

ECOSYSTEMS AND HUMAN WELL-BEING

OUR HUMAN PLANET



Summary for Decision Makers

MILLENNIUM ECOSYSTEM ASSESSMENT

Our Human Planet: Summary for Decision-makers

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment



Washington • Covelo • London

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Series

Ecosystems and Human Well-being: A Framework for Assessment
Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Current State and Trends, Volume 1
Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Scenarios, Volume 2
Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Policy Responses, Volume 3
Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Multiscale Assessments, Volume 4
Our Human Planet: Summary for Decision-makers

Synthesis Reports (available at MAweb.org)

Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis
Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Biodiversity Synthesis
Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Desertification Synthesis
Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Human Health Synthesis
Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Wetlands and Water Synthesis
Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Opportunities and Challenges for Business and Industry

Copyright © 2005 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the publisher: Island Press, 1718 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 300, NW, Washington, DC 20009.

ISLAND PRESS is a trademark of The Center for Resource Economics.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data.

Our human planet : summary for decision-makers / Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.

p. cm. -- (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment series)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-55963-386-7 (cloth : alk. paper)–ISBN 1-55963-387-5 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Human ecology. 2. Ecosystem management. I. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (Program) II. Series.

GF50.O97 2005

333.7--dc22

2005029022

British Cataloguing-in-Publication data available.

Printed on recycled, acid-free paper recycling logo here ♻

Book design by Maggie Powell
Typesetting by Coghill Composition, Inc.

Manufactured in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

About Island Press

Island Press is the only nonprofit organization in the United States whose principal purpose is the publication of books on environmental issues and natural resource management. We provide solutions-oriented information to professionals, public officials, business and community leaders, and concerned citizens who are shaping responses to environmental problems.

In 2005, Island Press celebrates its twenty-first anniversary as the leading provider of timely and practical books that take a multidisciplinary approach to critical environmental concerns. Our growing list of titles reflects our commitment to bringing the best of an expanding body of literature to the environmental community throughout North America and the world.

Support for Island Press is provided by the Agua Fund, The Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, Ford Foundation, The George Gund Foundation, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Kendeda Sustainability Fund of the Tides Foundation, The Henry Luce Foundation, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, The Curtis and Edith Munson Foundation, The New-Land Foundation, The New York Community Trust, Oak Foundation, The Overbrook Foundation, The David and Lucile Packard Foundation, The Winslow Foundation, and other generous donors.

The opinions expressed in this book are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of these foundations.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Board

The MA Board represents the users of the findings of the MA process.

Co-chairs

Robert T. Watson, The World Bank
A.H. Zakri, United Nations University

Institutional Representatives

Salvatore Arico, Programme Officer, Division of Ecological and Earth Sciences,
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Peter Bridgewater, Secretary General, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands
Hama Arba Diallo, Executive Secretary, United Nations Convention to Combat
Desertification
Adel El-Beltagy, Director General, International Center for Agricultural Research in
Dry Areas, Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
Max Finlayson, Chair, Scientific and Technical Review Panel, Ramsar Convention
on Wetlands
Colin Galbraith, Chair, Scientific Council, Convention on Migratory Species
Erica Harms, Senior Program Officer for Biodiversity, United Nations Foundation
Robert Hepworth, Acting Executive Secretary, Convention on Migratory Species
Olav Kjørven, Director, Energy and Environment Group, United Nations
Development Programme
Kerstin Leitner, Assistant Director-General, Sustainable Development and Healthy
Environments, World Health Organization

At-large Members

Fernando Almeida, Executive President, Business Council for Sustainable
Development-Brazil
Phoebe Barnard, Global Invasive Species Programme
Gordana Beltram, Undersecretary, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning,
Slovenia
Delmar Blasco, Former Secretary General, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands
Antony Burgmans, Chairman, Unilever N.V.
Esther Camac-Ramirez, Asociación Ixã Ca Vaá de Desarrollo e Información Indígena
Angela Cropper, President, The Cropper Foundation (*ex officio*)
Partha Dasgupta, Professor, Faculty of Economics and Politics, University of
Cambridge
José María Figueres, Fundación Costa Rica para el Desarrollo Sostenible
Fred Fortier, Indigenous Peoples' Biodiversity Information Network
Mohammed H.A. Hassan, Executive Director, Third World Academy of Sciences for
the Developing World
Jonathan Lash, President, World Resources Institute

Assessment Panel

Co-chairs

Angela Cropper, The Cropper Foundation
Harold A. Mooney, Stanford University

Members

Doris Capistrano, Center for International Forestry Research
Stephen R. Carpenter, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Kanchan Chopra, Institute of Economic Growth
Partha Dasgupta, University of Cambridge
Rashid Hassan, University of Pretoria
Rik Leemans, Wageningen University
Robert M. May, University of Oxford

Editorial Board Chairs

José Sarukhán, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Anne Whyte, Mestor Associates Ltd.

Director

Walter V. Reid, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment

Secretariat Support Organizations

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) coordinates the Millennium
Ecosystem Assessment Secretariat, which is based at the following partner institutions:

- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Italy
- Institute of Economic Growth, India
- International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT), Mexico (*until 2002*)
- Meridian Institute, United States
- National Institute of Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Netherlands (*until mid-2004*)

Alfred Oteng-Yeboah, Chair, Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and
Technological Advice, Convention on Biological Diversity
Christian Prip, Chair, Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological
Advice, Convention on Biological Diversity
Mario A. Ramos, Biodiversity Program Manager, Global Environment Facility
Thomas Rosswall, Executive Director, International Council for Science – ICSU
Achim Steiner, Director General, IUCN – World Conservation Union
Halldor Thorgeirsson, Coordinator, United Nations Framework Convention on
Climate Change
Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director, United Nations Environment Programme
Jeff Tschirley, Chief, Environmental and Natural Resources Service, Research,
Extension and Training Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the
United Nations
Riccardo Valentini, Chair, Committee on Science and Technology, United Nations
Convention to Combat Desertification
Hamdallah Zedan, Executive Secretary, Convention on Biological Diversity

Wangari Maathai, Vice Minister for Environment, Kenya
Paul Maro, Professor, Department of Geography, University of Dar es Salaam
Harold A. Mooney, Professor, Department of Biological Sciences, Stanford University
(*ex officio*)
Marina Motovilova, Faculty of Geography, Laboratory of Moscow Region
M.K. Prasad, Environment Centre of the Kerala Sastra Sahitya Parishad
Walter V. Reid, Director, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
Henry Schacht, Past Chairman of the Board, Lucent Technologies
Peter Johan Schei, Director, The Fridtjof Nansen Institute
Ismail Serageldin, President, Bibliotheca Alexandrina
David Suzuki, Chair, Suzuki Foundation
M.S. Swaminathan, Chairman, MS Swaminathan Research Foundation
José Galizia Tundisi, President, International Institute of Ecology
Axel Wenblad, Vice President Environmental Affairs, Skanska AB
Xu Guanhua, Minister, Ministry of Science and Technology, China
Muhammad Yunus, Managing Director, Grameen Bank

Prabhu Pingali, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Cristián Samper, National Museum of Natural History, United States
Robert Scholes, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
Robert T. Watson, The World Bank (*ex officio*)
A.H. Zakri, United Nations University (*ex officio*)
Zhao Shidong, Chinese Academy of Sciences

- Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE), France
- UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre, United Kingdom
- University of Pretoria, South Africa
- University of Wisconsin-Madison, United States
- World Resources Institute (WRI), United States
- WorldFish Center, Malaysia

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment: Objectives, Focus, and Approach

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment was carried out between 2001 and 2005 to assess the consequences of ecosystem change for human well-being and to establish the scientific basis for actions needed to enhance the conservation and sustainable use of ecosystems and their contributions to human well-being. The MA responds to government requests for information received through four international conventions—the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, and the Convention on Migratory Species—and is designed to also meet needs of other stakeholders, including the business community, the health sector, nongovernmental organizations, and indigenous peoples. The sub-global assessments also aimed to meet the needs of users in the regions where they were undertaken.

The assessment focuses on the linkages between ecosystems and human well-being and, in particular, on “ecosystem services.” An ecosystem is a dynamic complex of plant, animal, and microorganism communities and the nonliving environment interacting as a functional unit. The MA deals with the full range of ecosystems—from those relatively undisturbed, such as natural forests, to landscapes with mixed patterns of human use and to ecosystems intensively managed and modified by humans, such as agricultural land and urban areas. Ecosystem services are the benefits people obtain from ecosystems. These include *provisioning services* such as food, water, timber, and fiber; *regulating services* that affect climate, floods, disease, wastes, and water quality; *cultural services* that provide recreational, aesthetic, and spiritual benefits; and *supporting services* such as soil formation, photosynthesis, and nutrient cycling. The human species, while buffered against environmental changes by culture and technology, is fundamentally dependent on the flow of ecosystem services.

The MA examines how changes in ecosystem services influence human well-being. Human well-being is assumed to have multiple constituents, including the *basic material for a good life*, such as secure and adequate livelihoods, enough food at all times, shelter, clothing, and access to goods; *health*, including feeling well and having a healthy physical environment, such as clean air and access to clean water; *good social relations*, including social cohesion, mutual respect, and the ability to help others and provide for children; *security*, including secure access to natural and other resources, personal safety, and security from natural and human-made disasters; and *freedom of choice and action*, including the opportunity to achieve what an individual values doing and being. Freedom of choice and action is influenced by other constituents of well-being (as well as by other factors, notably education) and is also a precondition for achieving other components of well-being, particularly with respect to equity and fairness.

The conceptual framework for the MA posits that people are integral parts of ecosystems and that a dynamic interaction exists between them and other parts of ecosystems, with the changing human condition driving, both directly


and indirectly, changes in ecosystems and thereby causing changes in human well-being. At the same time, social, economic, and cultural factors unrelated to ecosystems alter the human condition, and many natural forces influence ecosystems. Although the MA emphasizes the linkages between ecosystems and human well-being, it recognizes that the actions people take that influence ecosystems result not just from concern about human well-being but also from considerations of the intrinsic value of species and ecosystems. Intrinsic value is the value of something in and for itself, irrespective of its utility for someone else.

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment synthesizes information from the scientific literature and relevant peer-reviewed datasets and models. It incorporates knowledge held by the private sector, practitioners, local communities, and indigenous peoples. The MA did not aim to generate new primary knowledge but instead sought to add value to existing information by collating, evaluating, summarizing, interpreting, and communicating it in a useful form. Assessments like this one apply the judgment of experts to existing knowledge to provide scientifically credible answers to policy-relevant questions. The focus on policy-relevant questions and the explicit use of expert judgment distinguish this type of assessment from a scientific review.

Five overarching questions, along with more detailed lists of user needs developed through discussions with stakeholders or provided by governments through international conventions, guided the issues that were assessed:

- What are the current condition and trends of ecosystems, ecosystem services, and human well-being?
- What are plausible future changes in ecosystems and their ecosystem services and the consequent changes in human well-being?
- What can be done to enhance well-being and conserve ecosystems? What are the strengths and weaknesses of response options that can be considered to realize or avoid specific futures?
- What are the key uncertainties that hinder effective decision-making concerning ecosystems?
- What tools and methodologies developed and used in the MA can strengthen capacity to assess ecosystems, the services they provide, their impacts on human well-being, and the strengths and weaknesses of response options?

The MA was conducted as a multiscale assessment, with interlinked assessments undertaken at local, watershed, national, regional, and global scales. A global ecosystem assessment cannot easily meet all the needs of decision-makers at national and sub-national scales because the management of any



Trade, poverty, and environment: sites in Chile, China, India, Madagascar, Mexico, South Africa, and Viet Nam

Eighteen assessments were approved as components of the MA. Any institution or country was able to undertake an assessment as part of the MA if it agreed to use the MA conceptual framework, to centrally involve the intended users as stakeholders and partners, and to meet a set of procedural requirements related to peer review, metadata, transparency, and intellectual property rights. The MA assessments were largely self-funded, although planning grants and some core grants were provided to support some assessments. The MA also drew on information from 16 other sub-global assessments affiliated with the MA that met a subset of these criteria or were at earlier stages in development.

SUB-GLOBAL ASSESSMENT	ECOSYSTEM TYPES										ECOSYSTEM SERVICES								
	COASTAL	CULTIVATED	DRYLAND	FOREST	INLAND WATER	ISLAND	MARINE	MOUNTAIN	POLAR	URBAN	FOOD	WATER	FUEL and ENERGY	BIODIVERSITY-RELATED	CARBON SEQUESTRATION	FIBER and TIMBER	RUNOFF REGULATION	CULTURAL, SPIRITUAL, AMENITY	OTHERS
Altai-Sayan Ecoregion			●	●	●			●			●		●	●		●		●	
San Pedro de Atacama, Chile			●		●						●	●		●			●		●
Caribbean Sea	●					●					●	●		●					
Coastal British Columbia, Canada	●			●	●			●			●			●		●	●		
Bajo Chirripo, Costa Rica		●		●	●						●	●		●		●		●	
Tropical Forest Margins		●		●							●	●		●	●		●		●
India Local Villages		●		●							●	●		●		●	●		●
Glomma Basin, Norway		●		●	●			●			●		●			●			●
Papua New Guinea	●	●				●		●			●	●	●	●		●	●		●
Vilcanota, Peru		●	●					●			●	●		●			●		●
Laguna Lake Basin, Philippines		●		●		●					●	●		●	●				●
Portugal	●	●	●	●	●	●		●		●	●	●		●	●	●	●		●
São Paulo Green Belt, Brazil	●	●		●	●				●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●		●
Southern Africa	●	●	●	●	●				●	●	●	●	●	●		●		●	●
Stockholm and Kristianstad, Sweden		●			●					●	●	●		●	●	●	●		●
Northern Range, Trinidad	●			●	●			●			●	●		●		●	●		●
Downstream Mekong Wetlands, Viet Nam	●	●			●						●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●
Western China		●	●	●	●			●			●	●		●	●		●		●
Alaskan Boreal Forest				●	●						●	●				●			●
Arafura and Timor Seas	●					●		●			●			●	●				●
Argentine Pampas		●									●	●						●	●
Central Asia Mountains								●			●	●		●				●	
Colombia coffee-growing regions		●						●	●		●	●		●				●	
Eastern Himalayas				●				●			●	●	●	●				●	
Sinai Peninsula, Egypt			●					●				●		●			●		●
Fiji	●					●					●	●	●				●		●
Hindu Kush-Himalayas					●			●			●	●		●					●
Indonesia	●					●		●			●			●					●
India Urban Resource									●		●	●	●	●	●			●	●
Tafilaft Oasis, Morocco		●	●								●	●						●	●
Northern Australia Floodplains					●						●	●					●		●
Assir National Park, Saudi Arabia		●									●						●		●
Northern Highlands Lake District, Wisconsin				●								●				●	●		●

particular ecosystem must be tailored to the particular characteristics of that ecosystem and to the demands placed on it. However, an assessment focused only on a particular ecosystem or particular nation is insufficient because some processes are global and because local goods, services, matter, and energy are often transferred across regions. Each of the component assessments was guided by the MA conceptual framework and benefited from the presence of assessments undertaken at larger and smaller scales. The sub-global assessments were not intended to serve as representative samples of all ecosystems; rather, they were to meet the needs of decision-makers at the scales at which they were undertaken. The sub-global assessments involved in the MA process are shown in the Figure and the ecosystems and ecosystem services examined in these assessments are shown in the Table.

The work of the MA was conducted through four working groups, each of which prepared a report of its findings. At the global scale, the Condition and Trends Working Group assessed the state of knowledge on ecosystems, drivers of ecosystem change, ecosystem services, and associated human well-being around the year 2000. The assessment aimed to be comprehensive with regard to ecosystem services, but its coverage is not exhaustive. The Scenarios Working Group considered the possible evolution of ecosystem services during the twenty-first century by developing four global scenarios exploring plausible future changes in drivers, ecosystems, ecosystem services, and human well-being. The Responses Working Group examined the strengths and weaknesses of various response options that have been used to manage ecosystem services and identified promising opportunities for improving human well-being while conserving ecosystems. The report of the Sub-global Assessments Working Group contains lessons learned from the MA sub-global assessments. The first product of the MA—*Ecosystems and Human Well-being: A Framework for Assessment*, published in 2003—outlined the focus, conceptual basis, and methods used in the MA. The executive summary of this publication appears as Chapter 1 of this volume.

Approximately 1,360 experts from 95 countries were involved as authors of the assessment reports, as participants in the sub-global assessments, or as members of the Board of Review Editors. The latter group, which involved 80 experts, oversaw the scientific review of the MA reports by governments and experts and ensured that all review comments were appropriately addressed by the authors. All MA findings underwent two rounds of expert and governmental review. Review comments were received from approximately 850 individuals (of which roughly 250 were submitted by authors of other chapters in the MA), although in a number of cases (particularly in the case of governments and MA-affiliated scientific organizations), people submitted collated comments that had been prepared by a number of reviewers in their governments or institutions.

The MA was guided by a Board that included representatives of five international conventions, five U.N. agencies, international scientific organizations, governments, and leaders from the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, and indigenous groups. A 15-member Assessment Panel of leading social and natural scientists oversaw the technical work of the assessment, supported by a secretariat with offices in Europe, North America, South America, Asia, and Africa and coordinated by the United Nations Environment Programme.

The MA is intended to be used:

- to identify priorities for action;
- as a benchmark for future assessments;
- as a framework and source of tools for assessment, planning, and management;
- to gain foresight concerning the consequences of decisions affecting ecosystems;
- to identify response options to achieve human development and sustainability goals;
- to help build individual and institutional capacity to undertake integrated ecosystem assessments and act on the findings; and
- to guide future research.

Because of the broad scope of the MA and the complexity of the interactions between social and natural systems, it proved to be difficult to provide definitive information for some of the issues addressed in the MA. Relatively few ecosystem services have been the focus of research and monitoring and, as a consequence, research findings and data are often inadequate for a detailed global assessment. Moreover, the data and information that are available are generally related to either the characteristics of the ecological system or the characteristics of the social system, not to the all-important interactions between these systems. Finally, the scientific and assessment tools and models available to undertake a cross-scale integrated assessment and to project future changes in ecosystem services are only now being developed. Despite these challenges, the MA was able to provide considerable information relevant to most of the focal questions. And by identifying gaps in data and information that prevent policy-relevant questions from being answered, the assessment can help to guide research and monitoring that may allow those questions to be answered in future assessments.

Foreword

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) was called for by United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan in 2000 in his report to the UN General Assembly, *We the Peoples: The Role of the United Nations in the 21st Century*. Governments subsequently supported the establishment of the assessment through decisions taken by three international conventions (the Convention on Biodiversity, the Convention to Combat Desertification, and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands), and the MA was initiated in 2001. The Convention on Migratory Species subsequently associated with the assessment. The MA was conducted under the auspices of the United Nations, with the secretariat coordinated by the United Nations Environment Programme, and it was governed by a multistakeholder board that included representatives of international institutions, governments, business, nongovernmental organizations, and indigenous peoples. The objective of the MA was to assess the consequences of ecosystem change for human well-being and to establish the scientific basis for actions needed to enhance the conservation and sustainable use of ecosystems and their contributions to human well-being.

The MA comprises four assessment reports (*Current State and Trends*, *Scenarios*, *Policy Responses*, and *Multiscale Assessments*) and six synthesis reports (one for a general audience and others focused on issues of biodiversity, wetlands and water, desertification, health, and business and ecosystems). The synthesis reports were prepared for decision-makers in these different sectors, and they integrate findings from across all the working groups for ease of use by those audiences.

This volume contains the Summary for Decision-makers from the four assessment reports prepared by the following groups: the Condition and Trends Working Group, which assessed the state of knowledge on ecosystems and their services, drivers of ecosystem change, and the consequences of ecosystem change for human well-being; the Scenarios Working Group, which examined possible changes in ecosystem services during the twenty-first century by developing four global scenarios exploring plausible future changes in drivers, ecosystems, ecosystem services, and human well-being; the Responses Working Group, which examined the strengths and weaknesses of various response options that have been used to manage ecosystem services and identified promising opportunities for improving human well-being while conserving ecosystems; and the Sub-global Assessments Working Group, which summarized lessons learned from the local, watershed, national, and regional assessments that were under-

taken as part of the MA process. The material in this report has undergone extensive peer review by experts and governments, overseen by an independent Board of Review Editors.

The MA provides a unique foundation of knowledge concerning human dependence on ecosystems as we enter the twenty-first century. Never before has such a holistic assessment been conducted that addresses multiple environmental changes, multiple drivers, and multiple linkages to human well-being, as well as ways in which societies have sought to manage those linkages. Collectively, these reports reveal both the extraordinary success that humanity has achieved in shaping ecosystems to meet the needs of growing populations and economies and the growing costs associated with many of these changes. They show us that these costs could grow substantially in the future, but also that there are actions within reach that could dramatically enhance both human well-being and the conservation of ecosystems.

This report would not have been possible without the extraordinary commitment of more than 2,000 authors and reviewers worldwide who contributed their knowledge, creativity, time, and enthusiasm to the development of the assessment, and we wish to acknowledge the in-kind support of their institutions, which enabled their participation.

We want to express our gratitude to the members of the MA Board, Board alternates, Exploratory Steering Committee, Assessment Panel, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors, Board of Review Editors, and expert reviewers for their extraordinary contributions to this process.

We would particularly like to thank the co-chairs of the Condition and Trends Working Group, Dr. Rashid Hassan and Dr. Robert Scholes, and the Technical Support Unit Coordinator, Neville Ash; the co-chairs of the Scenarios Working Group, Dr. Stephen Carpenter and Dr. Prabhu Pingali, and the TSU Coordinators, Dr. Elena Bennett and Dr. Monika Zurek; the co-chairs of the Responses Working Group, Dr. Kanchan Chopra and Dr. Rik Leemans, and the TSU Coordinators, Pushpam Kumar and Henk Simons; and the co-chairs of the Sub-global Assessments Working Group, Dr. Doris Capistrano and Dr. Cristián Samper, and the TSU Coordinators, Marcus Lee and Ciara Raudsepp-Hearne, for their skillful leadership of their working groups and their contributions to the overall assessment.

We would like to thank the host organizations of the MA Technical Support Units—WorldFish Center (Malaysia); UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre

(United Kingdom); Institute of Economic Growth (India); National Institute of Public Health and the Environment (Netherlands); University of Pretoria (South Africa), U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization (Italy); World Resources Institute, Meridian Institute, and Center for Limnology of the University of Wisconsin (all in the United States); Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (France); and International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (Mexico)—for the support they provided to the process. The Scenarios Working Group was established as a joint project of the MA and the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment, and we thank SCOPE for the scientific input and oversight that it provided.

We are also extremely grateful to the donors that provided major financial support for the MA: Global Environment Facility; United Nations Foundation; David and Lucile Packard Foundation; World Bank; Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research; United Nations Environment Programme; Government of China; Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Norway; Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; and Swedish International Biodiversity Programme. The full list of organizations that provided financial support to the MA is available at www.MAweb.org.

We give special thanks for the full-time staff of the MA Secretariat: Chan Wai Leng, John Ehrmann, Lori Han, Christine Jalleh, Marcus Lee, Belinda Lim, Nicolas Lucas, Mampiti Matete, Tasha Merican, Meenakshi Rathore, Ciara Raudsepp-Hearne, Sara Suriani, Jillian Thonell, and Valerie Thompson. This volume contains summaries that appeared in reports that were skillfully edited by Rosemarie Philips

and Linda Starke. We also thank the interns and volunteers who worked with the MA Secretariat, part-time members of the Secretariat staff, the administrative staff of the host organizations, and colleagues in other organizations who were instrumental in facilitating the process.

Finally, we would particularly like to thank Angela Cropper and Harold Mooney, the co-chairs of the MA Assessment Panel, and José Sarukhán and Anne Whyte, the co-chairs of the MA Review Board, for their skillful leadership of the assessment and review processes, and Walter Reid, the MA Director, for his pivotal role in establishing the assessment, his leadership, and his outstanding contributions to the process.

R. J. Watson

Dr. Robert T. Watson
MA Board Co-chair
Chief Scientist, The World Bank

Zakari Asyouri

Dr. A.H. Zakri
MA Board Co-chair
Director, Institute for Advanced Studies,
United Nations University

Reader's Guide

MA Conceptual Framework

Main Messages

Four technical reports present the findings of each of the MA Working Groups: Condition and Trends, Scenarios, Responses, and Sub-global Assessments. This volume, *Our Human Planet*, presents the summaries of all four reports in order to offer a concise account of the technical reports for decision-makers. In addition, six synthesis reports were prepared for ease of use by specific audiences: Synthesis (general audience), CBD (biodiversity), UNCCD (desertification), Ramsar Convention (wetlands), business and industry, and the health sector. Each MA sub-global assessment will also produce additional reports to meet the needs of its own audiences.

All printed materials of the assessment, along with core data and a list of reviewers, are available at www.MAweb.org.

Throughout this volume, dollar signs indicate U.S. dollars and ton means tonne (metric ton). Bracketed references are to chapters within each technical volume.

The following words have been used where appropriate to indicate judgmental estimates of certainty, based on the collective judgment of the authors, using the observational evidence, modeling results, and theory that they have examined: very certain (98% or greater probability), high certainty (85–98% probability), medium certainty (65%–58% probability), low certainty (52–65% probability), and very uncertain (50–52% probability). In other instances, a qualitative scale to gauge the level of scientific understanding is used: well established, established but incomplete, competing explanations, and speculative. Each time these terms are used they appear in italics.

1.6 Strategies and Interventions

BOXES

- 1.1 Key Definitions
- 1.2 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Conceptual Framework
- 1.3 Reporting Categories Used in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
- 1.4 Valuation of Ecosystem Services

FIGURES

- 1.1 Linkages between Ecosystem Services and Human Well-being

Contents

Foreword	xiii
Reader's Guide	xv
Chapter 1. MA Conceptual Framework	1
Chapter 2. Current State and Trends: Ecosystems and Their Services around the Year 2000	15
Chapter 3. Scenarios: Comparing Alternate Futures of Ecosystem Services and Human Well-being	41
Chapter 4. Policy Responses: Response Options and Strategies	59
Chapter 5. Multiscale Assessments: Integrated Assessments at Multiple Scales	83
Glossary	97
Index	105

business, nongovernmental organizations, and indigenous peoples. The objective of the MA was to assess the consequences of ecosystem change for human well-being and to establish the scientific basis for action needed to enhance the conservation and sustainable use of ecosystems and their contributions to human well-being.

The MA comprises four assessment reports (*Current State and Trends, Scenarios, Policy Responses, and Multiscale Assessments*) and six synthesis reports (one for a general audience and others focused on issues of biodiversity, wetlands and water, desertification, health, and humans and ecosystems). The synthesis reports were prepared for decision-makers in these different sectors, and they integrate findings from across all the working groups for ease of use by those audiences.

This volume contains the Summary for Decision-makers from the four assessment reports prepared by the following groups: the Condition and Trends Working Group, which assessed the state of knowledge on ecosystems and their services, drivers of ecosystem change, and the consequences of ecosystem change for human well-being; the Scenarios Working Group, which examined possible changes in ecosystem services during the twenty-first century by developing four global scenarios exploring plausible future changes in drivers, ecosystems, ecosystem services, and human well-being; the Responses Working Group, which examined the strengths and weaknesses of various response options that have been used to manage ecosystem services and identified promising opportunities for improving human well-being while conserving ecosystems; and the Sub-global Assessments Working Group, which summarized lessons learned from the local, watershed, national, and regional assessments that were under-

taken could grow substantially in the future, but also that there are actions within reach that could dramatically enhance both human well-being and the conservation of ecosystems.

This report would not have been possible without the extraordinary commitment of more than 2,000 authors and reviewers worldwide who contributed their knowledge, creativity, time, and enthusiasm to the development of the assessment, and we wish to acknowledge the in-kind support of their institutions, which enabled their participation.

We want to express our gratitude to the members of the MA Board, Board alternates, Exploratory Steering Committee, Assessment Panel, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors, Board of Review Editors, and expert reviewers for their extraordinary contributions to this process.

We would particularly like to thank the co-chairs of the Condition and Trends Working Group, Dr. Rashid Hassan and Dr. Robert Scholes, and the Technical Support Unit Coordinator, Neville Ash, the co-chairs of the Scenarios Working Group, Dr. Stephen Carpenter and Dr. Pabitra Dasgupta, and the TSN Coordinators, Dr. Ellen Bernier and Dr. Monica Zurich, the co-chairs of the Responses Working Group, Dr. Kanchan Chopra and Dr. Raj Leona, and the TSN Coordinators, Pushpan Kumar and Henk Struik, and the co-chair of the Sub-global Assessments Working Group, Dr. Doris Capistrano and Dr. Cynthia Campbell, and the TSN Coordinators, Marcus Lee and Cora Rautenbach-Henric for their skilled leadership of their working groups and their commitment to the overall assessment.

We would like to thank the host organizations of the MA Technical Support Units—Worldwide Center for Biological Diversity, UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre,

MA Conceptual Framework

Main Messages	2
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 What Is the Problem?	3
1.3 Conceptual Framework	5
1.3.1 Ecosystems and Their Services	
1.3.2 Human Well-being and Poverty Reduction	
1.3.3 Drivers of Change	
1.3.4 Cross-scale Interactions and Assessment	
1.4 Values Associated with Ecosystems	10
1.5 Assessment Tools	11
1.6 Strategies and Interventions	12

BOXES

- 1.1 Key Definitions
- 1.2 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Conceptual Framework
- 1.3 Reporting Categories Used in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
- 1.4 Valuation of Ecosystem Services

FIGURES

- 1.1 Linkages between Ecosystem Services and Human Well-being

Main Messages

Human well-being and progress toward sustainable development are vitally dependent upon improving the management of Earth's ecosystems to ensure their conservation and sustainable use. But while demands for ecosystem services such as food and clean water are growing, human actions are at the same time diminishing the capability of many ecosystems to meet these demands.

Sound policy and management interventions can often reverse ecosystem degradation and enhance the contributions of ecosystems to human well-being, but knowing when and how to intervene requires substantial understanding of both the ecological and the social systems involved. Better information cannot guarantee improved decisions, but it is a prerequisite for sound decision-making.

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment was established to help provide the knowledge base for improved decisions and to build capacity for analyzing and supplying this information.

This chapter presents the conceptual and methodological approach that the MA used to assess options that can enhance the contribution of ecosystems to human well-being. This same approach should provide a suitable basis for governments, the private sector, and civil society to factor considerations of ecosystems and ecosystem services into their own planning and actions.

1.1 Introduction

Humanity has always depended on the services provided by the biosphere and its ecosystems. Further, the biosphere is itself the product of life on Earth. The composition of the atmosphere and soil, the cycling of elements through air and waterways, and many other ecological assets are all the result of living processes—and all are maintained and replenished by living ecosystems. The human species, while buffered against environmental immediacies by culture and technology, is ultimately fully dependent on the flow of ecosystem services.

In his April 2000 Millennium Report to the United Nations General Assembly, in recognition of the growing burden that degraded ecosystems are placing on human well-being and economic development and the opportunity that better managed ecosystems provide for meeting the goals of poverty eradication and sustainable development, United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan stated that:

It is impossible to devise effective environmental policy unless it is based on sound scientific information. While major advances in data collection have been made in many areas, large gaps in our knowledge remain. In particular, there has never been a comprehensive global assessment of the world's major ecosystems. The planned Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, a major international collaborative effort to map the health of our planet, is a response to this need.

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment was established with the involvement of governments, the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, and scientists to provide an integrated assessment of the consequences of ecosystem

change for human well-being and to analyze options available to enhance the conservation of ecosystems and their contributions to meeting human needs. The Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention to Combat Desertification, the Convention on Migratory Species, and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands plan to use the findings of the MA, which will also help meet the needs of others in government, the private sector, and civil society. The MA should help to achieve the United Nations Millennium Development Goals and to carry out the Plan of Implementation of the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development. It has mobilized hundreds of scientists from countries around the world to provide information and clarify science concerning issues of greatest relevance to decision-makers. The MA has identified areas of broad scientific agreement and also pointed to areas of continuing scientific debate.

The assessment framework developed for the MA offers decision-makers a mechanism to:

- **Identify options that can better achieve core human development and sustainability goals. All countries and communities are grappling with the challenge of meeting growing demands for food, clean water, health, and employment.** And decision-makers in the private and public sectors must also balance economic growth and social development with the need for environmental conservation. All of these concerns are linked directly or indirectly to the world's ecosystems. The MA process, at all scales, was designed to bring the best science to bear on the needs of decision-makers concerning these links between ecosystems, human development, and sustainability.
- **Better understand the trade-offs involved—across sectors and stakeholders—in decisions concerning the environment.** Ecosystem-related problems have historically been approached issue by issue, but rarely by pursuing multisectoral objectives. This approach has not withstood the test of time. Progress toward one objective such as increasing food production has often been at the cost of progress toward other objectives such as conserving biological diversity or improving water quality. The MA framework complements sectoral assessments with information on the full impact of potential policy choices across sectors and stakeholders.
- **Align response options with the level of governance where they can be most effective.** Effective management of ecosystems will require actions at all scales, from the local to the global. Human actions now directly or inadvertently affect virtually all of the world's ecosystems; actions required for the management of ecosystems refer to the steps that humans can take to modify their direct or indirect influences on ecosystems. The management and policy options available and the concerns of stakeholders differ greatly across these scales. The priority areas for biodiversity conservation in a country as defined based on “global” value, for example, would be very different from those as defined based on the value to local communities. The multiscale assessment framework developed for the MA provides a new approach for analyzing

policy options at all scales—from local communities to international conventions.

1.2 What Is the Problem?

Ecosystem services are the benefits people obtain from ecosystems, which the MA describes as provisioning, regulating, supporting, and cultural services. (See Box 1.1.) Ecosystem services include products such as food, fuel, and fiber; regulating services such as climate regulation and disease control; and nonmaterial benefits such as spiritual or aesthetic benefits. Changes in these services affect human well-being in many ways. (See Figure 1.1.)

The demand for ecosystem services is now so great that trade-offs among services have become the rule. A country can increase food supply by converting a forest to agriculture, for example, but in so doing it decreases the supply of services that may be of equal or greater importance, such as clean water, timber, ecotourism destinations, or flood regulation and drought control. There are many indications that human demands on ecosystems will grow still greater in the coming decades. Current estimates of 3 billion more people and a quadrupling of the world economy by 2050 imply a formidable increase in demand for and consumption of biological and physical resources, as well as escalating impacts on ecosystems and the services they provide.

The problem posed by the growing demand for ecosystem services is compounded by increasingly serious degradation in the capability of ecosystems to provide these services. World fisheries are now declining due to overfishing, for instance, and a significant amount of agricultural land has been degraded in the past half-century by erosion, salinization, compaction, nutrient depletion, pollution, and urbanization. Other human-induced impacts on ecosystems include alteration of the nitrogen, phosphorous, sulfur, and carbon cycles, causing acid rain, algal blooms, and fish kills

in rivers and coastal waters, along with contributions to climate change. In many parts of the world, this degradation of ecosystem services is exacerbated by the associated loss of the knowledge and understanding held by local communities—knowledge that sometimes could help to ensure the sustainable use of the ecosystem.

This combination of ever-growing demands being placed on increasingly degraded ecosystems seriously diminishes the prospects for sustainable development. Human well-being is affected not just by gaps between ecosystem service supply and demand but also by the increased vulnerability of individuals, communities, and nations. Productive ecosystems, with their array of services, provide people and communities with resources and options they can use as insurance in the face of natural catastrophes or social upheaval. While well-managed ecosystems reduce risks and vulnerability, poorly managed systems can exacerbate them by increasing risks of flood, drought, crop failure, or disease.

Ecosystem degradation tends to harm rural populations more directly than urban populations and has its most direct and severe impact on poor people. The wealthy control access to a greater share of ecosystem services, consume those services at a higher per capita rate, and are buffered from changes in their availability (often at a substantial cost) through their ability to purchase scarce ecosystem services or substitutes. For example, even though a number of marine fisheries have been depleted in the past century, the supply of fish to wealthy consumers has not been disrupted since fishing fleets have been able to shift to previously underexploited stocks. In contrast, poor people often lack access to alternate services and are highly vulnerable to ecosystem changes that result in famine, drought, or floods. They frequently live in locations particularly sensitive to environmental threats, and they lack financial and institutional buffers against these dangers. Degradation of coastal fishery resources, for instance, results in a decline in protein consumed by the local community since fishers may not have access to alternate sources of fish and community members may not have enough income to purchase fish. Degradation affects their very survival.

Changes in ecosystems affect not just humans but countless other species as well. The management objectives that people set for ecosystems and the actions that they take are influenced not just by the consequences of ecosystem changes for humans but also by the importance people place on considerations of the intrinsic value of species and ecosystems. Intrinsic value is the value of something in and for itself, irrespective of its utility for someone else. For example, villages in India protect “spirit sanctuaries” in relatively natural states, even though a strict cost-benefit calculation might favor their conversion to agriculture. Similarly, many countries have passed laws protecting endangered species based on the view that these species have a right to exist, even if their protection results in net economic costs. Sound ecosystem management thus involves steps to address the utilitarian links of people to ecosystems as well as processes that allow considerations of the intrinsic value of ecosystems to be factored into decision-making.

BOX 1.1

Key Definitions

Ecosystem. An ecosystem is a dynamic complex of plant, animal, and microorganism communities and the nonliving environment interacting as a functional unit. Humans are an integral part of ecosystems. Ecosystems vary enormously in size; a temporary pond in a tree hollow and an ocean basin can both be ecosystems.

Ecosystem services. Ecosystem services are the benefits people obtain from ecosystems. These include provisioning services such as food and water; regulating services such as regulation of floods, drought, land degradation, and disease; supporting services such as soil formation and nutrient cycling; and cultural services such as recreational, spiritual, religious and other nonmaterial benefits.

Well-being. Human well-being has multiple constituents, including basic material for a good life, freedom of choice and action, health, good social relations, and security. Well-being is at the opposite end of a continuum from poverty, which has been defined as a “pronounced deprivation in well-being.” The constituents of well-being, as experienced and perceived by people, are situation-dependent, reflecting local geography, culture, and ecological circumstances.




Figure 1.1. Linkages between Ecosystem Services and Human Well-being. This Figure depicts the strength of linkages between categories of ecosystem services and components of human well-being that are commonly encountered and includes indications of the extent to which it is possible for socioeconomic factors to mediate the linkage. (For example, if it is possible to purchase a substitute for a degraded ecosystem service, then there is a high potential for mediation.) The strength of the linkages and the potential for mediation differ in different ecosystems and regions. In addition to the influence of ecosystem services on human well-being depicted here, other factors—including other environmental factors as well as economic, social, technological, and cultural factors—influence human well-being, and ecosystems are in turn affected by changes in human well-being.

The degradation of ecosystem services has many causes, including excessive demand for ecosystem services stemming from economic growth, demographic changes, and individual choices. Market mechanisms do not always ensure the conservation of ecosystem services either because markets do not exist for services such as cultural or regulatory services or, where they do exist, because policies and institutions do not enable people living within the ecosystem to benefit from services it may provide to others who are far away. For example, institutions are now only beginning to be developed to enable those benefiting from carbon sequestration to provide local managers with an economic incentive to leave a forest uncut, while strong economic incentives often exist for managers to harvest the forest. Also, even if a market exists for an ecosystem service, the results obtained through the market may be socially or ecologically undesirable. Properly managed, the creation of ecotourism opportunities in a country can create strong economic incentives for the maintenance of the cultural

services provided by ecosystems, but poorly managed ecotourism activities can degrade the very resource on which they depend. Finally, markets are often unable to address important intra- and intergenerational equity issues associated with managing ecosystems for this and future generations, given that some changes in ecosystem services are irreversible.

The world has witnessed in recent decades not just dramatic changes to ecosystems but equally profound changes to social systems that shape both the pressures on ecosystems and the opportunities to respond. The relative influence of individual nation-states has diminished with the growth of power and influence of a far more complex array of institutions, including regional governments, multinational companies, the United Nations, and civil society organizations. Stakeholders have become more involved in decision-making. Given the multiple actors whose decisions now strongly influence ecosystems, the challenge of providing information to decision-makers has grown. At the same