaps with high soil carbon stocks in the eastern peatlands. In the mountainous west of the island, forested slopes contain tiger habitat and substantially reduce erosion, which helps provide clean water to downstream users.

Ecosystem services were quantified and mapped for two alternative scenarios of the future in central Sumatra: a "green" scenario of sustainable land use, and a "business as usual" scenario representing land use plans proposed by the Indonesian government. InVEST results demonstrated that the "green" scenario would yield higher levels of habitat and services relative to the government plan. There is considerable variation in the distribution of services and their expected change across the landscape.

Local governments are using these results to prioritize and spatially target policy mechanisms, such as forest carbon and watershed conservation projects, to improve both wildlife conservation and human welfare.

**Figure 55: Overlap between conservation areas and ecosystem services (carbon stocks and erosion prevention) in Sumatra, Indonesia**  
The maps illustrate the overlap between tiger landscapes (red outlines) and areas of (a) high sediment retention (erosion and run-off prevention) and (b) carbon storage in central Sumatra in 2008 (Bhagabati *et al.*, 2012).




# THE LIVING FORESTS MODEL

The Living Forests Model, developed by WWF with the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) is being used to project forest loss and other land use changes under different scenarios (WWF, 2011a; b; c).

Starting from the reference (a) Do Nothing Scenario, the model projects changes if measures were introduced to rein-in deforestation and forest degradation and to increase biodiversity conservation. A number of scenarios have been developed for reductions in forest loss and degradation: (b) Target Scenario – Zero Net Deforestation and Forest Degradation (ZNDD – see definition in glossary) by 2020 and maintained at that level indefinitely; (c) Target Delayed Scenario – ZNDD by 2030 and maintained at that level indefinitely; and (d) Half Measures Scenario – gross deforestation rate declines by at least 50 per cent from the reference rate by 2020 and is maintained at that level indefinitely.

The Target Scenario was used to explore the costs and benefits of fast action to cut deforestation and degradation compared to the Do Nothing Scenario (Figure 56). Compared to the Target Scenario, doing nothing, delaying or taking half measures all result in more forest loss and associated GHG emissions, irreversible impacts on biodiversity, and declines in ecosystem services (for further analysis, see WWF, 2011a; b; c and for further information on the model see Strassburg *et al.*, 2012).




## Scenarios of biodiversity change: Modelling future habitat availability for tigers

Asia's most iconic species, the tiger, and its forests are not strangers to change. Over the last century, tigers have decreased in the wild from 100,000 individuals to an estimated 3,200 to 3,500 (Global Tiger Initiative, 2011), while Asia's forests have decreased by more than 70 per cent in half of the countries in this region (Laurance, 2007). What's in store for Asia's forests and tigers?

Projections of forest change using the Living Forests Model Do Nothing Scenario suggest that 332,207 km<sup>2</sup> (roughly 42 per cent) of habitat within WWF Tiger Landscapes will experience a decline in forest cover, with 50,708 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat declining to a 0-10 per cent forest cover (Figure 57). Asia has the opportunity to address deforestation by taking actions to conserve the forests in which tigers live. This includes smart, planned development; accounting for the benefits provided by these forests in decision-making; and investment in forests and tigers by nations following through on their existing commitments to tiger conservation. At the rate forests and tigers are currently being lost, immediate action is crucial.




**Figure 57: Forest cover in 2000 and projected forest cover in 2050**  
The Living Forests Model was used to model changes in forest cover within tiger range states between 2000 and 2050. The available habitat for tigers will shrink, according to projections based on past trends. This projection does not take in account national and local policies to protect forest resources (for more details about the model underlying these maps, see Strassburg *et al.*, 2012).



# CHAPTER 4: BETTER CHOICES FOR A LIVING PLANET

A satellite image of a phytoplankton bloom stretching across the Barents Sea off the coast of mainland Europe's most northern point, Cape Nordkinn. Free-floating phytoplankton highlight the whirls of ocean currents in spectacular shades of blue and green. These microscopic marine organisms that drift on or near the surface of oceans and seas have been called "the grass of the sea" because they are the foundation of the oceanic food chain. Phytoplankton are able to convert inorganic compounds such as water, nitrogen and carbon into complex organic materials. With their ability to "digest" these compounds, they are credited with removing as much carbon dioxide from the atmosphere as their plant "cousins" on land – therefore having a profound influence on climate. They are also sensitive to environmental changes, so it is important to monitor and model phytoplankton into calculations of future climate change.



# ONE PLANET PERSPECTIVE

Most people essentially desire the same thing: A life where needs are met; to be safe and healthy; to be able to explore interests and realize potential; and to improve well-being. Along with these personal aspirations, they have the support of all 193 member states of the United Nations, which have committed under various international agreements to end poverty, ensure safe drinking water, protect biodiversity and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The trends and analyses outlined in this report suggest that under “business as usual”, such expectations and commitments will become increasingly difficult to meet.

In order to reverse the declining Living Planet Index, bring the Ecological Footprint down to within planetary limits, avoid dangerous climate change and achieve sustainable development, a fundamental reality must be embedded as the basis of economies, business models and lifestyles: The Earth’s natural capital – biodiversity, ecosystems and ecosystem services – is limited.


WWF’s One Planet perspective explicitly proposes to manage, govern and share natural capital within the Earth’s ecological boundaries. In addition to safeguarding and restoring this natural capital, WWF seeks better choices along the entire system of production and consumption, supported by redirected financial flows and more equitable resource governance. All of this, and more, is required to decouple human development from unsustainable consumption (moving away from material and energy-intensive commodities), to avoid greenhouse gas emissions, to maintain ecosystem integrity, and to promote pro-poor growth and development (Figure 58).

The One Planet perspective reminds us that our choices are highly interdependent. Preserving natural capital, for example, will affect decisions and possible outcomes relating to the way we produce and consume. Financial flows and governance structures will similarly determine to a great extent whether production and consumption choices will actually contribute to biodiversity conservation, ecosystem integrity and, ultimately, food, water and energy for all.

This chapter outlines the top 16 priority actions required for living within the means of one planet. Implementing such a paradigm shift will be a tremendous challenge. We all face uncomfortable choices and trade-offs, but only by taking brave, informed decisions can healthy, sustainable and equitable human societies be ensured, now and into the future.

## WWF’S ONE PLANET PERSPECTIVE PROPOSES TO MANAGE, GOVERN AND SHARE NATURAL CAPITAL WITHIN THE EARTH’S ECOLOGICAL BOUNDARIES

**Figure 58: One Planet perspective**  
The centre panels reflect better choices for managing, using and sharing natural resources within One Planet limitations and ensuring food, water and energy security. Redirected financial flows and equitable resource governance are essential enabling factors.



# SHARE AND SHARE ALIKE

A visitor to Margaret's farm will be given sweet, milky tea and a hearty helping of potatoes, beans and greens. Margaret will also share her time and her knowledge, and her warm laugh. Sharing enriches us. It feels good. While we understand this on a personal level, we tend to forget it when it comes time to make decisions about allocating resources. When we remember what counts, we will be able to count what matters.



# PRESERVE NATURAL CAPITAL

Natural capital – biodiversity, ecosystems and ecosystem services – must be preserved and restored as the foundation of human societies and economies. Efforts must particularly focus on protecting and restoring key ecological processes necessary for food, water and energy security, as well as climate change resilience and adaptation. The Earth's diversity of species and habitats must also be preserved for their intrinsic value.

## i. Significantly expand the global protected areas network

- Protect 20 per cent of representative land, freshwater and marine areas, including areas key for ecological processes necessary for biodiversity, food, water and energy security, and climate change resilience and adaptation.
- Implement adequate funding mechanisms for effective protected area management.

### Halting forest degradation and deforestation

Achieving Zero Net Deforestation and Degradation (ZNDD) would not only stem the depletion of forest-based biodiversity and ecosystem services, but also eliminate the second-largest source of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions. WWF advocates ZNDD by 2020 to reflect the scale and urgency of these threats.

WWF defines ZNDD as: no net forest loss through deforestation and no net decline in forest quality through degradation; and stresses that: (a) most natural forest should be retained – the annual rate of loss of natural or semi-natural forests should be reduced to near zero; and (b) any gross loss or degradation of pristine natural forests would need to be offset by an equivalent area of socially and environmentally sound forest restoration.

WWF's Living Forests Model projects that it is possible to achieve ZNDD by 2020, and warns that the longer it takes to achieve this goal the harder it will become to stem forest loss. But major changes in land and resource use will be needed; the implications and options for this are explored in WWF's *Living Forests Report* (WWF, 2011a; b; c).



EFFORTS MUST FOCUS  
ON PROTECTING  
AND RESTORING KEY  
ECOLOGICAL PROCESSES  
NECESSARY FOR FOOD,  
WATER AND ENERGY  
SECURITY, AS WELL  
AS CLIMATE CHANGE  
RESILIENCE AND  
ADAPTATION



## ii. Halt loss of priority habitats

- Achieve Zero Net Deforestation and Degradation by 2020 and maintain thereafter.
- Halt fragmentation of freshwater systems.
- Increase the area of effectively managed marine protected areas from 5 per cent to at least 20 per cent.

## iii. Restore damaged ecosystems and ecosystem services

- Prioritize restoration of ecosystems and ecosystem services necessary for food, water and energy security, and climate change resilience and adaptation.



### Water reserves: Securing water resources for people and nature

The Mexican National Water Commission (CONAGUA), with support from WWF and the Fundacion Gonzalo Río Arronte, is working to manage freshwater ecosystems. In 2011, a national environmental flow standard was approved, and 189 basins were identified as potential "water reserves": watersheds with high biological richness and relatively high water availability. These basins are the main targets of the National Water Reserves Program (CONAGUA, 2011) that is creating conditions to safeguard the natural flow regimes that sustain critical ecosystems, secure the services they support and maintain buffering capacity against climate uncertainty and water scarcity risk.

# PRODUCE BETTER

Efficient production systems would help lower humanity's Ecological Footprint to within ecological limits by significantly reducing human demand for water, land, energy and other natural resources. This is especially urgent in light of the growing human population and the need to meet the needs of the world's poor. Such systems must manage food, fibre, energy and water in an integrated manner, and ensure that sustainability is no longer a choice, but embedded into every commodity, product and process.

## iv. Significantly reduce inputs and waste in production systems

- Increase total food supply-chain efficiency.
- Maximize energy, water and material efficiency.
- Maximize recycling and recovery.
- Minimize greenhouse gas emissions.

### A new energy paradigm

In order for the world to stay below 2°C of warming – and so avoid dangerous climate change – global greenhouse gas emissions must be reduced to no more than 80 per cent of 1990 levels by 2050.


The energy sector is key to achieving this goal. WWF's *Energy Report* presents one of the possible pathways toward achieving a cost-effective energy system, based wholly on renewable energy (WWF, 2011d). The report raises a number of significant issues and challenges – political, economic, environmental and social – that will need to be addressed in order to realize this energy vision and minimize the impact of using more bioenergy.

### Better cotton in Pakistan

Pakistan is the world's third-largest producer of cotton, which contributes 55 per cent of its foreign earnings. 40,000 farmers in Pakistan are now growing cotton with help from the Better Cotton Initiative – a programme initiated by WWF and IKEA in 2006 to reduce the severe environmental impacts of conventional cotton production. In 2010, 170,000 hectares of cotton production utilized 40 per cent less chemical fertilizers, 47 per cent less pesticides and 37 per cent less water. Biodiversity was not the only beneficiary. While yields remained the same, farmers received a 15 per cent increase in income and their working conditions improved substantially. Support for the initiative came from Levi Strauss and Co, H&M, Adidas and Marks & Spencer (WWF, 2003).



EFFICIENT PRODUCTION SYSTEMS WOULD HELP LOWER HUMANITY'S ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINT TO WITHIN ECOLOGICAL LIMITS



## v. Manage resources sustainably

- Eliminate overfishing by commercial fleets, including the indiscriminate capture of non-target organisms.
- Eliminate water over-abstraction.
- Implement policies to secure water quality.
- Minimize further habitat conversion through maximizing the sustainable use of productive land by improving genetic selection, adopting best practices, increasing efficiency, improving soil organic matter and rehabilitating degraded lands.

## vi. Scale-up renewable energy production

- Increase the proportion of sustainable renewable energies in the global energy mix to at least 40 per cent by 2030 and 100 per cent by 2050.
- Increase the share of renewable energy in the overall energy mix, along with ambitious energy demand management, especially in sectors with limited renewable options that are likely to be dependent on bioenergy. (Aviation, shipping and high heat industrial applications are likely to be among these.)



### Certification in Chile

Chile currently has one of the strongest economies in Latin America, with projections suggesting that it could meet OECD criteria for developed countries by 2020. It supplies 8 per cent of the global pulp and paper market. To avoid large environmental impacts and depletion of natural resources, fundamental choices are needed to transform the forestry sector and enable Chile to continue to supply pulp and paper in a more environmentally and socially sustainable way. The rising global demand for Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certified paper is contributing to this transformation. WWF is therefore working closely with the forestry sector and the government of Chile to strengthen and broaden the scope of FSC certification.

Similar developments are underway in Chile's oceans and lakes. Chile is an important exporter of fish: It accounts for around 30 per cent of the global salmon market, 13 per cent of the global market for forage fish; and 3 per cent of the global market for whitefish. Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification is an important mechanism to tackle the current overexploitation of the Chilean fisheries and to achieve both environmentally sustainable and economically viable fisheries. The Chilean hake fishery has recently become the first to enter the MSC certification process. The Chilean salmon industry is working with WWF in developing Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC) standards for sustainable salmon farming.

# CONSUME MORE WISELY

Living within the Earth's ecological limits also requires a global consumption pattern in balance with the Earth's biocapacity. The immediate focus must be on drastically shrinking the Ecological Footprint of high-income populations – particularly their carbon footprint. Changed dietary patterns among wealthy populations and reduced food waste are crucial, as is innovation for “low and fair” footprint solutions that allow developing nations and emerging economies to fulfil human needs and rights.

## vii. Change energy consumption patterns

- Decrease energy demand by 15 per cent by 2050 compared to 2005.
- Increase the proportion of electricity produced using renewable energy to cover all global energy needs by 2050.
- Provide sustainable energy to everyone in “off-grid” areas.

### The impact of food choices

The type and amount of food eaten by people living in higher-income countries already has global impacts on climate change, land and sea use, water availability and quality, biodiversity and equity issues. Future scenarios for achieving Zero Net Deforestation and Degradation and 100 per cent renewable energy are dependent on changed food consumption patterns. In particular, red meat and dairy consumption, and overall food loss and waste, must decrease in developed countries. Then everyone on the planet can enjoy healthy levels of protein in their diets, more space can be kept for nature, and bioenergy can expand without creating food shortages. Such a shift is also necessary to provide everyone on the planet with healthy levels of protein in their diet. Achieving such dietary changes will require cooperation from a broad set of stakeholders, including the food industry, governments, health institutions (such as the World Health Organization), consumer groups and individuals.



THE IMMEDIATE  
FOCUS MUST BE  
ON DRASTICALLY  
SHRINKING THE  
ECOLOGICAL  
FOOTPRINT OF HIGH-  
INCOME POPULATIONS



## viii. Promote healthy consumption patterns

- Balance protein intake per capita as recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO).
- Minimize retailer and consumer food waste in high- and middle-income countries.

## ix. Achieve low-footprint lifestyles

- Minimize resource consumption and waste by high-income individuals.
- Maximize market share of certified sustainable products.
- Transition urban areas to “smart” cities with low-footprint solutions for meeting urban housing, food, water, energy, and mobility needs.

## ENOUGH FOR ALL

Not much goes to waste on Margaret's farm. But for a rapidly urbanizing population, growing their own food may not be an option. Instead, consumers can learn about where food comes from and how it is produced. By asking questions and demonstrating a commitment to sustainability, each of us can help push retailers to improve efficiency along their supply chains. A series of better choices can contribute to the fight against hunger and poverty, while conserving nature.



# REDIRECT FINANCIAL FLOWS

In too many cases, the overexploitation of resources and damage or destruction of ecosystems are highly profitable for a few stakeholders in the short term; while the long-term benefits of protecting, maintaining and investing in natural capital are inadequately valued or not valued in an economic sense at all.

As a result, the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services is undervalued in economic and political trade-offs. Redirected financial flows that support conservation and sustainable ecosystem management are therefore an essential enabling condition for both preserving natural capital and for making better production and consumption choices – and ensuring that burdens are not passed on to future generations.

## x. Value nature

- Implement an inclusive and globally accepted system for measuring the economic and non-economic value of natural capital.
- Fully integrate this value into mainstream economic development policy and decision-making.

### The sustainable finance sector

The International Finance Corporation (IFC), the private sector branch of the World Bank Group, reports an 11 per cent higher return from companies that demonstrate environmental and social standards. By attaching sustainability criteria to their lending and investment conditions, financial institutions can help raise standards in critical markets. Important incentives include cost savings from using resources efficiently, avoiding reputational risks and better access to markets. WWF engages with leading financial institutions such as IFC in developing new risk management tools and services. The IFC performance standards, which include credible standards such as MSC and FSC, are now adopted by 70 financial institutions worldwide. With guidance from WWF, Rabobank – the largest agricultural financer in the world – has attached similar sustainability conditions to its investments.



## xi. Account for environmental and social costs

- Integrate social and environmental costs of production and consumption over long timeframes into standard national and corporate accounting and reporting methodologies.
- Ensure that social and environmental costs are reflected in the market price of all commodities and products, and in environmental impact assessments.

## xii. Support and reward conservation, sustainable resource management and innovation

- Eliminate all subsidies that undermine sustainable resource use and conservation, particularly those underpinning fossil fuel use and unsustainable agriculture, forestry and fisheries.
- Develop/implement new financial mechanisms that redirect public and private investment to support sustainable practices and new technologies for sustainability, and provide new additional financing for conservation and restoration of natural capital.
- Improve policy for increased investments and large-scale deployment of innovations and new technologies that can enable sustainable development in both public and private spheres.

# EQUITABLE RESOURCE GOVERNANCE

Equitable resource governance is the second essential enabling condition to shrink and share our resource use to stay within the regenerative capacity of one planet. In addition to efforts to reduce the footprint of high-income populations (see “Consume more wisely” section), we must also improve health and education standards, and create viable economic development plans. These must exist within legal and policy frameworks that provide equitable access to food, water and energy, and be supported by inclusive processes for sustainably managed land use. Equitable resource governance also requires a changed definition of well-being and success that includes personal, societal and environmental health.

## Cities as solution hot spots for a One Planet economy

While political gridlock may stop rational action elsewhere, leading cities are already realizing the shared benefits of footprint reduction, social well-being and economic resilience. WWF’s Earth Hour City Challenge invites cities to inspire the world with their plans for moving towards a 100% renewable economy and supporting One Planet Lifestyles. Whereas Earth Hour channels the public’s impatient calls for global political action, the Earth Hour City Challenge helps local governments realize the social, economic and ecological benefits of developing One Planet solutions (for housing, energy, mobility, food, etc.) together with their citizens and businesses. City Challenge candidates are supported to report their performance, commitments and action plans. Public participation is promoted and best practice from finalist cities in all countries is documented and shared internationally. An international jury of experts awards the city undertaking the most inspiring, ambitious and credible actions “Earth Hour Capital of the year”.

For more information: <http://www.earthhour.org/>



EQUITABLE RESOURCE GOVERNANCE IS AN ESSENTIAL ENABLING CONDITION TO SHRINK AND SHARE OUR RESOURCE USE



INVESTMENT IN ENERGY EFFICIENT URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES IS ESSENTIAL TO ENSURE FOOD, WATER AND ENERGY SECURITY FOR BILLIONS OF PEOPLE

## xiii. Share available resources

- Implement natural resource governance built on inclusive processes and broad participation by communities dependent on natural resources.
- Minimize the footprint of high-income populations and urban areas (see “Consume more wisely”).
- Promote the transition toward sustainable, resource-efficient cities and reduce the direct impact of cities on water and land by limiting urban sprawl, promoting urban agriculture and sustainable waste (water) management.

## xiv. Make fair and ecologically informed choices

- Implement policies and tools for analysing, resolving and managing competing land use and water use claims.

## xv. Measure success “beyond GDP”

- Include social and environmental indices in national indicators to measure and reward success.
- Implement economic policies with targets and indicators to monitor the impact of economic governance on natural capital and human well-being.

## xvi. Sustainable population

- Explicitly integrate population dynamics (size, growth rate, composition, location and migration) and per capita consumption trends into national planning policies to support a better balance between population and available resources.
- Ensure universal access to gender-sensitive reproductive health services and information, reduce child mortality and support the empowerment of women and young girls through greater access to higher education and employment opportunities.

## FINDING A NEW WAY

Once on a path, it can be difficult to see other routes. It can be tempting to think that the current way is the only way. But that's rarely the case. Margaret has farmed her land for decades and raised two children, thinking their lives would be much like hers. But through her willingness to change, she has opened new opportunities for the next generation. With her new income, she will send her son to study computers. Our adaptability and creativity can put humanity on a better path.



## CLOSING WORDS: ACTIONS FROM INSPIRATIONAL LEADERS

IT ALWAYS SEEKS IMPOSSIBLE  
UNTIL IT'S DONE

NELSON MANDELA

THE VULNERABLE NEED  
SOLUTIONS FROM YOU; AND  
FUTURE GENERATIONS NEED A  
VISIONARY LEGACY FROM YOU

CHRISTIANA FIGUERES

I JUST HAVE SOMETHING  
INSIDE ME THAT TELLS ME  
THERE IS A PROBLEM AND  
I MUST DO SOMETHING  
ABOUT IT, SO I AM DOING  
SOMETHING ABOUT IT

WANGARI MAATHAI

WE MUST BE THE CHANGE WE  
WISH TO SEE IN THE WORLD  
MAHATMA GANDHI

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IS A  
NOTION OF DISCIPLINE. IT MEANS  
HUMANITY MUST ENSURE THAT  
MEETING PRESENT NEEDS DOES NOT  
COMPROMISE THE ABILITY OF FUTURE  
GENERATIONS TO MEET THEIR NEEDS

GRO HARLEM BRUNDTLAND

YOU CANNOT SOLVE A PROBLEM  
FROM THE SAME CONSCIOUSNESS  
THAT CREATED IT. YOU MUST  
LEARN TO SEE THE WORLD ANEW

ALBERT EINSTEIN

# ANNEX: TECHNICAL NOTES AND DATA TABLES

Photo: A hurricane as viewed from the International Space Station.



# ANNEX 1: THE LIVING PLANET INDEX

## What is the Living Planet Index?

The Living Planet Index (LPI) tracks trends in a large number of populations of species in much the same way that a stock market index tracks the value of a set of shares or a retail price index tracks the cost of a basket of consumer goods. The data used in constructing the index are time series of either population size, density, abundance or a proxy of abundance. For example, the number of nests or breeding pairs recorded may be used instead of a direct count of population. The Living Planet Index now contains populations between 1970 and 2008.

## How many species and populations are there in the 20012 LPI?

The Living Planet Index is based on trends in **9,014 populations of 2,688 species of mammal, bird, reptile, amphibian and fish from around the globe**. This represents a substantial increase in data from previous years and means we have an ever clearer picture about the status the world's vertebrate species, which are themselves an indicator of the state of our natural capital.

## What “cuts” of the LPI are included in the *Living Planet Report (LPR) 2012*?

LPR 2012 contains cuts of the LPI to reflect trends in:

### 1. Tropical and temperate

The **tropical index** consists of terrestrial and freshwater species' populations found in the Afrotropical, Indo-Pacific and Neotropical realms, as well as marine species' populations from the zone between the Tropics of Cancer and Capricorn.

The **temperate index** includes terrestrial and freshwater species' populations from the Palearctic and Nearctic realms, as well as marine species' populations found north or south of the tropics.

### 2. Systems – freshwater, marine and terrestrial

This was assigned according to the system in which the population was monitored and in which it is normally found. Some species, such as Pacific salmon, can be found in both freshwater and marine environments, so it was possible for different populations of the same species to be included in different indices.

### 3. Biogeographic realms – Afrotropical, Neotropical, Palearctic, Nearctic and Indo-Pacific

Biogeographic realms combine geographic regions with the historic and evolutionary distribution patterns of terrestrial plants and animals. They represent large areas of the Earth's surface separated by major barriers to plant and animal migration – such as oceans, broad deserts and high mountain ranges – where terrestrial species have evolved in relative isolation over long periods of time.

## Trends in the LPI

### What are the main trends in the latest LPI?

The global Living Planet Index has declined by 28 per cent between 1970 and 2008.

The index shows that the decline in biodiversity has been more much serious in tropical regions – where the index shows an average decline of 60 per cent – than in temperate regions, where there had already been significant biodiversity losses before 1970. Temperate regions show an average increase of 30 per cent in the index; however, this average does mask losses in individual species or regions whose conservation status has worsened. Moreover, the temperate index starts from a much lower baseline in 1970 than the tropical index, since most of the decline in temperate zones happened before 1970. The Living Planet Index is also calculated for systems and biogeographical realms, providing a clearer picture than ever before of the state of the world's biodiversity.

### Between 1970 and 2008 temperate species showed an overall increase – particularly in comparison to tropical species. How can we explain this?

One explanation is that most habitat destruction since 1970 has taken place in the tropics. However, that is not to say that the state of biodiversity in temperate regions is better than in the tropics necessarily. The LPI shows only trends since 1970. Most habitat alteration and destruction in temperate regions occurred prior to 1970. If data were available, an LPI from 1900 to 1970 might show a decline in temperate regions equal to that in the tropics from 1970 to 2008. Other causes of population decline in wild species that may have had a greater impact in the tropics since 1970 are overexploitation of species and introduction of alien invasive species. Again, the important point to remember is that these drivers of biodiversity loss are not restricted to the tropics, but have occurred there mostly post-1970, whereas in temperate regions these processes have been at work for much longer.

|                      |               | No. species on index | Percent Change 1970-2008 | 95% Confidence Limits |       |
|----------------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------|
|                      |               |                      |                          | Lower                 | Upper |
| Total                | Global        | 2688                 | -28%                     | -38%                  | -18%  |
|                      | Temperate     | 1518                 | 31%                      | 19%                   | 44%   |
|                      | Tropical      | 1354                 | -61%                     | -70%                  | -49%  |
| Terrestrial          | Global        | 1432                 | -25%                     | -34%                  | -13%  |
|                      | Temperate     | 757                  | 5%                       | -3%                   | 15%   |
|                      | Tropical      | 725                  | -44%                     | -55%                  | -30%  |
| Freshwater           | Global        | 737                  | -37%                     | -49%                  | -21%  |
|                      | Temperate     | 436                  | 36%                      | 11%                   | 67%   |
|                      | Tropical      | 386                  | -70%                     | -80%                  | -57%  |
| Marine               | Global        | 675                  | -22%                     | -44%                  | 6%    |
|                      | Temperate     | 438                  | 53%                      | 27%                   | 85%   |
|                      | Tropical      | 287                  | -62%                     | -78%                  | -32%  |
| Biogeographic realms | Afrotropical  | 250                  | -38%                     | -57%                  | -12%  |
|                      | Indo-Pacific  | 384                  | -64%                     | -73%                  | -51%  |
|                      | Neotropical   | 515                  | -50%                     | -69%                  | -21%  |
|                      | Nearctic      | 684                  | -6%                      | -16%                  | 6%    |
|                      | Palearctic    | 535                  | 6%                       | -7%                   | 17%   |
| By country income    | High income   | 1732                 | 7%                       | -1%                   | 17%   |
|                      | Middle income | 1205                 | -31%                     | -42%                  | -19%  |
|                      | Low income    | 204                  | -60%                     | -72%                  | -40%  |

**Table 1: Trends in the Living Planet indices between 1970 and 2008, with 95% confidence limits**

Income categories are based on the World Bank income classifications (2008). Positive number means increase, negative means decline.

## Why is the total number of species in the marine, freshwater and terrestrial LPIs more than that of the global index?

The system the population is assigned depends on where the population is located, rather than where the species lives in general. This means that some species, like Pacific salmon, can have both marine populations and freshwater populations, depending on where they are in their migration cycle. This effectively “double counts” the species numbers (but not the population numbers) as they appear in both the marine and freshwater LPI cut, but only appear once in the global species counts.

Cases like this are minimized by asking a series of questions before assigning the population a system:

1. In which system does the species spend the majority of its time?
2. Which system does the species primarily rely on to sustain itself?
3. In which system does the species breed?
4. In which system is the species most threatened?

Borderline cases are the hardest to assign. For example, how do you assign a system to a seabird that spends most of its time at sea (where it is at risk from longline fishing), but breeds on land (where it is being impacted by rats preying on its eggs)? These are dealt with on a case-by-case basis and result in some species being included in more than one system, giving rise to the differences in totals seen in Table 1.

## Are extinct species included in the LPI?

Possibly, although thankfully very few. For example, the baiji – or Yangtze River dolphin – is now considered to be extinct (according to a survey in 2006 that failed to find any individuals in the Yangtze River in China). Accidental mortality caused by the fishing gear widely used in the Yangtze ecosystem is thought to be the main cause. In any case, absence of evidence is not evidence of absence, and biologists normally consider an absence of 50 years as evidence for extinction.

## What role has climate change played in the overall decline of species, particularly in recent trends?

It is likely that climate change has caused a decline in populations of some species, particularly those in vulnerable ecosystems such as coral reefs, mountains and the Arctic, but the LPI measures only average trends in species’ populations. We have not analysed the causes of trends in species’ populations. Over the last 30 years, the principal cause of population decline in wild species has been habitat loss or alteration. Over the next 30 years, however, it is

likely that climate change will be a more important factor affecting population trends, as well as itself being a driver of habitat loss and alteration.

## Calculating the LPI

### Where do the data used in the LPI come from?

All data used in constructing the index are time series of either population size, density, abundance or a proxy of abundance. The species' population data used to calculate the index are gathered from a variety of sources. We collate time-series information for vertebrate species from published scientific literature, online databases (e.g., NERC Centre for Population Biology [Global Population Dynamics Database], Pan-European Common Bird Monitoring Scheme) and grey literature. Data are only included if a measure of population size is available for at least two years, and information available on how the data were collected, what the units of measurement were and the geographic location of the population. The data must be collected using the same method on the same population throughout the time series and the data source referenced and traceable.

### The period covered by the index is from 1970 to 2008.

The year 2008 is chosen as the “cut-off” year for the index because there is not yet enough data to calculate a robust index for 2009–2011. Datasets are currently being added to the database to allow the calculation of the index for those years.

### How is the Living Planet Index calculated?

The LPI is based on population trends in over 2,600 vertebrate species worldwide. Data on species' populations from two or more years since 1970 are collected from a wide variety of published sources and entered into the LPI database. In some cases, we have data on more than one population of a single species. For each population, the rate of change from one year to the next is calculated. If we have data from only a few, non-consecutive years, we assume there was a constant annual rate of change in the population between each data year. Where we have data from many years (consecutive or not) we fit a curve through the data points using a statistical method called generalized additive modelling. Where we have more than one population trend for a single species, the average rate of change across all of the populations is calculated for each year. Then we calculate the average rate of change across all species from year to year. The index is set equal to 1 in 1970, and the average annual rate of population change is used to calculate the index value in each successive year.

## Technical details of the calculations

Annual data points were interpolated for time series with six or more data points using generalized additive modelling, or by assuming a constant annual rate of change for time series with less than six data points. First, the average rate of change in each year is calculated across all populations of a species, then across all species. The average annual rates of change in successive years were chained together to make an index, with the index value in 1970 set to 1.

Details of each of the methodologies used for each of the cuts of the LPI are outlined below:

### a. System LPIs

Each species is classified as being terrestrial, freshwater or marine, according to the system on which it is most dependent for survival and reproduction. The indices for terrestrial, freshwater and marine systems were aggregated by giving equal weight to temperate and tropical species within each system, i.e., a tropical index and a temperate index were first calculated for each system and the two were then aggregated to create the system index.

### b. Realm LPIs

Each species' population in the LPI database was assigned to a realm according to its geographic location. Realm indices were calculated by giving equal weight to each species, with the exception of the Palearctic realm, in which families were aggregated with equal weight. This was done because the volume of time series data for birds available from this realm far outweighs all other species put together. The data from Indo-Malaya, Australasia and Oceania were insufficient to calculate indices for these realms, so they were combined into a super-realm, Indo-Pacific.

## How has the Living Planet Index changed since LPR 2010?

On the whole, the results are very similar to the LPIs in LPR 2010. As we continue to add data, we are consistently seeing the same patterns of population trend at the global level. The following section details changes to the data set since LPR 2010.

## Increases in the LPI Database

The size of the dataset has increased by 13 per cent since LPR 2010 (see Figure 59). As populations in the LPI are continually added, so the average trend for each index changes. As a result, the 2012 dataset may show differences in the detail of some of the indices produced in 2010, but the overall trajectory of the trend remains roughly the same.


Compared to 2010 there are:

- 6 per cent more species and 13 per cent more populations in the global LPI;
- 7 per cent more terrestrial species and 19 per cent more terrestrial populations;
- 6 per cent more marine species and 18 per cent more marine populations;
- 3 per cent more freshwater species and 4 per cent more freshwater populations.

These changes have improved the spread of the data among different regions and different taxa also. There is a better balance between tropical and temperate species; for example, tropical species now account for 47 per cent of the species in the index compared to 41 per cent in 2010. Each of the taxa is better represented; for example, reptile species have increased by the greatest proportion at 39 per cent. Increasing the dataset in this way generally improves the robustness of the indices and usually produces smoother trends.

### Methodology changes

The method used to calculate the LPI has remained unchanged since 2008 (see Collen *et al.*, 2009 for more details).



**Figure 59: The cumulative number of population time series in the LPI database**

## ANNEX 2: ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINT: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

### How is the Ecological Footprint calculated?

The Ecological Footprint measures the amount of biologically productive land and water area required to produce the resources an individual, population or activity consumes and to absorb the waste it generates, given prevailing technology and resource management. This area is expressed in global hectares (hectares with world-average biological productivity). Footprint calculations use yield factors to normalize countries' biological productivity to world averages (e.g., comparing tonnes of wheat per UK hectare versus per world average hectare) and equivalence factors to take into account differences in world average productivity among land types (e.g., world average forest versus world average cropland).

Footprint and biocapacity results for countries are calculated annually by the Global Footprint Network. Collaborations with national governments are invited, and serve to improve the data and methodology used for the National Footprint Accounts. To date, Switzerland has completed a review, and Belgium, Ecuador, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Japan and the UAE have partially reviewed or are reviewing their accounts. The continuing methodological development of the National Footprint Accounts is overseen by a formal review committee. A detailed methods paper and copies of sample calculation sheets can be obtained from [www.footprintnetwork.org](http://www.footprintnetwork.org)

Footprint analyses can be conducted at any scale. There is growing recognition of the need to standardize sub-national Footprint applications in order to increase comparability across studies and longitudinally. Methods and approaches for calculating the Footprint of municipalities, organizations and products are currently being aligned through a global Ecological Footprint standards initiative. For more information on Ecological Footprint standards see [www.footprintstandards.org](http://www.footprintstandards.org)

## What is included in the Ecological Footprint?

### What is excluded?

To avoid exaggerating human demand on nature, the Ecological Footprint includes only those aspects of resource consumption and waste production for which the Earth has regenerative capacity, and where data exists that allow this demand to be expressed in terms of productive area. For example, toxic releases are not accounted for in Ecological Footprint accounts. Nor are freshwater withdrawals, although the energy used to pump or treat water is included.

Ecological Footprint accounts provide snapshots of past resource demand and availability. They do not predict the future. Thus, while the Footprint does not estimate future losses caused by current degradation of ecosystems, if this degradation persists it may be reflected in future accounts as a reduction in biocapacity.

Footprint accounts also do not indicate the intensity with which a biologically productive area is being used. Being a biophysical measure, it also does not evaluate the essential social and economic dimensions of sustainability.

### How is international trade taken into account?

The National Footprint Accounts calculate the Ecological Footprint associated with each country's total consumption by summing the Footprint of its imports and its production, and subtracting the Footprint of its exports. This means that the resource use and emissions associated with producing a car that is manufactured in Japan, but sold and used in India, will contribute to India's rather than Japan's consumption Footprint.

National consumption Footprints can be distorted when the resources used and waste generated in making products for export are not fully documented for every country. Inaccuracies in reported trade can significantly affect the Footprint estimates for countries where trade flows are large relative to total consumption. However, this does not affect the total global Footprint.

### How does the Ecological Footprint account for the use of fossil fuels?

Fossil fuels such as coal, oil and natural gas are extracted from the Earth's crust and are not renewable in ecological time spans. When these fuels burn, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is emitted into the atmosphere. There are two ways in which this CO<sub>2</sub> can be stored: human technological sequestration of these emissions, such as deep-well injection, or natural sequestration. Natural sequestration occurs when ecosystems absorb CO<sub>2</sub> and store it either in standing biomass, such as trees, or in soil.

The Carbon footprint is calculated by estimating how much natural sequestration would be necessary to maintain a constant concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere. After subtracting the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> absorbed by the oceans, Ecological Footprint accounts calculate the area required to absorb and retain the remaining carbon based on the average sequestration rate of the world's forests. CO<sub>2</sub> sequestered by artificial means would also be subtracted from the Ecological Footprint total, but at present this quantity is negligible. In 2008, 1 global hectare could absorb the CO<sub>2</sub> released by burning approximately 1,450 litres of gasoline.

Expressing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in terms of an equivalent biopродuctive area does not imply that carbon sequestration in biomass is the key to resolving global climate change. On the contrary, it shows that the biosphere has insufficient capacity to offset current rates of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The contribution of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to the total Ecological Footprint is based on an estimate of world average forest yields. This sequestration capacity may change over time. As forests mature, their CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration rates tend to decline. If these forests are degraded or cleared, they may become net emitters of CO<sub>2</sub>.

Carbon emissions from some sources other than fossil fuel combustion are incorporated in the National Footprint Accounts at the global level. These include fugitive emissions from the flaring of gas in oil and natural gas production, carbon released by chemical reactions in cement production and emissions from tropical forest fires.

### How does the Ecological Footprint account for carbon emissions absorbed by the oceans versus uptake by forests?

The National Footprint Accounts calculate the Carbon Footprint by considering sequestration from the world's oceans and forests. Annual ocean uptake values are taken from Katiwala *et al.*, 2009 (ref: Katiwala, S. *et al.*, 2009. Reconstruction of the history of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the ocean. *Nature* 462, 346-350) and used with the anthropogenic carbon emissions taken from CDIAC (CDIAC, 2011). There is a relatively constant percentage uptake for oceans, varying between 28 per cent and 35 per cent over the period 1961-2008. The remaining CO<sub>2</sub> requires land based sequestration. Due to the limited availability of large-scale datasets, the calculation currently assumes the world average sequestration rate for uptake of carbon dioxide into forests. Therefore the Carbon Footprint is a measure of the area of world average forest land that is necessary to sequester the carbon dioxide emissions that are not absorbed into the world's oceans.

## Does the Ecological Footprint take into account other species?

The Ecological Footprint compares human demand on biodiversity with the natural world's capacity to meet this demand. It thus serves as an indicator of human pressure on local and global ecosystems. In 2008, humanity's demand exceeded the biosphere's regeneration rate by more than 50 per cent. This overshoot may result in depletion of ecosystems and fill-up of waste sinks. This ecosystem stress may negatively impact biodiversity. However, the Footprint does not measure this latter impact directly, nor does it specify how much overshoot must be reduced if negative impacts are to be avoided.

## Does the Ecological Footprint say what is a “fair” or “equitable” use of resources?


The Footprint documents what has happened in the past. It can quantitatively describe the ecological resources used by an individual or a population, but it does not prescribe what they should be using. Resource allocation is a policy issue, based on societal beliefs about what is or is not equitable. While Footprint accounting can determine the average biocapacity that is available per person, it does not stipulate how this biocapacity should be allocated among individuals or countries. However, it does provide a context for such discussions.

## How relevant is the Ecological Footprint if the supply of renewable resources can be increased and advances in technology can slow the depletion of non-renewable resources?

The Ecological Footprint measures the current state of resource use and waste generation. It asks: In a given year, did human demands on ecosystems exceed the ability of ecosystems to meet these demands? Footprint analysis reflects both increases in the productivity of renewable resources and technological innovation (for example, if the paper industry doubles the overall efficiency of paper production, the footprint per tonne of paper will halve). Ecological Footprint Accounts capture these changes once they occur and can determine the extent to which these innovations have succeeded in bringing human demand within the capacity of the planet's ecosystems. If there is a sufficient increase in ecological supply and a reduction in human demand due to technological advances or other factors, Footprint Accounts will show this as the elimination of global overshoot.

For additional information about current Ecological Footprint methodology, data sources, assumptions and results, please visit: [www.footprintnetwork.org/atlas](http://www.footprintnetwork.org/atlas)

For more information on the Ecological Footprint at a global level, please see: (Butchart *et al.*, 2010; Global Footprint Network, 2010; GTZ, 2010; Kitzes *et al.*, 2009; Kitzes *et al.*, 2008) at a regional and national level, please see (Ewing *et al.*, 2009; Global Footprint Network, 2008; WWF, 2007; 2008a) and for further information on the methodology used to calculate the Ecological Footprint, please see (Ewing B. *et al.*, 2009; Galli *et al.*, 2007).



**Table 2: Ecological Footprint data tables. Please note: World population is inclusive of countries not included in the Table. Table includes Footprint data for countries with populations greater than 1 million.**

| Country/region                | Population (millions) | Cropland | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Carbon | Built up land | Total Ecological Footprint | Cropland | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Built up land | Total biocapacity | Ecological Footprint 2008 (global hectares per person) |              |             |                |        |               |                            | Biocapacity 2008 (global hectares per person) |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------|---------------|----------------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------|--|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------|---------------|----------------------------|---|--------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------|--|
|                               |                       |          |              |             |                |        |               |                            |          |              |             |                |               |                   | Cropland   | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Carbon | Built up land | Total Ecological Footprint | Cropland                                      | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Built up land | Total biocapacity |  |
| World                         | 6,739.6               | 0.59     | 0.21         | 0.26        | 0.10           | 1.47   | 0.06          | 2.70                       | 0.57     | 0.23         | 0.76        | 0.16           | 0.06          | 1.78              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| High-income countries         | 1,037.0               | 1.03     | 0.31         | 0.58        | 0.19           | 3.38   | 0.11          | 5.60                       | 0.98     | 0.28         | 1.17        | 0.51           | 0.11          | 3.05              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Middle-income countries       | 4,394.1               | 0.53     | 0.17         | 0.19        | 0.10           | 0.85   | 0.07          | 1.92                       | 0.49     | 0.21         | 0.78        | 0.16           | 0.07          | 1.72              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Low-income countries          | 1,297.5               | 0.47     | 0.12         | 0.23        | 0.06           | 0.18   | 0.07          | 1.14                       | 0.46     | 0.21         | 0.31        | 0.09           | 0.07          | 1.14              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Africa                        | 975.5                 | 0.51     | 0.23         | 0.29        | 0.07           | 0.29   | 0.06          | 1.45                       | 0.46     | 0.41         | 0.48        | 0.11           | 0.06          | 1.52              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Algeria                       | 34.4                  | 0.51     | 0.35         | 0.13        | 0.02           | 0.62   | 0.02          | 1.65                       | 0.19     | 0.31         | 0.02        | 0.01           | 0.02          | 0.56              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Angola                        | 18.0                  | 0.36     | 0.14         | 0.13        | 0.11           | 0.09   | 0.06          | 0.89                       | 0.29     | 1.66         | 0.72        | 0.25           | 0.06          | 2.98              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Benin                         | 8.4                   | 0.55     | 0.06         | 0.31        | 0.10           | 0.30   | 0.04          | 1.36                       | 0.46     | 0.04         | 0.41        | 0.03           | 0.04          | 0.98              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Botswana                      | 2.0                   | 0.42     | 1.22         | 0.18        | 0.01           | 0.93   | 0.07          | 2.84                       | 0.17     | 2.58         | 0.65        | 0.28           | 0.07          | 3.76              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Burkina Faso                  | 15.5                  | 0.84     | 0.19         | 0.35        | 0.01           | 0.06   | 0.08          | 1.53                       | 0.83     | 0.18         | 0.27        | 0.00           | 0.08          | 1.37              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Burundi                       | 7.9                   | 0.26     | 0.07         | 0.45        | 0.01           | 0.02   | 0.04          | 0.85                       | 0.24     | 0.15         | 0.01        | 0.01           | 0.04          | 0.45              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Cameroon                      | 18.8                  | 0.48     | 0.12         | 0.27        | 0.06           | 0.11   | 0.05          | 1.09                       | 0.52     | 0.11         | 1.08        | 0.11           | 0.05          | 1.87              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Central African Republic      | 4.2                   | 0.37     | 0.62         | 0.30        | 0.01           | 0.03   | 0.04          | 1.36                       | 0.32     | 0.62         | 7.38        | 0.00           | 0.04          | 8.35              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Chad                          | 10.7                  | 0.64     | 0.87         | 0.29        | 0.01           | 0.01   | 0.08          | 1.89                       | 0.60     | 1.36         | 1.05        | 0.09           | 0.08          | 3.17              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Congo                         | 3.8                   | 0.26     | 0.11         | 0.48        | 0.07           | 0.12   | 0.03          | 1.08                       | 0.14     | 3.51         | 8.07        | 0.44           | 0.03          | 12.20             |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Congo, Democratic Republic of | 62.5                  | 0.15     | 0.02         | 0.50        | 0.01           | 0.03   | 0.05          | 0.76                       | 0.13     | 0.28         | 2.60        | 0.05           | 0.05          | 3.10              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Egypt                         | 78.3                  | 0.66     | 0.07         | 0.16        | 0.03           | 0.96   | 0.18          | 2.06                       | 0.45     | 0.00         | 0.00        | 0.02           | 0.18          | 0.65              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Eritrea                       | 4.9                   | 0.16     | 0.23         | 0.20        | 0.01           | 0.03   | 0.03          | 0.66                       | 0.09     | 0.23         | 0.10        | 1.01           | 0.03          | 1.47              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Ethiopia                      | 79.4                  | 0.41     | 0.13         | 0.50        | 0.00           | 0.04   | 0.06          | 1.13                       | 0.36     | 0.13         | 0.05        | 0.05           | 0.06          | 0.65              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Gabon                         | 1.5                   | 0.48     | 0.22         | 0.96        | 0.12           | 0.00   | 0.03          | 1.81                       | 0.24     | 4.11         | 20.94       | 3.41           | 0.03          | 28.72             |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Gambia                        | 1.6                   | 0.72     | 0.15         | 0.21        | 0.09           | 0.20   | 0.05          | 1.41                       | 0.43     | 0.07         | 0.21        | 0.39           | 0.05          | 1.15              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Ghana                         | 23.3                  | 0.58     | 0.10         | 0.61        | 0.17           | 0.21   | 0.07          | 1.74                       | 0.70     | 0.28         | 0.17        | 0.06           | 0.07          | 1.28              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Guinea                        | 9.6                   | 0.65     | 0.33         | 0.51        | 0.04           | 0.10   | 0.08          | 1.72                       | 0.65     | 0.91         | 0.76        | 0.52           | 0.08          | 2.93              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Guinea-Bissau                 | 1.5                   | 0.35     | 0.42         | 0.19        | 0.03           | 0.07   | 0.05          | 1.10                       | 0.47     | 0.41         | 0.39        | 2.08           | 0.05          | 3.40              |  |              |             |                |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |               |                   |  |

| Country/region         | Population (millions) | Cropland | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Carbon | Built up land | Ecological Footprint 2008 (global hectares per person) |              |             |                |        |               |                            | Biocapacity 2008 (global hectares per person) |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
|------------------------|-----------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------|---------------|----------------------------|---|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------|---------------|-------------------|
|                        |                       |          |              |             |                |        |               | Cropland   | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Carbon | Built up land | Total Ecological Footprint | Cropland                                      | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Carbon | Built up land | Total biocapacity |
| Kenya                  | 38.5                  | 0.20     | 0.27         | 0.28        | 0.06           | 0.11   | 0.03          | 0.95   | 0.19         | 0.27        | 0.02           | 0.03   | 0.03          | 0.53                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Lesotho                | 2.1                   | 0.19     | 0.49         | 0.37        | 0.00           | 0.01   | 0.01          | 1.07   | 0.08         | 0.72        | 0.00           | 0.00   | 0.01          | 0.81                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Liberia                | 3.7                   | 0.31     | 0.03         | 0.75        | 0.02           | 0.12   | 0.05          | 1.28   | 0.21         | 0.71        | 1.66           | 0.33   | 0.05          | 2.95                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Libyan Arab Jamahiriya | 6.2                   | 0.65     | 0.54         | 0.12        | 0.04           | 1.82   | 0.02          | 3.19   | 0.15         | 0.23        | 0.02           | 0.24   | 0.02          | 0.66                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Madagascar             | 19.5                  | 0.30     | 0.39         | 0.27        | 0.08           | 0.06   | 0.06          | 1.16   | 0.27         | 1.50        | 0.89           | 0.19   | 0.06          | 2.92                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Malawi                 | 14.0                  | 0.46     | 0.04         | 0.17        | 0.01           | 0.05   | 0.05          | 0.78   | 0.44         | 0.09        | 0.03           | 0.06   | 0.05          | 0.67                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Mali                   | 14.5                  | 0.74     | 0.75         | 0.16        | 0.03           | 0.10   | 0.10          | 1.86   | 0.76         | 0.73        | 0.64           | 0.05   | 0.10          | 2.29                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Mauritania             | 3.3                   | 0.43     | 1.79         | 0.20        | 0.10           | 0.30   | 0.05          | 2.86   | 0.12         | 3.40        | 0.06           | 1.60   | 0.05          | 5.21                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Mauritius              | 1.3                   | 0.60     | 0.54         | 0.12        | 1.88           | 1.41   | 0.00          | 4.55   | 0.17         | 0.00        | 0.01           | 0.38   | 0.00          | 0.56                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Morocco                | 31.3                  | 0.60     | 0.21         | 0.06        | 0.05           | 0.37   | 0.03          | 1.32   | 0.30         | 0.18        | 0.09           | 0.10   | 0.03          | 0.70                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Mozambique             | 22.3                  | 0.26     | 0.04         | 0.32        | 0.03           | 0.08   | 0.05          | 0.78   | 0.22         | 1.09        | 0.68           | 0.16   | 0.05          | 2.21                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Namibia                | 2.2                   | 0.43     | 1.05         | 0.14        | 0.00           | 0.38   | 0.03          | 2.03   | 0.21         | 1.67        | 0.37           | 4.90   | 0.03          | 7.18                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Nigeria                | 150.7                 | 0.81     | 0.10         | 0.21        | 0.10           | 0.15   | 0.07          | 1.44   | 0.84         | 0.17        | 0.02           | 0.02   | 0.07          | 1.12                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Rwanda                 | 10.0                  | 0.40     | 0.06         | 0.15        | 0.01           | 0.05   | 0.04          | 0.71   | 0.40         | 0.06        | 0.01           | 0.01   | 0.04          | 0.52                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Senegal                | 11.8                  | 0.69     | 0.27         | 0.23        | 0.08           | 0.21   | 0.04          | 1.53   | 0.43         | 0.21        | 0.53           | 0.19   | 0.04          | 1.40                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Sierra Leone           | 5.6                   | 0.32     | 0.15         | 0.39        | 0.13           | 0.06   | 0.09          | 1.13   | 0.86         | 0.38        | 0.19           | 0.19   | 0.09          | 1.71                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Somalia                | 8.9                   | 0.18     | 0.66         | 0.50        | 0.02           | 0.04   | 0.04          | 1.44   | 0.08         | 0.65        | 0.26           | 0.33   | 0.04          | 1.36                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| South Africa           | 49.3                  | 0.42     | 0.19         | 0.31        | 0.08           | 1.57   | 0.03          | 2.59   | 0.32         | 0.62        | 0.02           | 0.22   | 0.03          | 1.21                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Sudan                  | 41.4                  | 0.47     | 0.82         | 0.21        | 0.00           | 0.09   | 0.03          | 1.63   | 0.42         | 0.81        | 0.94           | 0.14   | 0.03          | 2.34                       |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |
| Swaziland              | 1.2                   | 0.40     | 0.53         | 0.11        | 0.00           | 0.33   | 0.07          | 1.45   | 0.29         | 0.55        | 0.05</         |        |               |                            |   |              |             |                |        |               |                   |

| Country/region                         | Population (millions)                                  | Cropland | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Carbon | Built up land | Total Ecological Footprint                    | Cropland | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Built up land | Total biocapacity |
|--|--|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------|---------------|---|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------|
|  | Ecological Footprint 2008 (global hectares per person) |          |              |             |                |        |               | Biocapacity 2008 (global hectares per person) |          |              |             |                |               |                   |
| Georgia                                | 4.4  | 0.44     | 0.30         | 0.11        | 0.07           | 0.48   | 0.04          | 1.43  | 0.15     | 0.36         | 0.57        | 0.05           | 0.04          | 1.17              |
| Iran, Islamic Republic of              | 72.3   | 0.55     | 0.13         | 0.05        | 0.10           | 1.77   | 0.06          | 2.66  | 0.36     | 0.08         | 0.07        | 0.28           | 0.06          | 0.84              |
| Iraq                                   | 29.8   | 0.33     | 0.09         | 0.01        | 0.00           | 0.96   | 0.02          | 1.42  | 0.14     | 0.02         | 0.05        | 0.01           | 0.02          | 0.24              |
| Israel                                 | 7.1  | 0.86     | 0.36         | 0.33        | 0.01           | 2.33   | 0.06          | 3.96  | 0.17     | 0.01         | 0.03        | 0.01           | 0.06          | 0.29              |
| Jordan                                 | 5.8  | 0.66     | 0.41         | 0.18        | 0.05           | 0.74   | 0.09          | 2.13  | 0.09     | 0.02         | 0.03        | 0.00           | 0.09          | 0.24              |
| Kazakhstan                             | 15.7   | 0.76     | 0.25         | 0.12        | 0.02           | 2.95   | 0.04          | 4.14  | 1.13     | 2.01         | 0.24        | 0.06           | 0.04          | 3.48              |
| Kuwait                                 | 2.5  | 0.80     | 0.64         | 0.23        | 0.29           | 7.70   | 0.07          | 9.72  | 0.01     | 0.01         | 0.00        | 0.32           | 0.07          | 0.43              |
| Kyrgyzstan                             | 5.2  | 0.55     | 0.16         | 0.08        | 0.01           | 0.41   | 0.07          | 1.29  | 0.43     | 0.68         | 0.09        | 0.06           | 0.07          | 1.33              |
| Lebanon                                | 4.2  | 0.66     | 0.48         | 0.28        | 0.05           | 1.33   | 0.05          | 2.85  | 0.22     | 0.05         | 0.06        | 0.01           | 0.05          | 0.39              |
| Occupied Palestinian Territory         | 3.8  | 0.33     | 0.05         | 0.00        | 0.00           | 0.09   | 0.00          | 0.46  | 0.11     | 0.02         | 0.00        | 0.00           | 0.00          | 0.13              |
| Oman                                   | 2.6  | 0.74     | 1.04         | 0.16        | 0.37           | 3.27   | 0.11          | 5.69  | 0.09     | 0.07         | 0.00        | 1.92           | 0.11          | 2.20              |
| Qatar                                  | 1.4  | 0.91     | 1.12         | 0.17        | 0.46           | 8.91   | 0.11          | 11.68   | 0.03     | 0.00         | 0.00        | 1.91           | 0.11          | 2.05              |
| Saudi Arabia                           | 26.2   | 0.80     | 0.36         | 0.26        | 0.06           | 2.44   | 0.07          | 3.99  | 0.18     | 0.13         | 0.07        | 0.21           | 0.07          | 0.65              |
| Syrian Arab Republic                   | 19.7   | 0.48     | 0.16         | 0.05        | 0.01           | 0.71   | 0.04          | 1.45  | 0.37     | 0.11         | 0.04        | 0.00           | 0.04          | 0.57              |
| Tajikistan                             | 6.7  | 0.42     | 0.17         | 0.02        | 0.00           | 0.21   | 0.08          | 0.90  | 0.29     | 0.17         | 0.01        | 0.01           | 0.08          | 0.56              |
| Turkey                                 | 70.9   | 0.92     | 0.08         | 0.28        | 0.03           | 1.17   | 0.07          | 2.55  | 0.74     | 0.13         | 0.32        | 0.05           | 0.07          | 1.31              |
| Turkmenistan                           | 4.9  | 0.93     | 0.54         | 0.01        | 0.01           | 2.37   | 0.13          | 3.98  | 0.89     | 2.01         | 0.02        | 0.14           | 0.13          | 3.19              |
| United Arab Emirates                   | 8.1  | 0.77     | 1.06         | 0.37        | 0.25           | 5.97   | 0.03          | 8.44  | 0.05     | 0.00         | 0.07        | 0.49           | 0.03          | 0.64              |
| Uzbekistan                             | 26.8   | 0.54     | 0.09         | 0.03        | 0.00           | 1.09   | 0.07          | 1.82  | 0.53     | 0.21         | 0.06        | 0.03           | 0.07          | 0.91              |
| Yemen                                  | 22.6   | 0.29     | 0.18         | 0.03        | 0.00           | 0.32   | 0.05          | 0.87  | 0.13     | 0.13         | 0.04        | 0.25           | 0.05          | 0.60              |
| Asia-Pacific                           | 3,729.6  | 0.46     | 0.07         | 0.15        | 0.11           | 0.76   | 0.07          | 1.63  | 0.40     | 0.09         | 0.18        | 0.12           | 0.07          | 0.86              |
| Australia                              | 21.5   | 1.61     | 1.11         | 1.16        | 0.10           | 2.68   | 0.03          | 6.68  | 2.14     | 6.16         | 2.55        | 3.69           | 0.03          | 14.57             |
| Bangladesh                             | 145.5  | 0.33     | 0.01         | 0.08        | 0.02           | 0.15   | 0.07          | 0.66  | 0.28     | 0.00         | 0.00        | 0.06           | 0.07          | 0.42              |
| Cambodia                               | 13.8   | 0.52     | 0.04         | 0.25        | 0.07           | 0.27   | 0.05          | 1.19  | 0.51     | 0.11         | 0.21        | 0.13           | 0.05          | 1.01              |
| China                                  | 1,358.8  | 0.52     | 0.13         | 0.14        | 0.10           | 1.15   | 0.09          | 2.13  | 0.38     | 0.11         | 0.22        | 0.07           | 0.09          | 0.87              |
| India                                  | 1,190.9  | 0.37     | 0.00         | 0.12        | 0.02           | 0.31   | 0.05          | 0.87  | 0.38     | 0.00         | 0.02        | 0.03           | 0.05          | 0.48              |
| Indonesia                              | 235.0  | 0.44     | 0.04         | 0.16        | 0.20           | 0.23   | 0.07          | 1.13  | 0.47     | 0.06         | 0.32        | 0.41           | 0.07          | 1.32              |
| Japan                                  | 126.5  | 0.50     | 0.15         | 0.24        | 0.39           | 2.83   | 0.06          | 4.17  | 0.11     | 0.00         | 0.34        | 0.07           | 0.06          | 0.59              |
| Korea, Democratic People's Republic of | 24.1   | 0.33     | 0.01         | 0.14        | 0.02           | 0.75   | 0.06          | 1.31  | 0.27     | 0.00         | 0.23        | 0.07           | 0.06          | 0.62              |

| Country/region                   | Population (millions)                                  | Cropland | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Carbon | Built up land | Total Ecological Footprint                    | Cropland | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Built up land | Total biocapacity |
|----------------------------------|--|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------|---------------|---|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                                  | Ecological Footprint 2008 (global hectares per person) |          |              |             |                |        |               | Biocapacity 2008 (global hectares per person) |          |              |             |                |               |                   |
| Korea, Republic of               | 47.7   | 0.73     | 0.18         | 0.23        | 0.47           | 2.93   | 0.07          | 4.62  | 0.18     | 0.00         | 0.09        | 0.38           | 0.07          | 0.72              |
| Lao People's Democratic Republic | 6.0  | 0.56     | 0.14         | 0.39        | 0.01           | 0.08   | 0.13          | 1.30  | 0.57     | 0.18         | 0.73        | 0.04           | 0.13          | 1.65              |
| Malaysia                         | 27.5   | 0.61     | 0.26         | 0.47        | 0.46           | 2.02   | 0.08          | 3.90  | 0.85     | 0.01         | 0.70        | 0.86           | 0.08          | 2.50              |
| Mongolia                         | 2.7  | 0.28     | 3.97         | 0.13        | 0.00           | 1.13   | 0.01          | 5.53  | 0.08     | 8.93         | 6.16        | 0.15           | 0.01          | 15.33             |
| Myanmar                          | 47.3   | 1.09     | 0.01         | 0.34        | 0.28           | 0.08   | 0.14          | 1.94  | 1.11     | 0.01         | 0.64        | 0.32           | 0.14          | 2.22              |
| Nepal                            | 28.9   | 0.36     | 0.05         | 0.20        | 0.00           | 0.07   | 0.09          | 0.76  | 0.34     | 0.04         | 0.06        | 0.00           | 0.09          | 0.53              |
| New Zealand                      | 4.3  | 0.72     | 0.00         | 1.21        | 0.75           | 1.56   | 0.06          | 4.31  | 0.22     | 2.91         | 4.91        | 2.09           | 0.06          | 10.19             |
| Pakistan                         | 167.4  | 0.35     | 0.01         | 0.09        | 0.01           | 0.24   | 0.05          | 0.75  | 0.30     | 0.00         | 0.01        | 0.04           | 0.05          | 0.40              |
| Papua New Guinea                 | 6.5  | 0.31     | 0.18         | 0.38        | 0.81           | 0.84   | 0.16          | 2.68  | 0.43     | 0.04         | 2.45        | 0.59           | 0.16          | 3.67              |
| Philippines                      | 90.2   | 0.45     | 0.07         | 0.09        | 0.32           | 0.00   | 0.06          | 0.98  | 0.37     | 0.02         | 0.10        | 0.07           | 0.06          | 0.62              |
| Singapore                        | 4.8  | 0.52     | 0.92         | 0.31        | 0.15           | 4.20   | 0.00          | 6.10  | 0.00     | 0.00         | 0.00        | 0.02           | 0.00          | 0.02              |
| Sri Lanka                        | 20.5   | 0.36     | 0.07         | 0.15        | 0.28           | 0.29   | 0.06          | 1.21  | 0.30     | 0.02         | 0.04        | 0.05           | 0.06          | 0.46              |
| Thailand                         | 68.3   | 0.57     | 0.05         | 0.16        | 0.67           | 0.89   | 0.07          | 2.41  | 0.73     | 0.01         | 0.22        | 0.14           | 0.07          | 1.17              |
| Timor-Leste                      | 1.1  | 0.24     | 0.07         | 0.05        | 0.02           | 0.05   | 0.04          | 0.47  | 0.20     | 0.06         | 0.56        | 0.00           | 0.04          | 0.86              |
| Vietnam                          | 86.0   | 0.52     | 0.02         | 0.18        | 0.12           | 0.43   | 0.12          | 1.39  | 0.59     | 0.01         | 0.16        | 0.22           | 0.12          | 1.09              |
| Latin America                    | 576.8  | 0.64     | 0.67         | 0.39        | 0.12           | 0.80   | 0.08          | 2.70  | 0.80     | 0.80         | 3.60        | 0.31           | 0.08          | 5.60              |
| Argentina                        | 39.7   | 0.80     | 0.62         | 0.28        | 0.13           | 0.77   | 0.12          | 2.71  | 2.88     | 1.72         | 0.71        | 1.69           | 0.12          | 7.12              |
| Bolivia                          | 9.6  | 0.44     | 1.58         | 0.17        | 0.01           | 0.35   | 0.06          | 2.61  | 0.59     | 2.41         | 15.26       | 0.06           | 0.06          | 18.39             |
| Brazil                           | 191.5  | 0.80     | 0.95         | 0.55        | 0.05           | 0.48   | 0.10          | 2.93  | 1.09     | 1.03         | 7.25        | 0.16           | 0.10          | 9.63              |
| Chile                            | 16.8   | 0.55     | 0.33         | 0.91        | 0.62           | 0.73   | 0.09          | 3.24  | 0.32     | 0.47         | 2.12        | 0.73           | 0.09          | 3.74              |
| Colombia                         | 45.0   | 0.38     | 0.72         | 0.14        | 0.03           | 0.43   | 0.11          | 1.80  | 0.29     | 1.22         | 2.23        | 0.04           | 0.11          | 3.89              |
| Costa Rica                       | 4.5  | 0.37     | 0.24         | 0.81        | 0.05           | 0.93   | 0.11          | 2.52  | 0.43     | 0.33         | 0.62        | 0.10           | 0.11          | 1.60              |
| Cuba                             | 11.3   | 0.71     | 0.22         | 0.11        | 0.06           | 0.79   | 0.02          | 1.90  | 0.26     | 0.08         | 0.21        | 0.14           | 0.02          | 0.71              |
| Dominican Republic               | 9.7  | 0.39     | 0.14         | 0.12        | 0.08           | 0.65   | 0.04          | 1.42  | 0.20     | 0.12         | 0.17        | 0.01           | 0.04          | 0.54              |
| Ecuador                          | 14.1   | 0.36     | 0.34         | 0.23        | 0.75           | 0.62   | 0.07          | 2.37  | 0.39     | 0.33         | 1.21        | 0.17           | 0.07          | 2.18              |
| El Salvador                      | 6.1  | 0.53     | 0.31         | 0.41        | 0.14           | 0.57   | 0.04          | 1.99  | 0.31     | 0.11         | 0.05        | 0.11           | 0.04          | 0.62              |
| Guatemala                        | 13.7   | 0.42     | 0.23         | 0.56        | 0.04           | 0.47   | 0.06          | 1.78  | 0.39     | 0.19         | 0.38        | 0.04           | 0.06          | 1.07              |
| Haiti                            | 9.7  | 0.29     | 0.06         | 0.10        | 0.02           | 0.09   | 0.03          | 0.60  | 0.22     | 0.03         | 0.01        | 0.01           | 0.03          | 0.31              |
| Honduras                         | 7.3  | 0.29     | 0.33         | 0.55        | 0.03           | 0.48   | 0.06          | 1.73  | 0.37     | 0.29         | 1.03        | 0.23           | 0.06          | 1.97              |

| Country/region                    | Population (millions)                                  | Cropland | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Carbon | Built up land | Total Ecological Footprint | Cropland                                      | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Built up land | Total biocapacity |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------|---------------|----------------------------|---|--------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------|--|
|                                   | Ecological Footprint 2008 (global hectares per person) |          |              |             |                |        |               |                            | Biocapacity 2008 (global hectares per person) |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Jamaica                           | 2.7  | 0.41     | 0.30         | 0.22        | 0.12           | 0.63   | 0.04          | 1.72                       | 0.14  | 0.00         | 0.10        | 0.05           | 0.04          | 0.33              |  |
| Mexico                            | 110.6  | 0.74     | 0.40         | 0.32        | 0.09           | 1.69   | 0.06          | 3.30                       | 0.49  | 0.25         | 0.49        | 0.14           | 0.06          | 1.42              |  |
| Nicaragua                         | 5.6  | 0.36     | 0.33         | 0.43        | 0.07           | 0.33   | 0.04          | 1.56                       | 0.41  | 0.58         | 0.80        | 0.50           | 0.04          | 2.33              |  |
| Panama                            | 3.4  | 0.45     | 0.54         | 0.21        | 0.78           | 0.96   | 0.04          | 2.97                       | 0.21  | 0.49         | 1.33        | 0.61           | 0.04          | 2.67              |  |
| Paraguay                          | 6.2  | 0.50     | 1.06         | 0.84        | 0.01           | 0.48   | 0.11          | 2.99                       | 2.05  | 2.35         | 6.36        | 0.06           | 0.11          | 10.92             |  |
| Peru                              | 28.5   | 0.50     | 0.50         | 0.20        | 0.45           | 0.30   | 0.08          | 2.03                       | 0.35  | 0.50         | 2.65        | 0.24           | 0.08          | 3.82              |  |
| Uruguay                           | 3.3  | 0.84     | 2.98         | 0.37        | 0.11           | 0.67   | 0.11          | 5.08                       | 1.31  | 5.25         | 1.12        | 2.24           | 0.11          | 10.03             |  |
| Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of | 28.1   | 0.48     | 0.88         | 0.17        | 0.12           | 1.32   | 0.05          | 3.02                       | 0.20  | 0.61         | 1.84        | 0.30           | 0.05          | 3.00              |  |
| North America                     | 338.4  | 1.13     | 0.22         | 0.85        | 0.10           | 4.75   | 0.07          | 7.12                       | 1.66  | 0.26         | 2.22        | 0.75           | 0.07          | 4.95              |  |
| Canada                            | 33.3   | 1.49     | 0.42         | 0.74        | 0.10           | 3.63   | 0.05          | 6.43                       | 2.81  | 0.23         | 8.27        | 3.55           | 0.05          | 14.92             |  |
| United States of America          | 305.0  | 1.09     | 0.19         | 0.86        | 0.09           | 4.87   | 0.07          | 7.19                       | 1.53  | 0.26         | 1.56        | 0.44           | 0.07          | 3.86              |  |
| EU                                | 497.1  | 1.13     | 0.34         | 0.53        | 0.14           | 2.42   | 0.16          | 4.72                       | 0.91  | 0.13         | 0.77        | 0.27           | 0.16          | 2.24              |  |
| Austria                           | 8.3  | 1.08     | 0.22         | 0.62        | 0.03           | 3.05   | 0.28          | 5.29                       | 0.87  | 0.15         | 2.04        | 0.00           | 0.28          | 3.34              |  |
| Belgium                           | 10.6   | 1.82     | 0.95         | 0.47        | 0.17           | 3.26   | 0.45          | 7.11                       | 0.46  | 0.11         | 0.28        | 0.05           | 0.45          | 1.33              |  |
| Bulgaria                          | 7.6  | 0.95     | 0.21         | 0.51        | 0.03           | 1.68   | 0.17          | 3.56                       | 1.19  | 0.18         | 1.01        | 0.09           | 0.17          | 2.65              |  |
| Czech Republic                    | 10.4   | 1.17     | 0.19         | 0.83        | 0.02           | 2.89   | 0.17          | 5.27                       | 1.17  | 0.12         | 1.21        | 0.00           | 0.17          | 2.68              |  |
| Denmark                           | 5.5  | 2.77     | 0.70         | 1.21        | 0.78           | 2.54   | 0.26          | 8.25                       | 2.40  | 0.03         | 0.27        | 1.85           | 0.26          | 4.81              |  |
| Estonia                           | 1.3  | 0.83     | 0.07         | 1.60        | 0.15           | 1.93   | 0.15          | 4.73                       | 0.79  | 0.36         | 3.32        | 4.11           | 0.15          | 8.73              |  |
| Finland                           | 5.3  | 1.11     | 0.19         | 0.40        | 0.27           | 4.15   | 0.10          | 6.21                       | 0.95  | 0.00         | 8.64        | 2.50           | 0.10          | 12.19             |  |
| France                            | 62.1   | 1.25     | 0.39         | 0.60        | 0.18           | 2.24   | 0.25          | 4.91                       | 1.47  | 0.24         | 0.87        | 0.16           | 0.25          | 2.99              |  |
| Germany                           | 82.5   | 1.18     | 0.26         | 0.43        | 0.01           | 2.49   | 0.20          | 4.57                       | 0.95  | 0.09         | 0.64        | 0.08           | 0.20          | 1.95              |  |
| Greece                            | 11.3   | 1.26     | 0.53         | 0.38        | 0.13           | 2.53   | 0.11          | 4.92                       | 1.03  | 0.09         | 0.14        | 0.22           | 0.11          | 1.59              |  |
| Hungary                           | 10.0   | 1.29     | 0.03         | 0.44        | 0.01           | 1.63   | 0.18          | 3.59                       | 1.82  | 0.10         | 0.58        | 0.01           | 0.18          | 2.68              |  |
| Ireland                           | 4.4  | 1.26     | 0.47         | 0.53        | 0.04           | 3.75   | 0.16          | 6.22                       | 0.59  | 0.79         | 0.24        | 1.64           | 0.16          | 3.41              |  |
| Italy                             | 59.9   | 1.03     | 0.40         | 0.46        | 0.14           | 2.39   | 0.10          | 4.52                       | 0.62  | 0.06         | 0.30        | 0.06           | 0.10          | 1.15              |  |
| Latvia                            | 2.3  | 0.79     | 0.10         | 1.25        | 0.26           | 1.48   | 0.07          | 3.95                       | 0.98  | 0.66         | 3.03        | 1.88           | 0.07          | 6.63              |  |
| Lithuania                         | 3.4  | 1.05     | 0.13         | 1.02        | 0.39           | 1.59   | 0.20          | 4.38                       | 1.43  | 0.75         | 1.67        | 0.27           | 0.20          | 4.32              |  |
| Netherlands                       | 16.5   | 1.30     | 1.09         | 0.54        | 0.10           | 3.14   | 0.16          | 6.34                       | 0.30  | 0.06         | 0.08        | 0.44           | 0.16          | 1.03              |  |

| Country/region         | Population (millions)                                  | Cropland | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Carbon | Built up land | Total Ecological Footprint | Cropland                                      | Grazing land | Forest land | Fishing ground | Built up land | Total biocapacity |  |
|------------------------|--|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------|---------------|----------------------------|---|--------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------|--|
|                        | Ecological Footprint 2008 (global hectares per person) |          |              |             |                |        |               |                            | Biocapacity 2008 (global hectares per person) |              |             |                |               |                   |  |
| Poland                 | 38.2   | 0.98     | 0.04         | 0.75        | 0.07           | 2.01   | 0.08          | 3.94                       | 0.99  | 0.12         | 0.71        | 0.10           | 0.08          | 2.00              |  |
| Portugal               | 10.6   | 0.96     | 0.00         | 0.14        | 0.95           | 2.01   | 0.05          | 4.12                       | 0.29  | 0.24         | 0.64        | 0.07           | 0.05          | 1.29              |  |
| Romania                | 21.6   | 0.92     | 0.13         | 0.35        | 0.04           | 1.23   | 0.16          | 2.84                       | 0.93  | 0.16         | 1.00        | 0.09           | 0.16          | 2.33              |  |
| Slovakia               | 5.4  | 1.07     | 0.25         | 0.86        | 0.02           | 2.28   | 0.18          | 4.66                       | 1.00  | 0.08         | 1.60        | 0.00           | 0.18          | 2.86              |  |
| Slovenia               | 2.0  | 0.94     | 0.25         | 0.61        | 0.04           | 3.22   | 0.15          | 5.21                       | 0.37  | 0.23         | 1.84        | 0.00           | 0.15          | 2.59              |  |
| Spain                  | 45.1   | 1.26     | 0.31         | 0.35        | 0.38           | 2.39   | 0.06          | 4.74                       | 0.98  | 0.11         | 0.25        | 0.06           | 0.06          | 1.46              |  |
| Sweden                 | 9.2  | 0.97     | 0.47         | 0.99        | 0.17           | 3.00   | 0.10          | 5.71                       | 0.64  | 0.04         | 6.36        | 2.38           | 0.10          | 9.51              |  |
| United Kingdom         | 61.5   | 0.88     | 0.45         | 0.53        | 0.06           | 2.65   | 0.15          | 4.71                       | 0.49  | 0.10         | 0.11        | 0.50           | 0.15          | 1.34              |  |
| Other Europe           | 239.3  | 1.05     | 0.16         | 0.40        | 0.17           | 2.23   | 0.05          | 4.05                       | 1.01  | 0.27         | 2.82        | 0.73           | 0.05          | 4.88              |  |
| Albania                | 3.2  | 0.71     | 0.21         | 0.09        | 0.02           | 0.71   | 0.06          | 1.81                       | 0.41  | 0.13         | 0.20        | 0.08           | 0.06          | 0.88              |  |
| Belarus                | 9.7  | 1.41     | 0.02         | 0.42        | 0.07           | 1.98   | 0.08          | 3.99                       | 1.38  | 0.31         | 1.61        | 0.02           | 0.08          | 3.40              |  |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 3.8  | 0.78     | 0.22         | 0.48        | 0.04           | 1.16   | 0.05          | 2.74                       | 0.41  | 0.26         | 0.91        | 0.00           | 0.05          | 1.64              |  |
| Croatia                | 4.4  | 1.02     | 0.13         | 0.66        | 0.07           | 1.89   | 0.43          | 4.19                       | 0.87  | 0.17         | 1.14        | 0.32           | 0.43          | 2.92              |  |
| Macedonia TFYR         | 2.1  | 0.79     | 0.21         | 0.33        | 0.07           | 3.87   | 0.09          | 5.36                       | 0.53  | 0.22         | 0.70        | 0.01           | 0.09          | 1.55              |  |
| Moldova                | 3.6  | 1.01     | 0.09         | 0.11        | 0.06           | 0.77   | 0.06          | 2.10                       | 1.11  | 0.07         | 0.09        | 0.01           | 0.06          | 1.33              |  |
| Norway                 | 4.8  | 1.05     | 0.13         | 0.66        | 1.27           | 1.58   | 0.08          | 4.77                       | 0.36  | 0.02         | 3.18        | 1.75           | 0.08          | 5.40              |  |
| Russian Federation     | 143.2  | 1.05     | 0.20         | 0.47        | 0.09           | 2.55   | 0.04          | 4.40                       | 0.94  | 0.34         | 4.22        | 1.08           | 0.04          | 6.62              |  |
| Serbia                 | 9.8  | 0.87     | 0.06         | 0.34        | 0.05           | 1.25   | 0.00          | 2.57                       | 0.95  | 0.07         | 0.39        | 0.00           | 0.00          | 1.41              |  |
| Switzerland            | 7.6  | 0.76     | 0.28         | 0.55        | 0.06           | 3.26   | 0.10          | 5.01                       | 0.21  | 0.15         | 0.73        | 0.01           | 0.10          | 1.20              |  |
| Ukraine                | 46.0   | 1.14     | 0.03         | 0.17        | 0.11           | 1.68   | 0.07          | 3.19                       | 1.49  | 0.13         | 0.41        | 0.13           | 0.07          | 2.23              |  |

# ANNEX 3: GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE REPORT

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Biocapacity</b>            | The capacity of ecosystems to produce useful biological materials and to absorb waste materials generated by humans, using current management schemes and extraction technologies. Biocapacity is measured in global hectares (Global Footprint Network, 2012).  |
| <b>Biocapacity deficit</b>    | The difference between the <i>biocapacity</i> and <i>Ecological Footprint</i> of a region or country. A biocapacity deficit occurs when the Footprint of a population exceeds the biocapacity of the area available to that population. Conversely, a biocapacity remainder exists when the biocapacity of a region exceeds its population's Footprint. If there is a regional or national biocapacity deficit, it means that the region is importing biocapacity through trade or liquidating regional ecological assets. In contrast, the global biocapacity deficit cannot be compensated through trade, and is therefore equal to <i>overshoot</i> . |
| <b>Biocapacity per person</b> | This is calculated by dividing the number of productive global hectares available by the number of people living on the planet in that year.   |
| <b>Biodiversity</b>           | Shorthand for biological diversity. Variability among living organisms from all sources including 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 (CBD and UNEP).   |
| <b>Biome</b>                  | A major portion of the living environment of a particular region characterized by its distinctive vegetation and maintained by local climatic conditions.  |
| <b>Carbon budget</b>          | The average global temperature must not rise more than 2 degrees Celsius over pre-industrial levels if we are to avoid dangerous climate change (many Parties to the Convention have accepted this objective, as first asserted in 1995. A review of the objective to look at whether a 1.5°C limit is in fact needed is scheduled for 2013-15). The 2°C objective can be further expressed as a global carbon budget. To have a reasonable chance (better than 50 per cent) of forestalling such a rise, cumulative global carbon emissions must be limited to 870 gigatons of CO2 equivalent between 2009 and 2100 (Höhne and Moltmann, 2009).         |
| <b>Carbon Footprint</b>       | The demand on biocapacity required to sequester (through photosynthesis) the carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions from fossil fuel combustion. Although fossil fuels are extracted from the Earth's crust and are not regenerated in human time scales, their use demands ecological services if the resultant CO2 is not to accumulate in the atmosphere. The Ecological Footprint therefore includes the biocapacity, typically that of unharvested forests, needed to absorb that fraction of   |

fossil CO2 that is not absorbed by the ocean (Global Footprint Network, 2012). There are several calculators that use the phrase "Carbon Footprint", but many just calculate tonnes of carbon, or tonnes of carbon per Euro, rather than demand on biopродuctive area.

**The CLUM model – Consumption Land Use Matrix** The CLUM presented in Chapter 1 represents the Ecological Footprint of consumption and contains three main components. The first component is short-lived consumption paid by individuals (also known as "household" or "HH"). This component contains food, housing maintenance and operations, personal transportation, goods and services. The second component is consumption paid for by government (called "government") and it contains short-lived consumption expenditure such as public services, public schools, policing and governance, and defence. The third component is consumption for long-lived assets (called "gross fixed capital formation"), which may be paid by households (e.g., new housing), firms (e.g., new factories and machinery) or governments (e.g., transport infrastructure). These three components summed are equivalent to the total Ecological Footprint per nation.

**Country income categories** Countries were assigned to high, middle or low income categories based on World Bank income thresholds. The World Bank classifies economies according to 2007 Gross National Income (GNI) per person per year. This is calculated by dividing the gross national income of each country (converted to US dollars using the World Bank Atlas method), by the mid-year population (for more information see The World Bank, 2012). **The categories are:** **Low income:** ≤US\$935 GNI per person. **Middle income:** US\$936-11,455 GNI per person (combines World Bank categories of lower middle and upper middle income). **High income:** ≥US\$11,456 GNI per person.

**Ecological Footprint** A measure of how much biologically productive land and water an individual, population or activity requires to produce all the resources it consumes, and to absorb the waste it generates, using prevailing technology and resource management practices. The Ecological Footprint is usually measured in global hectares. Because trade is global, an individual or country's Footprint includes land or sea from all over the world. Ecological Footprint is often referred to in short form as Footprint (Global Footprint Network, 2012).

**Ecological Footprint: Future scenarios** (continues over) This "business as usual" scenario has the following assumptions: (a) Global population of 9.3 billion by 2050 (UN, 2010 Medium variant); (b) Total energy demand doubles from 2005 levels (IEA Business as Usual from IEA, 2008); (c) Increasing dependency on coal for power generation from 45% in 2005 to 60% by 2050 (IEA Business as Usual); (d) 12% increase in caloric intake per person, with an increase in the amount from meat, milk, and dairy; decrease in amount from cereals and fish (FAO Agriculture Towards 2030/2050 FAO, 2006); (e) Constant crop and forest yields based on 2005 figures; (f) Increase in crops fed to animals (FAO Agriculture Towards 2030/2050, FAO, 2006); (g) Increases in atmospheric CO2 and methane concentrations associated


|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Ecological Footprint: Future scenarios (continued)</b> | with the scenarios in food and energy were combined with the estimates of the IPCC (IPCC, 2007b) and a land suitability model (Global Agro-Ecological Zones – GAEZ) to predict changes in the area and suitability of land for growing crops (Fischer et al., 2008).   |
| <b>Ecosystem</b>  | A dynamic complex of plant, animal and micro-organism communities and their non-living environment interacting as a functional unit.   |
| <b>Ecosystem services</b>                                 | The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment distinguished supporting, provisioning, regulating and cultural services that contribute to human well-being (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005a; b). These services are defined in the four panels below:   |
| <b>Provisioning services</b>                              | Goods obtained directly from ecosystems (e.g., food, medicine, timber, fibre and bioenergy).   |
| <b>Regulating services</b>                                | Benefits obtained from the regulation of natural processes (e.g., water filtration, waste decomposition, climate regulation, crop pollination and regulation of some human diseases).  |
| <b>Supporting services</b>                                | Regulation of basic ecological functions and processes that are necessary for the provision of all other ecosystem services (e.g. nutrient cycling, photosynthesis and soil formation).  |
| <b>Cultural services</b>                                  | Psychological and emotional benefits gained from human relations with ecosystems (e.g., enriching recreational, aesthetic and spiritual experiences).  |
| <b>Global hectare (gha)</b>                               | A productivity weighted area used to report both the biocapacity of the Earth, and the demand on biocapacity (the Ecological Footprint). The global hectare is normalized to the area-weighted average productivity of biologically productive land and water in a given year. Because different land types have different productivity, a global hectare of, for example, cropland, would occupy a smaller physical area than the much less biologically productive pasture land, as more pasture would be needed to provide the same biocapacity as one hectare of cropland. Because world bioproduction varies slightly from year to year, the value of a gha may change slightly from year to year (Global Footprint Network, 2012).   |
| <b>Human development</b>                                  | Human development is a process of “enlarging” people’s choices. Enlarging people’s choices is achieved by expanding human capabilities and functioning. At all levels of development the three essential capabilities for human development are for people to lead long and healthy lives; to be knowledgeable; and to have a decent standard of living. If these basic capabilities are not achieved, many choices are simply not available and many opportunities remain inaccessible. But Human development is a process of “enlarging” people’s choices. Enlarging people’s choices is achieved by expanding human capabilities and functioning. At all levels of development the three essential capabilities for human development are for people to lead long and healthy lives; to be knowledgeable; and to have a decent standard of living. If these basic capabilities are not achieved, many choices are |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>HDI</b>  | simply not available and many opportunities remain inaccessible. But the realm of human development goes further: Essential areas of choice, highly valued by people, range from political, economic and social opportunities for being creative and productive; to enjoying self-respect, empowerment and a sense of belonging to a community. The concept of human development is a holistic one, putting people at the centre of all aspects of the development process. (Source: Human Development Report webpage).   |
| <b>IHDI</b>   | The HDI – Human Development Index – is a summary composite index that measures a country’s average achievements in three basic aspects of human development: health, knowledge and a decent standard of living. The HDI contains three components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Health:</b> Life expectancy at birth (number of years a newborn infant would live if prevailing patterns of mortality at the time of birth were to stay the same throughout the child’s life).</li> <li><b>2. Knowledge:</b> A combination of the adult literacy rate and the combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment ratio.</li> <li><b>3. Standard of living:</b> GDP per capita (PPP US\$).</li> </ul> (Source: Human Development Report webpage).  |
| <b>Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index (IHDI)</b> | The IHDI is a measure of the level of human development of people in a society that accounts for inequality. Under perfect equality, the IHDI is equal to the HDI; but it falls below the HDI when inequality rises. In this sense, the IHDI is the actual level of human development while the HDI can be viewed as an index of the potential human development that could be achieved if there is no inequality. The IHDI accounts for inequality in HDI dimensions by “discounting” each dimension’s average value according to its level of inequality.<br>The average loss in the HDI due to inequality is about 23 per cent – that is, adjusted for inequality, the global HDI of 0.682 in 2011 would fall to 0.525. Countries with less human development tend to have greater inequality in more dimensions – and thus larger losses in human development.<br>This new version of the HDI was developed for the 2011 Human Development Report (UNDP, 2011) and at the time of publication, the adjustment has been applied to 134 countries. For this definition and more information, see the IHDI homepage. |
| <b>Living Planet Index (LPI)</b>                          | The LPI reflects changes in the health of the planet’s ecosystems by tracking trends in over 9,000 populations of vertebrate species. Much as a stock market index tracks the value of a set of shares over time as the sum of its daily change, the LPI first calculates the annual rate of change for each species’ population in the dataset (example populations are shown in Figures 4-6). The index then calculates the average change across all populations for each year from 1970, when data collection began, to 2008, the latest date for which data is available (Collen et al., 2009 and see Annex 1 for more details).   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>National Accounts Review Committee</b> | Global Footprint Network's scientific advisors who develop and endorse recommendations for methodological changes to the Ecological Footprint Accounts (Global Footprint Network, 2012).   |
| <b>National Footprint Accounts</b>        | The central data set that calculates the footprints and biocapacities of the world, and roughly 150 nations from 1961 to the present (generally with a three-year lag due to data availability). The ongoing development, maintenance and upgrades of the National Footprint Accounts are coordinated by Global Footprint Network and its 70+ partners (Global Footprint Network, 2012).   |
| <b>Natural capital</b>                    | Natural capital can be defined as all of the raw materials and natural cycles on Earth. Footprint analysis considers one key component: life-supporting natural capital, or ecological capital for short. This capital is defined as the stock of living ecological assets that yield goods and services on a continuous basis. Main functions include resource production (such as fish, timber or cereals), waste assimilation (such as CO <sub>2</sub> absorption or sewage decomposition) and life support services (such as UV protection, biodiversity, water cleansing or climate stability). |
| <b>Overshoot</b>                          | Global overshoot occurs when humanity's demand on the natural world exceeds the biosphere's supply, or regenerative capacity. Such overshoot leads to a depletion of Earth's life-supporting natural capital and a build-up of waste. At the global level, biocapacity deficit and overshoot are the same, since there is no net-import of resources to the planet. Local overshoot occurs when a local ecosystem is exploited more rapidly than it can renew itself (Global Footprint Network, 2012).   |
| <b>Sustainable development</b>            | Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.  |
| <b>Virtual water</b>                      | The "virtual water content" of a product is the same as its "Water Footprint". The Water Footprint of a product (a commodity, good or service) is the volume of freshwater used to produce the product, measured at the place where the product was actually produced. It refers to the sum of the water used in the various steps of the production chain.  |
| <b>Water Footprint</b>                    | The Water Footprint of an individual, community or business is defined as the total volume of freshwater that is used to produce the goods and services consumed by the individual or community, or produced by the business. The Water Footprint of a nation is defined as the total amount of water that is used to produce the goods and services consumed by the inhabitants of the nation.  |
| <b>ZNDD</b>                               | WWF defines ZNDD as: no net forest loss through deforestation and no net decline in forest quality through degradation; and stresses that: (a) most natural forest should be retained – the annual rate of loss of natural or semi-natural forests should be reduced to near zero; and (b) any gross loss or degradation of pristine natural forests would need to be offset by an equivalent area of socially and environmentally sound forest restoration.   |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| <b>ASC</b>     | Aquaculture Stewardship Council                                 |
| <b>BRIICS</b>  | Brazil, Russia, India, Indonesia, China, South Africa           |
| <b>CBD</b>     | Convention on Biological Diversity                              |
| <b>CLUM</b>    | Country Land Use Matrix   |
| <b>CONAGUA</b> | Mexican National Water Commission (Comisión Nacional del Agua)  |
| <b>EF</b>      | Ecological Footprint  |
| <b>EFR</b>     | Ecological Footprint Report                                     |
| <b>ESA</b>     | European Space Agency   |
| <b>ESRI</b>    | Environmental Systems Research Institute                        |
| <b>FAO</b>     | United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization               |
| <b>FSC</b>     | Forest Stewardship Council                                      |
| <b>GAM</b>     | General Additive Modeling                                       |
| <b>GAEZ</b>    | Global Agro Ecological Zones                                    |
| <b>GDP</b>     | Gross Domestic Product  |
| <b>Gha</b>     | Global Hectares   |
| <b>GHG</b>     | Greenhouse Gas  |
| <b>GNI</b>     | Gross National Income   |
| <b>HDI</b>     | Human Development Index   |
| <b>ICCAT</b>   | International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas |
| <b>IEA</b>     | International Energy Agency                                     |
| <b>IFC</b>     | International Finance Corporation                               |
| <b>IHDI</b>    | Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index                     |
| <b>IIASA</b>   | International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis            |
| <b>IPCC</b>    | International Panel on Climate Change                           |
| <b>IUCN</b>    | International Union for the Conservation of Nature              |
| <b>MEA</b>     | Millennium Ecosystem Assessment                                 |
| <b>MSC</b>     | Marine Stewardship Council                                      |
| <b>LPI</b>     | Living Planet Index   |
| <b>LPR</b>     | Living Planet Report  |
| <b>OECD</b>    | Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development           |
| <b>REDD</b>    | Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation    |
| <b>TEEB</b>    | The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity                    |
| <b>TOE</b>     | Tons of Oil Equivalent  |
| <b>UNDP</b>    | United Nations Development Programme                            |
| <b>UNFCCC</b>  | United Nations Convention on Climate Change                     |
| <b>UNFPA</b>   | United Nations Population Fund                                  |
| <b>WBCSD</b>   | World Business Council for Sustainable Development              |
| <b>WF</b>      | Water Footprint   |
| <b>WHO</b>     | World Health Organization                                       |
| <b>WMO</b>     | World Meteorological Organization                               |
| <b>WWF</b>     | World Wide Fund for Nature                                      |
| <b>ZNDD</b>    | Zero Net Deforestation and Forest Degradation                   |
| <b>ZSL</b>     | Zoological Society London                                       |



©ESA

A satellite image of the Canary Islands with unique cloud formations, created by “Von Karman vortices”, off the coast of Africa (right) in the Atlantic Ocean. These vortices, named after aeronautical engineer Theodore von Karman, form as air flows around an object in its path, causing it to separate and create eddies in its wake. The clockwise and counter-clockwise spirals in this image were created as wind blowing from the north over the Atlantic was disturbed by the archipelago. The islands are (left to right): El Hierro, La Palma, La Gomera, Tenerife, Gran Canaria, Fuerteventura and Lanzarote.

## REFERENCES

- Abramovitz, J.N. 1996. Worldwatch paper #128: Imperiled waters, impoverished future: the decline of freshwater ecosystems. Worldwatch Institute, Washington, DC.
- Ahrends, A., Burgess, N.D., Milledge, S.A.H., Bulling, M.T., Fisher, B., Smart, J.C.R., Clarke, G.P., Mhoro, B.E. and Lewis, S.L. 2010. Predictable waves of sequential forest degradation and biodiversity loss spreading from an African city. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 107 (33): 14556-14561.
- Angliss, R.P. and Outlaw, R.B. 2006. Bowhead whale (*Balaena mysticetus*): Western Arctic Stock. NOAA’s National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska, National Marine Fisheries Service.
- Anseeuw, W., Alden Wily, L., Cotula, L. and Taylor, M. 2012. Land Rights and the Rush for Land: Findings of the Global Commercial Pressures on Land Research Project. International Land Coalition (ILC), Rome, Italy.
- Aquamaps 2010. Aquamaps (08/2010). <http://www.aquamaps.org/>, downloaded on: 5th November 2011.
- Bhagabati, N., Barano, T., Conte, M.N., Ennaanay, D., Hadian, O., McKenzie, E., Olwero, N., Rosenthal, A., Suparmoko, A., Shapiro, A., Tallis, H. and Wolny, S. 2012. A Green Vision for Sumatra: Using ecosystem services information to make recommendations for sustainable land use planning at the province and district level. WWF-US and the Natural Capital Project, Washington DC, USA.
- BirdLife International 2008. State of the World’s Birds 2008: Indicators for our changing world. BirdLife International, Cambridge, UK.
- Bosch, J. and Martinez-Solano, I. 2006. Chytrid fungus infection related to unusual mortalities of Salamandra salamandra and *Bufo bufo* in the Peñalara Natural Park, Spain. *Oryx*. (40): 84-89.
- Braulik, G.T. 2006. Status assessment of the Indus River dolphin, *Platanista gangetica minor*, March-April 2001. *Biological Conservation*. 129: 579-590.
- Butchart, S.H., Walpole, M., Collen, B., van Strien, A., Scharlemann, J.P., Almond, R.E., Baillie, J.E., Bomhard, B., Brown, C., Bruno, J., Carpenter, K.E., Carr, G.M., Chanson, J., Chinery, A.M., Csirke, J., Davidson, N.C., Dentener, F., Foster, M., Galli, A., Galloway, J.N., Genovesi, P., Gregory, R.D., Hockings, M., Kapos, V., Lamarque, J.F., Leverington, F., Loh, J., McGeoch, M.A., McRae, L., Minasyan, A., Hernandez Morcillo, M., Oldfield, T.E., Pauly, D., Quader, S., Revenga, C., Sauer, J.R., Skolnik, B., Spear, D., Stanwell-Smith, D., Stuart, S.N., Symes, A., Tierney, M., Tyrrell, T.D., Vie, J.C. and Watson, R. 2010. Global biodiversity: indicators of recent declines. *Science*. 328 (5982): 1164-8.
- CDIAC 2011. Global CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from Fossil-Fuel Burning, Cement Manufacture, and Gas Flaring: 1751-2008. Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, USA. [http://cdiac.ornl.gov/ftp/ndpo30/global.1751\\_2008.ems](http://cdiac.ornl.gov/ftp/ndpo30/global.1751_2008.ems), downloaded on: June 10, 2011.
- Chapagain A.K. and Tickner, D. 2011. The utility and limits of water footprint in water management. WWF-UK.
- Chave, J., Olivier, J., Bongers, F., Châtellet, P., Forget, P.M., van der Meer, P., Norden, N., Riéra, B. and Charles-Dominique, P. 2008. Aboveground biomass and productivity in a rain forest of eastern South America. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*. 24: 355-366.
- Chomitz, K.M., Buys, P., De Luca, G., Thomas, T.S. and Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S. 2007. At loggerheads? Agricultural expansion, poverty reduction and environment in the tropical forests. World Bank, Washington DC, USA.
- Collen, B., Loh, J., Whitmee, S., Mcrae, L., Amin, R. and Baillie, J.E.M. 2009. Monitoring Change in Vertebrate Abundance: the Living Planet Index. *Conservation Biology*. 23 (2): 317-327.
- CONAGUA 2011. Identificación de reservas potenciales de agua para el medio ambiente en México. Comisión Nacional del Agua, Coyoacán, México.
- Craigie, I.D., Baillie, J.E.M., Balmford, A., Carbone, C., Collen, B., Green, R.E. and Hutton, J.M. 2010. Large mammal population declines in Africa’s protected areas. *Biological Conservation*. 143 (9): 2221-2228.

Davidson, E.A., de Araujo, A.C., Artaxo, P., Balch, J.K., Brown, I.F., MM, C.B., Coe, M.T., DeFries, R.S., Keller, M., Longo, M., Munger, J.W., Schroeder, W., Soares-Filho, B.S., Souza, C.M., Jr. and Wofsy, S.C. 2012. The Amazon basin in transition. *Nature*. 481 (7381): 321-8.

Defra 2010. Wild bird populations in the UK, 1970 to 2010. Defra National Statistics Release <http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/files/Wild-bird-populations-in-the-UK-1970-2010-National-Statistics-Release.pdf>, downloaded on: 30th November 2010.

DeFries, R.S., Rudel, T., Uriarte, M. and Hansen, M. 2010. Deforestation driven by urban population growth and agricultural trade in the twenty-first century. *Nature Geoscience*. 3: 178-181.

Dodman, D. 2009. Urban Density and Climate Change. in: (ed.), Analytical Review of the Interaction between Urban Growth Trends and Environmental Changes (Revised draft: April 2, 2009), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), New York, USA.

Ewing, B., Goldfinger, S., Oursler, A., Reed, A., Moore, D. and Wackernagel, M. 2009. Ecological Footprint Atlas. Global Footprint Network, San Francisco, California, USA.

Ewing B., Goldfinger, S., Oursler, A., Reed, A., Moore, D. and Wackernagel, M. 2009. Ecological Footprint Atlas. Global Footprint Network, San Francisco, California, USA.

FAO 2005. State of the World's Forests. FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO 2006. World agriculture: towards 2030/2050 – Interim report. FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO 2009. The Resource Outlook to 2050: By how much do land, water and crop yields need to increase by 2050? FAO Expert Meeting: "How to Feed the World in 2050", FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO 2010a. Global Forest Resources Assessment, 2010: Key findings. FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO 2010b. The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2010 (SOFIA) FAO, Rome, Italy.

Fischer, G., Nachtergael, F., Prieler, S., van Velthuizen, H.T., Verelst, L. and Wiberg, D. 2008. Global Agro-ecological Zones Assessment for Agriculture (GAEZ 2008). IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria and FAO, Rome, Italy.

Galli, A., Kitzes, J., Werner, P., Wackernagel, M., Niccolucci, V. and Tiezzi, E. 2007. An exploration of the mathematics behind the Ecological Footprint. *International Journal of Ecodynamics*. 2 (4): 250-257.

Global Footprint Network 2008. India's Ecological Footprint – a Business Perspective. Global Footprint Network and Confederation of Indian Industry, Hyderabad, India.

Global Footprint Network 2010. Ecological Wealth of Nations Global Footprint Network, San Francisco, California, USA.

Global Footprint Network 2011. The National Footprint Accounts. Global Footprint Network, San Francisco, California, USA, downloaded on: 20th February 2012.

Global Footprint Network 2012. Glossary. Global Footprint Network, Oakland, USA. <http://www.footprintnetwork.org/en/index.php/GFN/page/glossary/>, downloaded on: 12th December 2011.

Global Tiger Initiative 2011. Global Tiger Recovery Program 2010-2022. Global Tiger Initiative Secretariat, The World Bank, Washington DC, USA.

GTZ 2010. A Big Foot on a Small Planet? Accounting with the Ecological Footprint. Succeeding in a world with growing resource constraints. In: Sustainability has many faces, N° 10. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), Eschborn, Germany.

Hansen, M.C., Stehman, S.V., Potapov, P.V., Loveland, T.R., Townshend, J.R.G., DeFries, R.S., Pittman, K.W., Arunarwati, B., Stolle, F., Steininger, M.K., Carroll, M. and DiMiceli, C. 2008. Humid tropical forest clearing from 2000 to 2005 quantified by using multitemporal and multiresolution remotely sensed data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 105 (27): 9439-9444.

Hoekstra, A.Y., Chapagain, A.K., Aldaya, M.M. and Mekonnen, M.M. 2011. The Water Footprint Assessment Manual: Setting the Global Standard Earthscan, London, UK.

Hoekstra, A.Y. and Mekonnen, M.M. 2012. The Water Footprint of humanity. *PNAS*, published ahead of print February 13, 2012, doi:10.1073/pnas.1109936109.

Hoekstra, A.Y., Mekonnen, M.M., Chapagain, A.K., Mathews, R.E. and Richter, B.D. 2012. Global Monthly Water Scarcity: Blue Water Footprints versus Blue Water Availability. *PloS ONE*. 7 (2): e32688 (<http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0032688>).

Höhne, N. and Moltmann, S. 2009. Sharing the Effort under a Global Carbon Budget. WWF International and Ecofys, Gland, Switzerland.

Honisch, B., Ridgwell, A., Schmidt, D.N., Thomas, E., Gibbs, S.J., Sluijs, A., Zeebe, R., Kump, L., Martindale, R.C., Greene, S.E., Kiessling, W., Ries, J., Zachos, J.C., Royer, D.L., Barker, S., Marchitto, T.M., Jr., Moyer, R., Pelejero, C., Ziveri, P., Foster, G.L. and Williams, B. 2012. The geological record of ocean acidification. *Science*. 335 (6072): 1058-63.

Hubacek, K., Guan, D., Barrett, J. and Wiedmann, T. 2009. Environmental implications of urbanization and lifestyle change in China: Ecological and Water Footprints. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 17: 1241-1248.

IEA 2008. Energy Technology Perspectives 2008: Scenarios and strategies to 2050. International Energy Agency, Paris, France.

IPCC 2007a. Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland.

IPCC 2007b. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

IPCC 2007c. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

IUCN 2011. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2011.2. <http://www.iucnredlist.org>. IUCN downloaded on: 19 December 2011.

Jaiser, R., Dethloff, K., Handorf, D., Rinke, A. and Cohen, J. 2012. Impact of sea ice cover changes on the Northern Hemisphere atmospheric winter circulation. *Tellus Series A: Dynamic Meteorology and Oceanography*. 64: 11595.

Joshi, M., Hawkins, E., Sutton, R., Lowe, J. and Frame, D. 2011. Projections of when temperature change will exceed 2°C above pre-industrial levels. *Nature Climate Change*. 1: 407-412.

Kemp, A.C., Horton, B.P., Donnelly, J.P., Mann, M.E., Vermeer, M. and Rahmstorf, S. 2011. Climate related sea-level variations over the past two millennia. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 108 (27): 11017-22.

Kinnard, C., Zdanowicz, C.M., Fisher, D.A., Isaksson, E., de Vernal, A. and Thompson, L.G. 2011. Reconstructed changes in Arctic sea ice over the past 1,450 years. *Nature*. 479 (7374): 509-12.

Kitzes, J., Galli, A., Bagliani, M., Barrett, J., Dige, G., Ede, S., Erb, K.-H., Giljum, S., Haberl, H., Hails, C., Jungwirth, S., Lenzen, M., Lewis, K., Loh, J., Marchettini, N., Messinger, H., Milne, K., Moles, R., Monfreda, C., Moran, D., Nakano, K., Pyhälä, A., Rees, W., Simmons, C., Wackernagel, M., Wada, Y., Walsh, C. and Wiedmann, T. 2009. A research agenda for improving national Ecological Footprint accounts. *Ecological Economics*. 68 (7): 1991-2007.

Kitzes, J., Wackernagel, M., Loh, J., Peller, A., Goldfinger, S. and Cheng, D. 2008. Shrink and share: humanity's present and future Ecological Footprint. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*. 363 (1491): 467-475.

Larsen, F.W., Londonö-Murcia, M.C. and Turner, W.R. 2011. Global priorities for conservation of threatened species, carbon storage, and freshwater services: Scope for synergy? *Conservation Letters*. 4 (5): 355-363.

Laurance, W.F. 2007. Forest destruction in tropical Asia. *Current Science*. 93 (11): 1544-1550.

Laurance, W.F. 2012. Special Agricultural and Business Leases imperil forests in Papua New Guinea. *Pacific Conservation Biology*. (in press).

Lenton, T., Footitt, A. and Dlugolecki, A. 2009. Major Tipping Points in the Earth's Climate System and Consequences for the Insurance Sector. WWF and Allianz, Berlin and Munich, Germany.

Lewis, S.L., Brando, P.M., Phillips, O.L., van der Heijden, G.M. and Nepstad, D. 2011. The 2010 Amazon drought. *Science*. 331 (6017): 554.

- Lewis, S.L., Lopez-Gonzalez, G., Sonke, B., Affum-Baffoe, K., Baker, T.R., Ojo, L.O., Phillips, O.L., Reitsma, J.M., White, L., Comiskey, J.A., Djuikouo K, M.-N., Ewango, C.E.N., Feldpausch, T.R., Hamilton, A.C., Gloor, M., Hart, T., Hladik, A., Lloyd, J., Lovett, J.C., Makana, J.-R., Malhi, Y., Mbago, F.M., Ndangalasi, H.J., Peacock, J., Peh, K.S.H., Sheil, D., Sunderland, T., Swaine, M.D., Taplin, J., Taylor, D., Thomas, S.C., Votere, R and Woell, H. 2009. Increasing carbon storage in intact African tropical forests. *Nature*. 457 (7232): 1003-U3.
- Lotze, H.K., Lenihan, H.S., Bourque, B.J., Bradbury, R.H., Cooke, R.G., Kay, M.C., Kidwell, S.M., Kirby, M.X., Peterson, C.H. and Jackson, J.B.C. 2006. Depletion, degradation, and recovery potential of estuaries and coastal seas. *Science*. 312 (5781): 1806-1809.
- Luthi, D., Le Floch, M., Bereiter, B., Blunier, T., Barnola, J.M., Siegenthaler, U., Raynaud, D., Jouzel, J., Fischer, H., Kawamura, K. and Stocker, T.F. 2008. High-resolution carbon dioxide concentration record 650,000-800,000 years before present. *Nature*. 453 (7193): 379-82.
- Ma, Z., Peng, C., Zhu, Q., Chen, H., Yu, G., Li, W., Zhou, X., Wang, W. and Zhang, W. 2012. Regional drought-induced reduction in the biomass carbon sink of Canada's boreal forests. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 109 (7): 2423-7.
- Mahli, Y., Wood, D., Baker, T.R., Wright, J., Phillips, O.L., Cochrane, T., Meir, P., Chave, J., Almeida, S., Arroyo, L., Higuchi, N., Killeen, T.J., Laurance, S.G., Laurance, W.F., Lewis, S.L., Monteagudo, A., Neill, D.A., Vargas, P.N., Pitman, N.C.A., Quesada, C.A., Salomaro, R., Silva, J.N.M., Lez, A.T., Terborgh, J., Martinez, R.V. and Vinceti, B. 2006. The regional variation of aboveground live biomass in old-growth Amazonian forests. *Global Change Biology*. 12: 1107–1138.
- Malhi, Y., Baldocchi, D.D. and Jarvis, P.G. 1999. The carbon balance of tropical, temperate and boreal forests. *Plant, Cell and Environment*. 22: 715–740.
- Matthews, E. 2000. Undying Flame: The Continuing Demand for Wood as Fuel. *Earthtrends*, World Resources Institute, Washington DC, USA.
- McAllister, D.E., Hamilton, A.L. and Harvey, B. 1997. Global freshwater diversity: Striving for the integrity of freshwater ecosystems. *Sea Wind*. 11: 1-140.
- MEA 2005. Ecosystems and human well-being: Biodiversity synthesis: Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, World Resources Institute, Washington, DC., USA.
- Meyfroidt, P. and Lambin, E.F. 2011. Global forest transition: Prospects for an end to deforestation. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*. 36: 343-371.
- Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005a. Ecosystems and human well-being: Biodiversity synthesis: Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, World Resources Institute, Washington, DC., USA.
- Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005b. Ecosystems and human well-being: Synthesis. World Resources Institute, Press, I., Washington, DC, USA.
- Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005c. Ecosystems and human well-being: Wetlands and water synthesis. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC., USA.
- Milner-Gulland, E.J., Kholodova, M.V., Bekenov, A., Bukreeva, O.M., Grachev, I.A., Amgalan, L. and Lushchekina, A.A. 2001. Dramatic declines in saiga antelope populations. *Oryx*. 35 (4): 340-345.
- Moore, D., Cranston, G., Reed, A. and Galli, A. 2012. Projecting future human demand on the Earth's regenerative capacity. *Ecological Indicators*. 16: 3-10.
- Mwampamba, T.H. 2007. Has the woodfuel crisis returned? Urban charcoal consumption in Tanzania and its implications to present and future forest availability *Energy Policy*. 35 (8): 4221-4234.
- Naidoo, R., Balmford, A., Costanza, R., Fisher, B., Green, R.E., Lehner, B., Malcolm, T.R. and Ricketts, T.H. 2008. Global mapping of ecosystem services and conservation priorities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 105 (28): 9495-9500.
- NASA 2012. Annual mean Land-Ocean Temperature Index in .01 degrees Celsius selected zonal means. NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS), New York, USA. [http://data.giss.nasa.gov/gistemp/tabledata\\_v3/ZonAnn.Ts+dSST.txt](http://data.giss.nasa.gov/gistemp/tabledata_v3/ZonAnn.Ts+dSST.txt), downloaded on: 1st January 2012.
- National Research Council 2010. Advancing the Science of Climate Change. The National Academies Press, Washington, DC, USA.

- National Research Council 2011. Climate Stabilization Targets: Emissions, Concentrations, and Impacts over Decades to Millennia. The National Academies Press, Washington, DC, USA.
- Normander, B., Gregor Levin, G., Auvinen, A., Bratli, H., Stabbertorp, O., Hedblom, M., Glimskär, A. and Gudmundsson, G.A. 2009. State of biodiversity in the Nordic countries: An assessment of progress towards achieving the target of halting biodiversity loss by 2010. Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Norris, K., Asase, A., Collen, B., Gockowski, J., Mason, J., Phalan, B. and Wade, A. 2010. Biodiversity in a forest-agriculture mosaic: The changing face of West African rainforests. *Biological Conservation*. 143 (10): 2341-2350.
- Oak Ridge National Laboratory 2011. Carbon Dioxide Emissions Rebound Quickly After Global Financial Crisis. Tennessee, USA.
- Porter, J.R., Deutsch, L., Dumaresq, D. and Dyball, R. 2011. How will growing cities eat? *Nature*. 469 (7328): 34-34.
- Potapov, P., Hansen, M.C., Stehman, S.V., Loveland, T.R. and Pittman, K. 2008. Combining MODIS and Landsat imagery to estimate and map boreal forest cover loss. *Remote Sensing of Environment*. 112: 3708–3719.
- Poumanyvong, P. and Kaneko, S. 2010. Does urbanization lead to less energy use and lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions? A cross-country analysis. *Ecological Economics*. 70: 434–444.
- Richter, B.D., Davis, M.M., Apse, C. and Konrad, C. 2011. A presumptive standard for environmental flow protection. *River Research and Applications*.
- Roberts , C.M. 2007. The Unnatural History of the Sea. Island Press, Covelo, USA.
- Rogelj, J., Hare, W., Lowe, J., van Vuuren, D.P., Riahi, K., Matthews, B., Hanaoka, T., Jiang, K. and Meinshausen, M. 2011. Emission pathways consistent with a 2 degrees C global temperature limit. *Nature Climate Change*. 1 (8): 413-418.
- Rosenberg, A.A., Bolster, W.J., Alexander, K.E., Leavenworth, W.B., Cooper, A.B. and McKenzie, M.G. 2005. The history of ocean resources: modeling cod biomass using historical records. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*. (3): 84-90.
- Saatchi, S.S., Harris, N.L., Brown, S., Lefsky, M., Mitchard, E.T.A., Salas, W., Zutta, B.R., Buermann, W., Lewis, S.L., Hagen, S., Petrova, S., White, L., Silman, M. and Morel, A. 2011. Benchmark map of forest carbon stocks in tropical regions across three continents. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 108 (24): 9899-9904.
- Safina, C. and Klinger, D.H. 2008. Collapse of Bluefin Tuna in the Western Atlantic. *Conservation Biology*. 22 (2): 243-246.
- Sanderson, E., Forrest, J., Loucks, C., Ginsberg, J. and Dinerstein, E. 2006. Setting priorities for the conservation and recovery of wild tigers 2005–2015: A technical report WWF-US, World Wildlife Fund, Smithsonian, and National Fish and Wildlife Foundation—Save the Tiger Fund, New York and Washington, DC, USA.
- Schuur, E.A. and Abbott, B. 2011. Climate change: High risk of permafrost thaw. *Nature*. 480 (7375): 32-3.
- Stern, N. 2006. Stern Review on The Economics of Climate Change. HM Treasury, London.
- Strassburg, B.B.N., Kelly, A., Balmford, A., Davies, R.G., Gibbs, H.K., Lovett, A., Miles, L., Orme, C.D.L., Price, J., Turner, R.K. and Rodrigues, A.S.L. 2010. Global congruence of carbon storage and biodiversity in terrestrial ecosystems. *Conservation Letters*. 3 (2): 98-105.
- Strassburg, B.B.N., Rodrigues, A.S.L., Gusti, M., Balmford, B., Fritz, S., Obersteiner, M., Turner, R.K. and Brooks, T.M. 2012. Impacts of incentives to reduce emissions from deforestation on global species extinctions. *Nature Climate Change*.
- Swartz, W., Sala, E., Tracey, S., Watson, R. and Pauly, D. 2010. The spatial expansion and ecological footprint of fisheries (1950 to present). *PloS ONE*. 5 (12): e15143 (<Go to ISI>://WOS:00028468000026)
- TEEB 2010. The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity: Mainstreaming the Economics of Nature: A synthesis of the approach, conclusions and recommendations of TEEB. European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.
- The World Bank 2012. World Development Indicators (WDI): GNI per capita, Atlas method (current US\$). The World Bank <http://data.worldbank.org/about/country-classifications/world-bank-atlas-method>, downloaded on: 21st February 2012.

- Thurstan, R.H., Brockington, S. and Roberts, C.M. 2010. The effects of 118 years of industrial fishing on UK bottom trawl fisheries. *Nature Communications*. 1 (15): 1-6.
- Tremblay-Boyer, L., Gascuel, D., Watson, D.R., Christensen, V. and Pauly, D. 2011. Modelling the effects of fishing on the biomass of the world's oceans from 1950 to 2006. *Marine Ecology-Progress Series*. 442: 169–185.
- Turvey, S.T., Pitman, R.L., Taylor, B.L., Barlow, J., Akamatsu, T., Barrett, L.A., Zhao Xiujiang, Reeves, R.R., Stewart, B.S., Pusser, L.T., Wang Kexiong, Wei Zhuo, Zhang Xianfeng, Richlen, M., Brandon, J.R. and Ding, W. 2007. First human-caused extinction of a cetacean species? *Biology Letters*. 3: 537-540.
- UN 2009. World Urbanization Prospects, the 2009 Revision. The Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations <http://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/index.htm>, downloaded on: 12th December 2011.
- UN 2010. World Population Prospects, the 2010 Revision. Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat <http://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/index.htm>, downloaded on: 28th February 2012.
- UNDP 2009. The Human Development Report: Overcoming barriers: Human Mobility and Development. UNDP, New York, USA.
- UNDP 2010. The Human Development Report: The Real Wealth of Nations: Pathways to Human Development. The United Nations Development Programme, New York, USA.
- UNDP 2011. The Human Development Report: Sustainability and Equity: A Better Future for All. The United Nations Development Programme, New York, USA.
- UNEP 2010. The Emissions Gap Report. United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya.
- UNFPA 2007. State of World Population 2007: Unleashing the Potential of Urban Growth. United Nations Population Fund, New York, USA.
- UNFPA 2011. State of World Population 2011: People and possibilities in a world of 7 billion. United Nations Population Fund, New York, USA.
- USGCRP 2009. Global Climate Change Impacts on the United States. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, USA.
- van der Werf, G.R., Morton, D.C., DeFries, R.S., Olivier, J.G.J., Kasibhatla, P.S., Jackson, R.B., Collatz, G.J. and Randerson, J.T. 2009. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from forest loss. *Nature Geoscience*. 2 (11): 737-738.
- Vermeer, M. and Rahmstorf, S. 2009. Global sea level linked to global temperature. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 106 (51): 21527-32.
- Wackernagel, M., Schulz, N.B., Deumling, D., Linares, A.C., Jenkins, M., Kapos, V., Monfreda, C., Loh, J., Myers, N., Norgaard, R. and Randers, J. 2002. Tracking the ecological overshoot of the human economy. *PNAS*. 99: 9266–9271.
- Walston, J., Robinson, J.G., Bennett, E.L., Breitenmoser, U., da Fonseca, G.A.B., Goodrich, J., Gumal, M., Hunter, L., Johnson, A., Karanth, K.U., Leader-Williams, N., MacKinnon, K., Miquelle, D., Pattanavibool, A., Poole, C., Rabinowitz, A.R., Smith, J.L.D., Stokes, E.J., Stuart, S.N., Vongkhamheng, C. and Wibisono, H. 2010. Bringing the tiger back from the brink - the six percent solution. *PloS Biology*. 8: e1000485
- WBCSD 2010. Vision 2050: The New Agenda for Business. World Business Council for Sustainable Development, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S. and Kongphan-apira, M. 2009. Emerging REDD+: A preliminary survey of demonstration and readiness activities. Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor Barat, Indonesia.
- World Economic Forum 2011. Global Risks 2011: An initiative of the Risk Response Network (Sixth Edition). World Economic Forum, Geneva, Switzerland.
- World Resources Institute 2011. World Resources Institute online. [www.wri.org](http://www.wri.org), downloaded on: 14th December 2011.
- WWF 2003. Thirsty Crops: Our food and clothes: eating up nature and wearing out the environment? WWF, Gland, Switzerland.
- WWF 2006a. Free-flowing rivers: Economic luxury or ecological necessity? WWF-Global Freshwater Programme, Zeist, Netherlands.
- WWF 2006b. Living Planet Report. WWF, Gland, Switzerland.
- WWF 2007. Europe 2007: Gross Domestic Product and Ecological Footprint. WWF European Policy Office (EPO), Brussels, Belgium.

- WWF 2008a. Hong Kong Ecological Footprint Report: Living Beyond Our Means. WWF Hong Kong, Wanchai, Hong Kong.
- WWF 2008b. The Living Planet Report. WWF International, Gland, Switzerland.
- WWF 2010a. The Living Planet Report: Biodiversity, biocapacity and development. WWF-International, Gland, Switzerland.
- WWF 2010b. Reinventing the City: Three Prerequisites for Greening Urban Infrastructures. WWF International, Gland, Switzerland.
- WWF 2011a. Chapter 1: Forests for a Living Planet. in: WWF Living Forests Report, WWF International, Gland, Switzerland.
- WWF 2011b. Chapter 2: Forests and Energy. in: WWF Living Forests Report, WWF International, Gland, Switzerland.
- WWF 2011c. Chapter 3: Forests and Climate - REDD+ at a crossroads. in: WWF Living Forest Report, WWF International, Gland, Switzerland.
- WWF 2011d. The Energy Report: 100% Renewable Energy by 2050. WWF, Gland, Switzerland.
- WWF/ZSL 2012. The Living Planet Index database. WWF and the Zoological Society of London. downloaded on: 22nd February 2012.
- Xiao, J., Zhuang, Q., Law, B.E., Baldocchi, D.D., Chen, J., Richardson, A.D., Melillo, J.M., Davis, K.J., Hollinger, D.Y., Wharton, S., Oren, R., Noormets, A., Fischer M.L., Verma, S.B., Cook, D.R., Sun, G., Menutly, S., Wofsy, S.C., Bolstad, P.V., Burns, S.P., Curtis, P.S., Drake, B.G., Falk, M., Foster, D.R., Gu, L., Hadley, J.L., Katul, G.G., Litvak, M., Ma, S., Martin, T.A., Matamala, R., Meyers, T.P., Monson, R.K., Munger, J.W., Oechel, W.C., Tha Paw, U.K., Schmid, H.P., Scott, R.L., Starr, G., Stuyker, A.E. and Torn, M.S. 2011. Assessing net ecosystem carbon exchange of U.S. terrestrial ecosystems by integrating eddy covariance flux measurements and satellite observations. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*. 151 (1): 60-69.
- Zhao, M. and Running, S.W. 2010. Drought-Induced Reduction in Global Terrestrial Net Primary Production from 2000 Through 2009. *Science*. 329 (5994): 940-943.

# WWF WORLDWIDE NETWORK

**WWF Offices**

|                              |                          |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Armenia                      | Laos                     |
| Azerbaijan                   | Madagascar               |
| Australia                    | Malaysia                 |
| Austria                      | Mauritania               |
| Belgium                      | Mexico                   |
| Belize                       | Mongolia                 |
| Bhutan                       | Mozambique               |
| Bolivia                      | Namibia                  |
| Brazil                       | Nepal                    |
| Bulgaria                     | Netherlands              |
| Cambodia                     | New Zealand              |
| Cameroon                     | Norway                   |
| Canada                       | Pakistan                 |
| Central African Republic     | Panama                   |
| Chile                        | Papua New Guinea         |
| China                        | Paraguay                 |
| Colombia                     | Peru                     |
| Costa Rica                   | Philippines              |
| Democratic Republic of Congo | Poland                   |
| Denmark                      | Romania                  |
| Ecuador                      | Russia                   |
| Finland                      | Senegal                  |
| Fiji                         | Singapore                |
| France                       | Solomon Islands          |
| Gabon                        | South Africa             |
| Gambia                       | Spain                    |
| Georgia                      | Suriname                 |
| Germany                      | Sweden                   |
| Ghana                        | Switzerland              |
| Greece                       | Tanzania                 |
| Guatemala                    | Thailand                 |
| Guyana                       | Tunisia                  |
| Honduras                     | Turkey                   |
| Hong Kong                    | Uganda                   |
| Hungary                      | United Arab Emirates     |
| India                        | United Kingdom           |
| Indonesia                    | United States of America |
| Italy                        | Vietnam                  |
| Japan                        | Zambia                   |
| Kenya                        | Zimbabwe                 |

**WWF Associates**

|   |
|---|
| Fundación Vida Silvestre (Argentina)          |
| Fundación Natura (Ecuador)                    |
| Pasaules Dabas Fonds (Latvia)                 |
| Nigerian Conservation Foundation<br>(Nigeria) |

**Others**

Emirate Wildlife Society (UAE)  
As at: May 2012

**Publication details**

Published in May 2012 by WWF – World Wide Fund for Nature (formerly World Wildlife Fund), Gland, Switzerland. Any reproduction in full or in part of this publication must mention the title and credit the above-mentioned publisher as the copyright owner.

Recommended citation:  
WWF. 2012. *Living Planet Report 2012*.  
WWF International, Gland, Switzerland.

Text and graphics: 2012 WWF  
All rights reserved.

Reproduction of this publication for educational or other non-commercial purposes is authorized without prior written permission from the copyright holder. However, WWF does request advance written notification and appropriate acknowledgement. Reproduction of this publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without prior written permission of the copyright holder.

The designation of geographical entities in this report, and the presentation of the material, do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of WWF concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

### **Living Planet Index**

The authors are extremely grateful to the following individuals and organizations for sharing their data: Richard Gregory, Petr Vorisek and the European Bird Census Council for data from the Pan-European Common Bird Monitoring scheme; the Global Population Dynamics Database from the Centre for Population Biology, Imperial College London; Derek Pomeroy, Betty Lutaaya and Herbert Tushabe for data from the National Biodiversity Database, Makerere University Institute of Environment and Natural Resources, Uganda; Kristin Thorsrud Teien and Jorgen Randers, WWF-Norway; Pere Tomas-Vives, Christian Perennou, Driss Ezzine de Blas, Patrick Grillas and Thomas Galewski, Tour du Valat, Camargue, France; David Junor and Alexis Morgan, WWF-Canada and all data contributors to the LPI for Canada; Miguel Angel Nuñez Herrero and Juan Diego López Giraldo, the Environmental Volunteer Programme in Natural Areas of Murcia Region, Spain; Mike Gill from the CBMP, Christoph Zockler from UNEP-WCMC and all data contributors to the ASTI report ([www.asti.is](http://www.asti.is)); Arjan Berkhuysen, WWF-Netherlands and all data contributors to the LPI for global estuarine systems. A full list of data contributors can be found at [www.livingplanetindex.org](http://www.livingplanetindex.org)

### **Ecological Footprint**

The authors would like to thank the following national governments for their collaboration on research to improve the quality of the National Footprint Accounts: Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom; Finland, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Belgium, Luxembourg, Indonesia and Ecuador.

Much of the research for this report would not have been possible without the generous support of: Avina Stiftung, Foundation for Global Community, Funding Exchange, MAVA - Fondation pour la Protection de la Nature, Mental Insight Foundation, Skoll Foundation, Stiftung ProCare, The Winslow Foundation; Flora Family Foundation; Karl Mayer Foundation; Zayed International Prize for the Environment; VIVA Trust; Environment Agency – Abu Dhabi; Dr. Med Arthur und Estella Hirzel-Callegari Stiftung; Daniela Schlettwein-Gsell; Oliver and Bea Wackernagel; Marie-Christine Wackernagel-Burckhardt; Ader B. Gandi; Sarosh Kumana; Terry and Mary Vogt and many other individual donors.

We would also like to acknowledge the Global Footprint Network's 77 partner organizations; and the Global Footprint Network National Accounts Committee for their guidance, contributions, and commitment to robust National Footprint Accounts.

### **European Space Agency**

ESA's activities fall into two categories – "mandatory" and "optional". Programmes carried out under the General Budget and the Science Programme budget are "mandatory"; they include the agency's basic activities (studies on future projects, technology research, shared technical investments, information systems and training programmes).

All member states contribute to these programmes on a scale based on their Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The other programmes, known as "optional", are only of interest to some member states, who are free to decide on their level of involvement.

Optional programmes cover areas such as Earth observation, telecommunications, satellite navigation and space transportation. Similarly, the International Space Station and microgravity research are financed by optional contributions.

### **Additional thanks**

With special thanks to staff at WWF-US, WWF-UK, WWF-Netherlands and WWF International for their invaluable comments during the review of this report and for further contributions.

# LIVING PLANET REPORT 2012

## BIOCAPACITY

It takes 1.5 years for the Earth to regenerate the renewable resources that people use, and absorb the CO<sub>2</sub> waste they produce, in that same year.



## BETTER CHOICES

Living within ecological boundaries requires a global consumption and production pattern in balance with the Earth's biocapacity.

## BIODIVERSITY

Biodiversity, ecosystems and ecosystem services – our natural capital – must be preserved as the foundation of well-being for all.

100%  
RECYCLED



## EQUITABLE SHARING

Equitable resource governance is essential to shrink and share our resource use.



### Why we are here

To stop the degradation of the planet's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature.

[panda.org/lpr](http://panda.org/lpr)