



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WS-CB-IAS-AFR/1/2
25 April 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AFRICAN SUBREGIONAL WORKSHOP TO
STRENGTHEN CAPACITY FOR THE
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
PROGRAMMES OF WORK RELEVANT TO
INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES
Nairobi, 7-9 December 2011

REPORT OF AFRICAN SUBREGIONAL WORKSHOP TO STRENGTHEN CAPACITY FOR THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY PROGRAMMES OF WORK RELEVANT TO INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES

INTRODUCTION

1. At its tenth meeting, in decision X/2, the Conference of the Parties adopted “The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020” with 20 global targets (Aichi Biodiversity Targets). Target 9 of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets focuses on invasive alien species, stating: “By 2020 invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment”.
2. Also in decision X/2, Parties were urged to review, and as appropriate update and revise, their national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), in line with the Strategic Plan and the guidance previously adopted in decision IX/9. Parties have been urged to address the threats posed by invasive alien species (paragraphs 10 (a)-(g) in decision VI/23*) when developing, revising and implementing NBSAPs. The Guiding Principles annexed to decision VI/23* are intended to provide support in this regard.
3. In paragraph 28 of decision IX/4 B, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP) and other relevant organizations, to encourage the organization of practical workshops to strengthen capacity for the implementation of the Guiding Principles (annex to decision VI/23*) and other measures to address the threats from invasive alien species.
4. In paragraph 4 of decision X/39, Parties and relevant organizations were encouraged to make taxonomic and other necessary data and metadata from taxonomic and other relevant institutions and organizations easily accessible and their collections available in response to the information needs identified as national and regional priorities such as, *inter alia*, information and expertise to manage invasive alien species and endangered species.

* One representative entered a formal objection during the process leading to the adoption of this decision and underlined that he did not believe that the Conference of the Parties could legitimately adopt a motion or a text with a formal objection in place. A few representatives expressed reservations regarding the procedure leading to the adoption of this decision (see UNEP/CBD/COP/6/20, paras. 294-324).

/...

5. The outcome-oriented deliverables for each of the planned activities of the Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI) annexed to decision IX/22, and the planned activity on invasive alien species in the annex to decision VIII/3 on the programme of work for the GTI, refer to taxonomic information relevant to invasive alien species. It is important for Parties to be informed regarding where these information sources can be found and how to use them to address the issue of invasive alien species.

6. In line with these decisions, the Executive Secretary organized an English-language African subregional workshop to strengthen the capacity for the Convention on Biological Diversity programmes of work relevant to invasive alien species, with generous support from the Government of Japan, and in collaboration with the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office, the IUCN Invasive Species Initiative, and other relevant organizations.

7. Participants from the following Parties and organizations attended the workshop: Botswana, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), IUCN, World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), CABI, The International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE), the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), the National Museums of Kenya, and Congruence LLC. The participants list can be found in annex I below.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

8. The meeting was opened by a representative of the Government of Japan, which held the Presidency of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, at 9.30 a.m. on Wednesday, 7 December 2011. Mr. Kazuhiro Miyaki, First Secretary, Deputy Permanent Representative to UN-HABITAT, Embassy of Japan, welcomed the participants and urged them to consider invasive alien species as an issue of urgent concern. He called on participants to have the wisdom and courage to take on the current environmental challenges, and encouraged the workshop participants to collaborate regionally and build strong capacity to effectively implement the Convention on Biological Diversity.

9. Ms. Alice Kaudia, Environment Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources of Kenya and former Regional Director of IUCN, gave welcoming remarks to the participants. She expressed her gratitude and appreciation for being back at the IUCN offices. She passed on regrets from Mr. Ali Mohammed, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, who was not able to attend this meeting as he was representing the government at the meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Durban, South Africa. She highlighted that Kenya and other countries in Africa had suffered very serious impacts of invasive alien species on biodiversity and human livelihoods. She reiterated that Kenya had had mixed results in controlling invasive alien species and had put into place relevant legislation, including the Seeds and Plant Varieties Act, Agricultural Produce Act, Plant Protection Act and the Noxious Weeds Act. She stated that invasive alien species could be found in all habitats and all taxonomic groups and that there was thus a need for various approaches that reflected the complexity of the matter. She commended the Convention on Biological Diversity for taking up their work on invasive alien species as a priority and for helping African countries develop approaches for prevention, control, and eradication of invasive alien species. She reaffirmed Kenya's commitment to its work under the Convention, and concluded by wishing the participants a fruitful meeting and expressing her hope that they would gain ideas that they could carry back to their countries and apply in the fight against invasive alien species.

10. Ms. Junko Shimura, from the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, welcomed the participants and expressed gratitude for IUCN's offer to host the meeting, as well as their longstanding support of the Convention. She recognized IUCN as an original author of the Convention text and announced the recent signing of the CBD-IUCN supplementary agreement for the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 as it related to invasive alien species. She provided background on the mission and history of the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well

as its participatory processes. Ms. Shimura also highlighted the importance of addressing invasive alien species as a key driver of biodiversity loss and emphasized the need for application of science and policy, as well as the inclusion of all relevant sectors. Further, she noted that the Executive Secretary hoped that the participants would take full advantage of this workshop to focus on capacity-building needs to achieve target 9 of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets/Strategic Plan. Finally, she expressed gratitude to the government of Kenya for being the host country, the Government of Japan for its generous financial support, and IUCN for its scientific and logistical support of the workshop and other actions on invasive alien species in partnership with the Convention on Biological Diversity. She concluded by wishing the participants a productive workshop.

11. Mr. Ali Kaka, Regional Director of IUCN in Eastern and Southern Africa, welcomed the participants to the unrivalled biodiversity and ambience of the IUCN grounds. He thanked the representative from Japan for his support and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for organizing the meeting. Mr. Kaka pointed out that the Global Invasive Species Initiative for IUCN was based at the Nairobi office under the auspices of Mr. Geoffrey Howard. He stressed the need for the global office to be based in Africa because the continent was faced with a major threat from invasive alien species. He expressed his concern that invasive alien species were spreading/being spread across the continent, but the issue was not receiving the magnitude of attention that it deserved. He called on the African governments to raise awareness on this particular threat, especially in the face of climate change. Mr. Kaka expressed hope that this particular meeting would raise the level of awareness of invasive alien species and that participants would take the conclusions back to their colleagues.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

12. The participants introduced themselves and agreed that Mr. Geoffrey Howard would be the Chair of the workshop and Ms. Jamie K. Reaser the rapporteur. Mr. Geoffrey Howard then went through the proposed programme/agenda of the meeting. The agenda adopted by the participants is presented in annex II of this document.

ITEM 3. SUBSTANTIVE MATTERS

3.1 Background

13. Ms. Junko Shimura from the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity gave a presentation entitled “Achieving the invasive alien species target and required reporting to the Convention on Biological Diversity”. She provided information to the participants on the impacts of invasive alien species and why the Convention addressed the issue. Article 8(h) of the Convention was the guiding text for work on invasive alien species under the Convention. She reminded the participants that the Convention on Biological Diversity was a legally binding Convention and thus Parties were legally obligated to implement the Convention text, and decisions regarding invasive alien species provided guidance to address the issue of invasive alien species at national, regional and global levels. She provided an overview of past decisions and upcoming deadlines relevant to invasive alien species work under the Convention. Ms. Shimura also highlighted the role of the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties in reviewing how much progress had been made toward achieving target 9 (invasive alien species) of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and provided an overview of the indicators for invasive alien species, which were considered and recommended at the fifteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA 15). She noted that further work would be undertaken in the process of reviewing NBSAPs at the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. She expressed the hope that invasive alien species would be incorporated into the participating countries’ updated NBSAPs. In conclusion, Ms. Shimura reminded the group that Parties were requested by the Conference of the Parties to submit their fifth national reports by March 2014, and invited each government to explicitly include a focus on invasive alien species in its report.

14. Ms. Jamie K. Reaser, President/CEO of Congruence, LLC, gave a presentation entitled “Invasive alien species: draft toolkits and the taxonomic imperative”. She provided a general overview of the

ecological and socioeconomic implications of invasive alien species, relevant definitions used by the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention context for work on invasive alien species, and two draft toolkits recently developed as guidance for Parties on invasive alien species: one on integrating the work of other relevant global organizations on invasive alien species in NBSAPs and the other on best practices for the development of National Invasive Species Strategies and Action Plans (NISSAPs). The second half of her presentation focused on taxonomy. It included an overview of the Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI), the urgent need for building taxonomic capacity on invasive alien species, and the roles that taxonomy played in invasive alien species prevention, eradication, and control. She concluded by encouraging participants to consider how to fill the gaps in the linkages between invasive alien species and taxonomic capacity-building in light of the closure of the secretariats of the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP) and BioNET INTERNATIONAL (BioNET), two bodies which had been important sources of technical support for the Convention.

15. Following these presentations, the participants made the following points:

(a) The biological invasion phenomenon is context specific and not species specific, and needs to be addressed as such. The identification of a species as invasive in one area does not make it invasive if detected in another area unless it is showing signs of causing harm, such as damage to native biodiversity or people's livelihoods;

(b) The utilization of invasive alien species is a controversial topic that warrants further discussion. Some fear that once an invasive alien species is being used for large-scale purposes and an economic value is attached to it, people will intentionally spread it further. A cost-benefit analysis should always be done in order to weigh control options. Ideally, sociologists and economists should also be involved in the process;

(c) Participants asked whether GMOs would be considered invasive alien species for the purposes of the meeting. The Secretariat noted that GMOs are covered by the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and hence the potential invasiveness of GMOs would not be part of the workshop discussion;

(d) Parties need to distinguish between invasive alien species and invasive species (i.e., native, spreading species). Climate change may be exacerbating the spread of both in some contexts. For this meeting, it was agreed that the focus was explicitly on invasive alien species;

(e) Parties urgently need guidance and case-studies on building Regional Invasive Alien Species Strategies and Action Plans (as well as NISSAPs);

(f) Parties are responsible for expressing/setting priorities under the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as implementation of Convention decisions. Therefore, the Parties have a particularly important role in bringing the output of the workshop forward in the CBD process;

(g) There is substantial concern about the loss of BioNET and GISP, and implications for capacity-building activities in the region. Participants recognized the need for further discussion on how gaps created as a result of the dissolution of BioNET and GISP can be filled in the near-term;

(h) There is need for further discussion on invasion pathways within the CBD process, as well as at the national level.

3.2 Country practices for addressing invasive alien species

16. The participants gave presentations on best practices used for addressing invasive alien species in their countries. Delegates from the following Parties gave presentations: Egypt, Gambia, Liberia, Malawi, Nigeria, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe. The following summarizes the points made by each representative:

(a) South Africa incorporated invasive alien species into its NBSAP, but has yet to produce a NISSAP. There is legislation that has been promulgated for the management of invasive alien species, particularly plants. Regulations have been drafted under the National Environmental Management

Biodiversity Act (Act No. 10 of 2004) for the management of invasive alien species (both animals and plants). Invasive alien plants that are a threat to agricultural resources are regulated under the Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act. Species are listed in three categories: plants that must be removed and can no longer be planted, plants that can be planted after issuance of permits, and plants that should no longer be planted but do not need to be removed. The South African approach to the management of invasive alien species is integrated, and recognizes that no single control mechanism (e.g., chemical, mechanical, or biological control) is effective and efficient on its own. South Africa has also invested in early detection and rapid response to invasive alien species and has invested substantial funding in invasive alien species research. South Africa's management approach includes engaging stakeholders through partnerships, such as with the South African Nursery Association. Integrated management in some circumstances may include utilization of invasive alien species;

(b) Sudan reported that it does not yet have an NISSAP and its NBSAP does not yet include a focus on invasive alien species. The Government has drafted a proposal to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) requesting support for NBSAP development. Other constraints mentioned included lack of awareness on invasive alien species issues, lack of taxonomists, low policy priority-setting for invasive alien species, and lack of skilled personnel to offer technical advice;

(c) Uganda reported that a NISSAP was produced by the project on "Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa" (RBIPMA; UNEP-GEF) and it has since been submitted to the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) for approval. The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity will request a copy of the NISSAP from the Convention focal point in Uganda and will make it available as a reference for other countries through the Convention's invasive alien species portal.

(d) Liberia reported that the country started developing a NISSAP in 2002/2003;

(e) Malawi reported that 32 invasive alien species were identified through its NBSAP process, and more had been identified since 2006. The presenter pointed out that the country has had a problem retaining staff once these individuals have benefited from capacity-building. They also have a challenge engaging participation of other non-governmental stakeholders. Malawi recognizes the need for new capacity needs assessments, as well as the development and implementation of investment plans so that Aichi Targets can be met in practice. The presenter further reported that invasive alien species are the second greatest threat to biodiversity in Malawi, and that the government will incorporate the issue into its revised NBSAP;

(f) Nigeria intends to incorporate a NISSAP into their revised NBSAP. So far, considerable effort has been made by government to control the three "celebrity" invasive alien species (water hyacinth, nypa palm and typha grass);

(g) Swaziland has been working on a NISSAP focused on plants, but lack of funding has posed a barrier, even though the government declared invasive alien species a national disaster in 2005/2006;

(h) Egypt reported that there was willingness to work on identifying and managing invasive alien species in Egypt but limited staff capacity in government (Mr. El Helw works alone on this subject in the Ministry responsible for Environment). The country has a list of existing freshwater, marine, and terrestrial invasive alien species but little capacity to move forward at the present time;

(i) Gambia reported that there is a willingness to identify invasive alien species in the country, especially in regard to their threats and impacts on biodiversity. There is little enforcement of the few existing laws to protect biodiversity from invasive alien species. The invasive alien species issue will be addressed in the revised NBSAP;

(j) Zimbabwe reported that laws regarding invasive alien species were in force prior to the country's independence. However, they only referred to "pests" and "weeds". In the 1980s, Zimbabwe revised the legal framework under the National Conservation Strategy and included community-level

control of invasive alien species. The country's NBSAP was formulated in 2008 and included invasive alien species. In 2009, the National Environmental Policy Act emphasized the need to control invasive alien species. The fifth NBSAP is currently being revised. The control of invasive alien species does not rely on donor funds in Zimbabwe; rather, the funds come from the Central Government. Recently, aquatic invasive alien species have been added;

(k) Tanzania reported that it does not yet have an NISSAP. The presenter stated that there is a need to raise awareness of the invasive alien species issue so it can rise as a priority and thus benefit from more funding;

(l) Ethiopia reported that invasive alien species are becoming a serious threat to biodiversity, particularly in pastureland. Efforts have been made by the Ethiopian Institute of Biodiversity and collaborators in mechanical control of invasive alien species, and biocontrol is being investigated as an option.

17. Participants discussed the invasive alien species practices employed in their countries. The following points were made:

(a) In general, governments have been more successful at developing strategies than at implementing action plans. Lack of guidance and capacity-building support are largely responsible for this;

(b) The eradication or control of an invasive alien species largely depends on the specific context and available financial resources. Eradication and control are often very expensive undertakings. In some cases, the financial resources do not exist to support a country's needs. Prevention is thus very important and should be considered an investment;

(c) Effective communication and partnership with stakeholders is necessary. The government cannot effectively implement NBSAPs/NISSAPs in isolation;

(d) Risk analyses are useful, but there is need for more guidance and capacity-building support (training, tools, etc.) for national governments to be able to apply them;

(e) It is useful to proactively inform the public/stakeholders about NBSAP and NISSAP processes. This helps to identify invasive alien species issues and alleviate concerns, as well as garner support for the measures and partners;

(f) Staff retention mechanisms need to be considered in capacity-building initiatives so that qualified staff can be retained;

(g) Information access/capacity has been a barrier to developing and implementing NBSAPs/NISSAPs. It is important to develop capacity in invasive alien species information management systems, as well as to develop and update regional invasive alien species inventories. In many countries, little is known about many native and non-native species;

(h) Regional cooperation is needed in the fight against invasive alien species for transboundary ecosystems. The Asian house crow, which is affecting many cities and urban areas along the eastern coast of Africa, is a good example of why regional cooperation is needed;

(i) Inadequacy of taxonomic services was identified as a problem in most of the countries present at the workshop. Taxonomists are retiring and the field is not regarded as particularly attractive to young professionals. There is an urgent need to inspire and train young people in order to maintain/build taxonomic capacity.

3.3 Best practices in building capacity in taxonomy

18. Two resource persons, from the National Museum of Kenya (NMK) and the International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (icipe) respectively, were invited to report on recent achievement of capacity-building in taxonomy in the African region.

19. Ms. Helida Oyieke of the National Museum of Kenya gave a presentation entitled “The role of natural history museums as centres of excellence for biodiversity science to support the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 – The National Museum of Kenya (NMK) Experience”. She pointed out that invasive alien species were one of the greatest threats facing biodiversity in Kenya, and that the lack of taxonomic capacity was an impediment to minimizing the spread and impact of invasive alien species. She stated that natural history museums were a critically important source of taxonomic information. There were millions of specimens in the collection, but only a small percentage had been digitized thus far (different percentages for different taxonomic groups). Records were held/shared with stakeholders through specimens, specimen databases, checklists, scientific papers, monographs, distribution maps, documentaries, and exhibitions. Collections were used not only by scientists, but also by farmers, law enforcement agencies, etc. She emphasized that collections reflected people’s personal interests – both in terms of the taxonomic groups and locations for collections. Nevertheless, museum information could and should be used to address questions regarding invasive alien species, from both scientific and policy perspectives. She gave examples of how data from museum collections could be used to monitor biodiversity hot spots, including hotspots of invasive alien species. Challenges to maintaining quality museum collections included the decline in taxonomic expertise (incentives were needed), lack of digitization facilities and storage facilities, and the historical nature of the collection (for instance lack of reference coordinates, unknown localities or localities too generally recorded, changes in locality names and illegible handwriting).

20. Mr. Fabian Haas of the International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology gave a presentation entitled “Invasive alien species and DNA barcoding: chance of new technology”. He provided an overview of the basic concept of barcoding, which includes taking one region of DNA that occurs in all animals but that varies enough to see differences between species, putting this information into a genetic database, making a comparison, and identifying the species. He emphasized that DNA barcoding allowed for species identification at all life stages, as well as for samples that were not readily identifiable due to condition (e.g., partially digested gut contents, plant/animal parts). Mr. Haas also pointed that there were numerous initiatives underway based on barcoding that were receiving contributions from a wide array of countries and organizations. He noted that although the technology had great potential to contribute valuable information to the CBD process, DNA barcoding did have its limits (e.g., it required a laboratory for analysis and could not yet be used for species identification in the field). He also noted that the technology was getting faster and less expensive, and that users just needed basic DNA handling skills. He stated that information sharing among institutions and countries was of critical importance to making this new technology more applicable for biodiversity monitoring.

21. The participants were invited to discuss needs for taxonomic capacity-building in the Africa region. The following points were raised for consideration:

(a) There are notable conflicts of interests among different ministries (e.g., agriculture, environment, development, forestry) over policies on the role/use of specific species. There is a need for cross-sectoral capacity-building in this regard so that all sectors are able to understand the importance of not introducing invasive alien species or potential invasive alien species. However, implementation is decided largely at the national level;

(b) There is need to improve accessibility to information through databases. There are many databases that already exist but it can be difficult to determine where they are and how to access them. Portals for interoperable databases help overcome this challenge;

(c) There is a need to explore approaches for identifying and linking regional databases. The portals that exist through the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) and Global Invasive Species Information Network (GISIN) can help in this regard. The participants wished to consider making a recommendation to the joint work programme on invasive alien species to support the informatics needs of the Africa region by identifying/linking existing databases. These databases may include information on native, introduced, and naturalized flora that is available in published flora series (e.g., Flora of

Tropical East Africa, Flora of Tropical West Africa, Flora Zambeziaca (for Southern Africa), Flora of Ethiopia, and Flora of Somalia);

(d) There is great potential for regional project development among African subregional organizations, such as the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the East African Community (EAC). The SADC has an invasive alien species programme. The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) may need to develop a new programme on invasive alien species; the risk of movement of invasive alien species from one end of Africa to the other will increase as vehicles, goods, and people begin moving more freely.

3.4 Opportunities for support of implementation (technical support)

22. The representatives from CABI and the World Organisation of Animal Health (OIE) made presentations on invasive alien species issues as they relate to their organizations.

23. Mr. Arne Witt, CABI's Coordinator for Invasive Species for Africa and Asia, presented a talk entitled "Challenges facing invasive alien species (invasive alien species) management in Africa". He provided an overview of invasive alien species in the African biological and socioeconomic contexts, pointing out the linkages between invasive alien species and biodiversity, agriculture, medicine/health care, and tourism. He stated that invasive alien species were eroding the base of biodiversity, as well as human needs dependent on biodiversity. People were actually being forced out of their homes because they could no longer sustain their livelihoods due to biological invasions. He estimated that Africa was likely losing more than 30% of its crop yields due to weeds in a region that was already food-insecure. Children were being taken out of school to weed and women had to dedicate a large percentage of their daily activities to weeding. Conflicts existed between the impact of invasive plants on local communities and commercial industries based on invasive alien species. Mr. Witt also provided information on the barriers to addressing invasive alien species in Africa. These included lack of awareness of invasive alien species; lack of information (inventories, maps) and information sharing; lack of coordination and cooperation across sectors and agencies; lack of expertise; the need for a revised and well-enforced legal system; inadequate financial resources; conflicts of interest; and aversion to biocontrol. He concluded with solutions, including establishing coordination across ministries and sectoral units, developing NBSAPs that include invasive alien species, building capacity, improving information, revising and/or updating legislation frequently, and establishing cost recovery programs for invasive alien species management.

24. Mr. Antoine Maillard, a Technical Assistant with OIE, presented a talk entitled "OIE activities relevant to invasive alien species". He informed the group that OIE was established as a standard-setting body in 1924, was recognized by the World Trade Organization (WTO), and was the sole standard-setting body for animal health matters. He noted that OIE's fifth Strategic Plan (2011-2015) contained explicit reference to OIE's relevance to the invasive alien species issue. The organization's core functions included activities to ensure transparency and safety and provide expertise on animal health matters. He pointed out that expanding the OIE's mandate to explicitly address invasive alien species brought new challenges and opportunities. Topics of concern included the One Health (animal, human, ecosystem health interfaces) initiative, the role of wildlife health in disease transmission, and climate change linkages. In response to calls from Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to fill gaps in invasive alien species pathways, the Secretariat of the Convention and OIE were now working together. There were several activities taking place under OIE that were directly relevant to the mission of the Convention on Biological Diversity. For example, infections of amphibians caused by invasive pathogens had recently been included by OIE under the Aquatic Code. There was a proposal to include diseases that impact wild animal populations as listable under OIE, and an online notification system for diseases of wildlife was being developed (WAHIS-wild). There was also a process underway to include new guidance on invasive animal risk in the OIE Terrestrial Code, and possibly the Aquatic Code (meeting held in Paris, 30 November – 1 December 2011). Mr. Maillard pointed out that OIE was not an implementing agency and that the future work of OIE would be decided by delegates on a democratic

basis. Veterinary service divisions were the ones who had to comply with the standards. He reminded Parties that funds from the Members allowed OIE to organize the work of experts around the world. He concluded by adding that the World Animal Health and Welfare Fund had allowed the OIE to put into place a programme to reinforce veterinary services through training programs.

25. After the presentations the participants raised the following points:

(a) The Convention on Biological Diversity does not have a notification process for invasive alien species entry/establishment like the OIE disease notification system. A notification process could be instrumental in warning other/neighbouring countries that there is impending danger/threat and that thus measures should be taken to prevent introduction and invasion of high-risk species;

(b) Participants were informed of an upcoming meeting of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) on invasive alien species on 9 July 2012. See <http://www.standardsfacility.org/en/index.htm>;

(c) Utilization of invasive alien species is not a stand-alone invasive alien species management tool and should be considered on a context-specific basis. Invasive alien species control should start from the edges of the invasions (where it is lightest) in order to contain the population. Utilization of invasive alien species generally happens from the densest invasion sites outward to the edges;

(d) Concern was raised as to the specificity of biocontrol agents introduced for invasive alien species management. It was noted that host specificity experiments have to be carried out and should involve target and non-target species (including closely related species) in order to rule out undesirable non-target effects;

(e) Countries have not invested enough in sustainable funding mechanisms and sustainable programmes to address invasive alien species; they are almost totally dependent on funding from outside donors. As a result, invasive alien species projects are short-lived and thus the management efforts frequently have little to no long-term impact;

(f) Invasive alien species have a direct link to poverty. Indigenous and local communities are greatly impacted because they depend almost entirely on the direct extraction of natural resources for their livelihoods. They need to be informed about the linkages between poverty and invasive alien species;

(g) Local communities do not tend to utilize invasive alien species as a control mechanism, but rather as a source of livelihood. There is a need to raise awareness of the linkages between invasive alien species and poverty and to empower local people with information and options so that they are not reliant on invasive alien species for survival.

26. A request was made for guidelines/decision support tools on the wise and cautious utilization of invasive alien species.

3.5 Opportunities for support of implementation (financial support)

27. Under this agenda item, the representatives from the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and the United Nations Environment Programme, Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination (UNEP-GEF) made presentations.

28. Mr. Yoichi Inoie, from the JICA Kenya Office, presented a talk entitled “JICA’s cooperation on forestry and nature conservation”. He explained JICA’s mission and policy, which included an explicit focus on global environmental issues. Projects under JICA had guidelines for project implementation: field-oriented approach, human security, and effectiveness, efficiency and speed. There were three major project areas: (i) sustainable use of national resources by communities, (ii) biodiversity conservation, and (iii) sustainable forest management. Projects currently addressed the following topics: governance of forest and nature conservation, climate change, corporate social responsibility, and multilateral

framework building. Mr. Inoie explained that preparation of project proposals occurred over a 12-month period in a dialogue between the partner country and the Japanese government (including JICA). Each country had its own priority areas. Countries had to make environment a priority if they wanted funding from JICA's environment programme. Mr. Inoie stated that countries could determine their JICA focal point by contacting the JICA local office, a Japanese Embassy, or by going to the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. Potential applications (for instance from a Ministry of the Environment) had to work with the JICA focal point, who in turn would submit the proposal to the Embassy of Japan.

29. Ms. Esther Mwangi, from the GEF Biodiversity/Land Degradation/Biosecurity Unit, presented a talk entitled "Invasive alien species and the GEF". She noted that GEF now had ten different agencies, and that we were now in what is known as the GEF 5 phase (fifth replenishment period of the GEF Trust Fund). The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) had identified invasive alien species as major drivers of biodiversity loss. This had inspired the GEF to take invasive alien species up as an issue of priority, and GEF 4 (2006 to 2010) had invited proposals related to invasive alien species. GEF 5 accepted invasive alien species proposals that produced operational frameworks, and GEF was still accepting proposals on invasive alien species. Tracking tools needed to be used to monitor progress. Ms. Mwangi stated that the GEF was particularly interested in funding projects focused on policies, frameworks, and systems. They were not interested in doing isolated, localized interventions that did not substantially minimize invasive alien species as direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss. She said that the GEF could fund invasive alien species projects that included the following elements: policy issues, monitoring systems, invasive alien species risk analysis procedures for quarantine, early detection, regional harmonization, and capacity-building and knowledge strengthening at the institutional level. She stated that Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity could apply for GEF 5 funds by determining whether the country had been funded previously for biodiversity (she suggested asking if one's country still had funds for biodiversity work under the GEF) and contacting a GEF agency for help in formulating the project proposal (project identification form or "PIF"). Ms. Mwangi concluded by presenting information on NBSAPs. She said that UNEP was addressing five components: stocktaking and assessment; setting national targets, principles, and priorities; mainstreaming invasive alien species issues; development of implementation plans for NBSAPs; and monitoring and communication with the NBSAP process. UNEP intended to roll out new funding by February 2012 for development and revision of NBSAPs; each participating country would receive about US\$ 220,000 in NBSAP support.

30. Participants were invited to ask questions regarding application for grants and the following discussion resulted:

(a) If organizations or institutions are interested in participating in a regional GEF-funded project, the very first step is contacting a regional GEF agency. The regional GEF agency will contact the appropriate countries to see if they have GEF funding available;

(b) A relatively small amount of funding was provided for regional invasive alien species projects during the period of GEF 4, and regional invasive alien species projects were underway in the Caribbean and Southeast Asia. However, under GEF 5, funding of such projects may be less likely.

(c) If any participants seek GEF funding at this time, each participant must have adequate funds of their own as well;

(d) The NBSAP process is coupled with the fifth national report to the Convention on Biological Diversity, which is due in 2014. However, the NBSAP revision should be completed earlier than that – in next 1.5 years ideally. The Secretariat of the Convention has been training the focal points on the NBSAP revision process;

(e) The signature process for GEF funds has been a common source of delay in the funding process. Participants were encouraged to develop communication with their Ministries of Finance at the national level;

(f) If a country wishes to add invasive alien species to relevant existing projects, it is necessary to talk to the country's UNEP-GEF Task Manager about introducing this issue to the project as it goes forward.

31. The participants spent the remainder of the afternoon discussing potential recommendations from this workshop and how to most constructively bring them into the CBD process. Participants were provided with a printout reflecting the discussion above, and were invited to continue the work in small groups in the evening.

3.6 *Identifying capacity needs to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Targets related to invasive alien species and associated taxonomy, as well as for updating NBSAPs and NISSAPs*

32. The participants were invited to identify capacity needs to achieve target 9 and associated taxonomy as well as for updating NBSAPs and NISSAPs. The Chair asked questions; responses are noted below:

Question 1: What are the needs in our African countries?

- (a) Information/awareness;
- (b) Funding: Countries must be very vocal in expressing their needs in order to get financial support (from both government and non-government sources);
- (c) More data are needed for decision-making at all levels; data are available from the agricultural sector, but it is very difficult to make economic assessments for biodiversity due to lack of equivalent data. These data are needed in science, policy and management-related decision-making processes;
- (d) Evidence of invasive alien species impacts on ecosystems is needed (from biodiversity value data), ecosystem goods and services, and economic livelihoods (needed for awareness and getting attention from policymakers and funders). You have to prove the effect. It is also important to show that addressing invasive alien species can create opportunities for solving unemployment and poverty concerns (South Africa "Working for Water" programme example);
- (e) Political commitment at the highest levels. These commitments need to come from within countries, preferably from the highest levels of government;
- (f) Feeding research findings (scientific and development assistance studies) into policy decision-making;
- (g) Information sharing;
- (h) Engagement of stakeholders – indigenous peoples, local communities, the private sector, etc;
- (i) Enforcement capacities (e.g., strong penalties);
- (j) A perspective more oriented toward prevention than eradication or management – we need to keep potential invasive alien species from being introduced. There is a need to simultaneously address the worst problems that already exist within countries;
- (k) Better coordination/communication is needed between environment and agriculture ministries at national level. Internationally, it is expected that the Inter-Agency Liaison Group on Invasive Alien Species may provide assistance for national governments to achieve this coordination across sectors as a part of capacity-building activity;
- (l) African countries need to build capacity development systems that are self-sustaining. Some countries have a biosecurity system that is able to support itself through permits and fines;

(m) African countries need policy and legislation – information is required in order to raise awareness, concern, and commitment;

(n) African countries can make use of the data already available (e.g., in South Africa). It is possible to share lessons learned on commitment, political will, and the importance of the involvement of all stakeholders;

(o) A suggestion was made to develop a capacity-building package on taxonomy, linked to the Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI).

33. Countries were reminded to use the new toolkit on international organizations and to provide feedback for improvement. They were also encouraged to review information on the Liaison Group and to consider making recommendations as Parties that support the work of this group in terms of national capacity-building for multi-sector coordination.

Question 2: What resources exist nationally?

(a) See paragraph 16 above;

(b) Most of the Anglophone African countries have a Noxious Weeds Act and what is needed is just to update and uphold it;

(c) Many countries have environmental authorities that have inspectors who have a right to inspect property. Other agencies also exist, responsible for biodiversity, agriculture, etc.

34. The participants pointed out that agencies often operate in isolation. There is little or no exchange of information or sharing of resources. Cooperation should be encouraged to maximize use of the existing capacity and resources.

Question 3: What resources exist regionally?

(a) Subregional organizations exist with relevance to invasive alien species. They are vehicles for regional cooperation;

(b) South-South cooperation under the Convention on Biological Diversity could facilitate processes to strengthen resources and capacity.

Question 4: How can the needed capacity be developed and by whom?

(a) Need a regional, interoperable database portal with information relevant to invasive alien species;

(b) There is an urgent need to get data into the existing databases.

35. Participants stressed that it would be feasible to make regional cooperation more formal by incorporating the regional work under the programme of work for invasive alien species.

36. The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity noted that decision VI/23* and other relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties for invasive alien species repeatedly mentioned the need for the regional cooperation. If Parties wished to make the regional work more formal, Parties could raise the issue through the process of the Conference of the Parties in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, particularly as it related to achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 9.

37. The participants agreed to discuss a possible process to make the regional cooperation more formal under item 3.7 below (see annex III).

3.7 Regional approach to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 9

38. The participants developed worked together to produce a statement of workshop conclusions and the statement. Participants felt strongly that Parties should be informed about the result of this workshop in the near-term and requested the Secretariat to prepare an information document for SBSTTA 16 which

included the outcome of the meeting (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/31). The statement is presented in annex III to this document.

ITEM 4. OTHER MATTERS

Invasion pathways

39. Mr. Geoffrey Howard, meeting Chair, called on the participants to acknowledge/recognize the importance of pathways of invasions in the management of invasive alien species. He pointed out that identification and management of pathways were integral to Aichi Biodiversity Target 9 (**Target 9:** By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment). SBSTTA 15 had called on the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity to document pathways and a decision-making guide. There was a need to identify and prioritize the most common pathways. Mr. Howard noted that if something were to be done to meet target 9 in its entirety, pathways of invasion had to be addressed. The discussion that followed included the following:

(a) In Egypt, the Suez Canal connected the Red Sea and the Mediterranean Sea, which facilitated the migration of species from the Indo-Pacific Ocean to the eastern region of the Mediterranean, leading to many invasive alien species problems; the movement of ships through the canal also accelerated the introduction of new species to the Mediterranean and the Red Sea via hull fouling and ballast water. Another example concerned Liberia, where there is a seaweed covering the beaches that seems to be moved by the off-shore oil drilling platforms. These platforms can move not only what is physically attached onto them but schools of fish also follow them as they are moved from one place to another;

(b) Aid trade/development assistance programs can be a pathway for invasive alien species, as most quarantine and phytosanitary measures are not met when there is an emergency to be addressed;

(c) Virtually everyone in Africa lives in a “farming context”, and people need to be aware that they could be moving animal pathogens and parasites on their shoes when they go to other countries;

(d) Unchecked/ unregulated en masse movement of people (e.g., refugees) is likely to carry and spread organisms that could be invasive when they relocate. The Maasai, who live a nomadic way of life, can cross the border between Kenya and Tanzania without inspection. They used to do this with their animals. Animal diseases have been transmitted during these border crossings. Now the animals have to be inspected and other restrictions have been put in place;

(e) From a policy and management perspective, it is valuable to know the pathway of introduction on an invasive alien species, but this is often not feasible. The management of pathways, especially in aquatic environments, can be very difficult. Nevertheless, it is very important to include a focus on pathways in NISSAPs, not just species;

(f) eDNA is a new, developing tool that could be used in aquatic environments to detect the presence of invasive alien species.

ITEM 5. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

40. Each participant was invited to make a short statement on outputs achieved from the workshop. These are compiled in annex IV below.

41. Mr. Geoffrey Howard, meeting Chair, provided an overview of the next item on the agenda: the field trip, and encouraged the participants to consider how the invasive alien species got to the park. He also encouraged the participants to consider the transboundary issues and potential for collaboration;

42. Ms. Jamie K. Reaser, Resource Person, expressed her gratitude to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, IUCN, and the participants, and offered to continue supporting the participants in their efforts to take the results of the meeting forward in the CBD and other processes.

/...

43. The representative of the Secretariat thanked IUCN and the technical support given by Mr. Geoffrey Howard and Ms. Esther Abanyo, as well as Mr. Jamie K. Reaser and all resource persons who made presentations with up-to-date information. She encouraged the participants to report back in their countries on the workshop; to include invasive alien species issues in their NBSAPs; to contact focal points of the Convention on Biological Diversity, OIE, IPPC, the WTO-SPS Agreement, CITES, RAMSAR and other environmental conventions to collaborate on invasive alien species issues in order to encourage cross-sectoral communication; and finally to process what was discussed during this workshop through the upcoming CBD meetings, in line with the region's sustainable development and other relevant agenda items, as appropriate.

44. The formal agenda items of the meeting closed on Friday December 2011 at 12.45 p.m.

45. The workshop was followed by lunch, and the participants enjoyed an afternoon excursion in Nairobi National Park where they were able to see several invasive plant species of concern to the park authorities, including *Parthenium hysterophorus*, *Lantana camara* (which is being systematically cleared through mechanical methods), two species of *Bryophyllum* and two species of cactus (*Opuntia* spp.). Various efforts have been made to remove these plants from the park but it is clear that here, as well as in many parts of Africa, mechanical removal of invading plants is only a temporary measure and it will require biological control and/or chemical control to provide lasting solutions to these invasions and to restore native biodiversity.

Annex I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CBD Parties

Botswana

1. Mr. Ephraim Kagiso
Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism
Private Bag 00424
Gaborone
Botswana
E-Mail: ekagiso@gov.bw

Egypt

2. Mr. Mohamed El Helw
Environmental Researcher
Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs
30 Misr Helwan Road El Zyrae Rd
Maadi
Cairo
Egypt
Tel.: 01088051361
E-Mail: melhellw@yahoo.com,
melhellw@Gmail.com

Ethiopia

3. Ms. Alganesh Tesema
Director
Directorate of Biodiversity Conservation and Use
Institute of Biodiversity Conservation
P.O. Box 30726
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia
Tel: 00251116612340
E-Mail: Adishihu@yahoo.com

Gambia

4. Mr. Alpha Omar Jallow
Head of Resource and Development
Department of Parks & Wildlife Management
State House
Banjul
Gambia
Tel.: +7449881/9196731/3691015
E-Mail: mawdoj@gmail.com,
alphaojayl@gmail.com

Japan

5. Mr. Yoichi Inoue
Senior Programme Officer
Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)-
Kenya Office
The Rahimtulla Trust Tower, 10th floor, Upper Hill
Rd.
P O Box 50572-00200
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel.: 254 20 2724121
E-Mail: inoue.yoichi@jica.go.jp
22/12/2011
6. Mr. Kazuhiro Miyaki
First Secretary, Deputy Permanent Representative
to UN-HABITAT
Embassy of Japan in Kenya
P.O. Box 60202-00200
Mara Rd., Upper Hill
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel.: 254 (20) 289 8000
Fax: 254 (20) 289 8120
E-Mail: kazuhiro.miyaki@mofa.go.jp
22/12/2011

Kenya

7. Ms. Alice Kaudia
Environment Secretary
Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources
P.O. Box 13229 - 00100
NHIF Building - Ragat Road
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel.: +254 20 273 08 08/9
22/12/2011
8. Mr. Parkinson M. Ndoye
Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources
P.O. Box 13229 - 00100
NHIF Building - Ragat Road
Nairobi
Kenya
E-Mail: parkinsonndoye@yahoo.co.uk
22/12/2011

Lesotho

9. Ms. Theko Bokang
Ministry of Tourism Environment and Culture
National Environment Secretariat
P. O. Box 10933
Maseru 100
Lesotho
Tel.: +266-223 11767
Fax: +266-631-34824
E-Mail: bokangtheko@yahoo.com

Liberia

10. Ms. Cecelia Kollie
Assistant Manager for Conservation
Environmental Protection Agency
4th Street Sinkor, Tubman Blvd
PO Box 4024
Monrovia Montserrado County
Liberia
Tel.: 2316558594
E-Mail: cekollie@yahoo.com

Malawi

11. Mr. Sothini Nyirenda
Environmental Affairs Department
Lingadzi House, City Centre
Private Bag 394
Lilongwe 3
Malawi
Tel.: +265 1 771 111
Fax: +255 1 773 379
E-Mail: sothinyirenda@gmail.com

Mozambique

12. Ms. Romana Rombe Bandeira
Faculty of Agronomy and Forest Engineering
Eduardo Mondlane University
P.O. 257 University Campus
Maputo
Mozambique
Tel.: +258 21496238
E-Mail: rbandeira@uem.mz,
romana.bandeira467@gmail.com

Nigeria

13. Ms. Halima Bawa-Bwari
Assistant Director
Department of Forestry,
Federal Ministry of Environment
Plot 393/394, Augustus Aikhomu Way
Utako District
Abuja
Nigeria
Tel.: +234-(0)80-331-19734
E-Mail: halimabawab@yahoo.com

South Africa

14. Ms. Nonhlanhla Mkhize
Manager, Invasive Species Programme
Department of Agriculture and Environmental
Affairs
Kwazulu-Natal Provincial Government
Private Bag x 9059
South Africa
Tel.: +27 33 355 9298; 355 9335
Fax: +27 33 3859577; 355 9334
E-Mail: Nonhlanhla.Mkhize@kzndae.gov.za

Sudan

15. Mr. Ahmed Suleiman El Wakeel
Biodiversity Project Coordinator
General Secretariat
Higher Council for Environment and Natural
Resources
Tel.: +249 183 784 279 / 781 479 / 777 160
Fax: +249 183 787 617
E-Mail: aswakeel@yahoo.com,
hccenr@sudanmail.net

Swaziland

16. Ms. Calsile Mhlanga
Environment Biodiversity Officer
Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Affairs
PO Box 2602, 3rd Floor, SPTC Building
Plot 335 of Farm 2, Sheffield Road, Industrial Site
Mbabane
Swaziland
Tel.: +26824047893/6960
Fax: +26824041719
E-Mail: phuzic@yahoo.com,
cfmhlanga@sea.org.sz
Web: <http://www.sea.org.sz>

Uganda

17. Mr. David L.N. Hafashimana
Senior Research Officer
National Agricultural Research Organization
National Forestry Resources Research Institute
PO Box 1752
Kampala
Uganda
Tel.: +256 712 161 161 / 256 752 161 161
Fax: +256 414 383 028
E-Mail: davidhaf2000@yahoo.com

United Republic of Tanzania

18. Mr. Thomas Bwana
Senior Environment Management Officer
Vice President's Office
Luthuli Street
P.O. Box 5380
Dar Es Salaam
United Republic of Tanzania
Tel.: +255 22 211 3983
Fax: +255 222125297
E-Mail: tbwana2000@yahoo.com

Zimbabwe

19. Mr. Abraham Zivayi Matiza
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
Management
11 Fl, Kaguvi Bldg
Cor. 4th St and Central Ave
Harare
Zimbabwe
Tel.: 263-4-730 188/701681-2

Fax: 263-4-252 673
E-Mail: matiza.abraham@gmail.com

United Nations and Specialized Agencies

United Nations Environment Programme, Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination (UNEP/DGEF)

20. Ms. Esther Mwangi
Task Manager
Biodiversity Enabling Activities, UNEP-DGEF
United Nations Environment Programme, Division
of Global Environment Facility Coordination
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel.: +254 20 7623717
E-Mail: esther.mwangi@unep.org
Web: <http://www.unep.org/>

Intergovernmental Organizations

IUCN - International Union for Conservation of Nature

21. Ms. Esther Adhiambo Abonyo
Invasive Species Initiative
IUCN - International Union for Conservation of
Nature
P.O. Box 68200,
Nairobi 00200
Kenya
Tel.: +254 20 2493561
E-Mail: Esther.ABONYO@iucn.org
Web: <http://www.iucn.org>
22. Mr. Geoffrey Howard
Global Invasive Species Coordinator
IUCN - International Union for Conservation of
Nature
Wasaa Conservation Centre
PO Box 68200
Nairobi 00200
Kenya
Tel.: 254 20 2493561/5
E-Mail: Geoffrey.Howard@iucn.org
23. Mr. Ali A. Kaka
Regional Director - Eastern and Southern Africa
Regional Office
IUCN - The World Conservation Union (Kenya)
P.O Box 68200
Nairobi 00200
Kenya
Tel.: +254 20 248 3561
E-Mail: ali.kaka@iucn.org
Web: www.iucn.org/esaro

24. Mr. Antoine Maillard
World Organisation for Animal Health Sub-regional
Office for Eastern Africa and Horn of Africa
P.O Box 19687-00202
Nairobi 00100
Kenya
E-Mail: a.maillard@oie.int
Web: www.rr-africa.oie.int

Non-Governmental Organizations

Congruence LLC

22/12/2011

25. Ms. Jamie K. Reaser
President / CEO
Congruence LLC
1207 Bull Yearling Road
Stanardsville VA 22973
United States of America
Tel.: +1-434-990-9494
E-Mail: ecos@nelsoncable.com

Indigenous and Local Community Organizations

Longido Community Development Organization

26. Ms. Martha Lekitony Ntoipo
Longido Community Development Organization
E-Mail: marthalaiser@yahoo.com

08/12/2011

Namanga Environmental Group

27. Mr. John Nkapapa Koringo
Community Worker
Namanga Environmental Group
P.O. Box 133
Namanga
Kenya
Tel.: +254 735 390 762
E-Mail: kihukei@yahoo.com, kikukei@yahoo.com

22/12/2011

Resource Persons and Observers

28. Mr. Alex Obara
Consultant
Kenya
E-Mail: alexobara@hotmail.com

CAB International (CABI)

22/12/2011

29. Mr. Arne Witt
Coordinator
Invasive Species, CABI Africa
CAB International
United Nations Avenue
Gigiri
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel.: +254 20 722 4450/62

Fax: +254 20 7122 150
E-Mail: a.witt@cabi.org

**International Centre of Insect Physiology
and Ecology**

30. Mr. Fabian Haas
Insect Taxonomist and ABS Specialist
African Insect Science for Food and Health
International Centre of Insect Physiology and
Ecology
(ICIPE)
P.O. Box 30772-00100
E-Mail: fhaas@icipe.org
Web: www.icipe.org
Nairobi
Kenya

National Museums of Kenya

31. Ms. Helida Oyieke
Chief Research Scientist
National Museums of Kenya
P.O. Box 40658
Nairobi

Kenya
Tel.: +254 20 3742131/4
Fax: +254 20 3741424
E-Mail: hoieke@museums.or.ke,
nmk@museums.or.ke

SCBD

22/12/2011

**Secretariat of the Convention on Biological
Diversity**

32. Ms. Junko Shimura
Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological
Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W.
Suite 800
Montreal Quebec
Canada
Tel.: 514 287 8706
Fax: 524 288 6588
E-Mail: junko.shimura@cbd.int
Web: www.cbd.int

22/12/2011

Annex II

**AGENDA FOR THE AFRICAN SUBREGIONAL WORKSHOP TO
STRENGTHEN CAPACITY FOR THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL
DIVERSITY PROGRAMMES OF WORK RELEVANT TO INVASIVE
ALIEN SPECIES, AS ADOPTED**

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - 2.1 Adoption of the agenda.
3. Substantive issues:
 - 3.1 Background of this workshop;
 - 3.2 Country practices in addressing invasive alien species;
 - 3.3 Best practices in building capacity in taxonomy;
 - 3.4 Opportunities for support of implementation (technical support);
 - 3.5 Opportunities for support of implementation (financial support);
 - 3.6 Identifying capacity needs to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Targets related to invasive alien species and associated taxonomy, as well as for updating NBSAPs and NISSAPs;
 - 3.7 Regional approach to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 9.
4. Other matters.
5. Closure of the meeting.

Annex III

STATEMENT AND SUGGESTIONS BY THE PARTICIPANTS AT THE WORKSHOP

The experts from African countries at the English-language African subregional capacity-building workshop held from 7 to 9 December 2011 in Nairobi express their gratitude to the Government of Japan for its financial and technical support for the workshop.

The workshop wishes to make a statement with suggestions along the following lines: **

The workshop,

Recalling decisions VI/23*, VII/13, VIII/27, IX/4 and X/38 of the Conference of the Parties,

1. *Suggests* that Parties, particularly within the region of Africa:
 - (a) Consider the development of regional networks;
 - (b) Facilitate sharing of information and best practices for the implementation of the programme of work on invasive alien species;
 - (c) Designate or assign national contact points for work on invasive alien species;
 - (d) Consider an invasive alien species notification process to inform others and the clearing-house mechanism of newly recognized biological invasions in their countries in line with Article 8(h) of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;
 - (e) Develop and continuously update a roster of national experts and make it available to other Parties;
2. *Welcomes* the joint work programme to strengthen information services on invasive alien species as a contribution towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 9 (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/INF/14) and *requests* the organizations mentioned in the joint work programme to support and prioritize the relevant information needs of the African region;
3. *Recognizes* the existing capacity of research institutions and national bodies for developing legislation and national policies addressing invasive alien species, and *acknowledges* the need for further capacity-building in, *inter alia*, taxonomy and other relevant technical skills to develop national invasive species strategies and action plans (NISSAPs) and to conduct risk analysis and to manage the pathways for invasion, as well as communication, education and public awareness (CEPA) through establishing regional Centres of Excellence for biodiversity science and technologies;
4. *Expresses* its concern over the loss of BioNET INTERNATIONAL and the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP) in relation to their work on biological invasions and *suggests* that Parties and other interested organizations to provide support to help fill the technical gaps left by the loss of these organizations;

** This statement was developed by the participants in the workshop; it does not imply the expression of position of Parties that the participants were nominated from.

5. *Recognizing* the multi-sectoral nature of the issues associated with invasive alien species, and strong needs of capacity-building to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 9, *suggests* that the Executive Secretary:

(a) Continue providing practical guidance for addressing invasive alien species and update it for Parties to develop and implement their national invasive alien species strategies and action plans (NISSAPs);

(b) Coordinate the compilation of best practices and tools in the regional approach towards effective management of invasive alien species in collaboration with the relevant organizations and networks and make the information on the examples of regional approaches available on the clearing-house mechanism;

(c) Prepare guidance for Parties on the management of invasive alien species based on pathways in line with paragraph 20(b) of recommendation XV/4 of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice;

(d) Provide guidance and technical support for developing and conducting risk analysis systems specifically for invasive alien species that have impacts specifically on wildlife and ecosystem services.

Annex IV

CLOSING COMMENTS BY WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

In the closing session, workshop participants were invited to comment on outputs achieved during the workshop. The responses are compiled below in the form in which they were recorded.

(a) Egypt: Learned from experience of other countries working with invasive alien species. Will transfer knowledge to other colleagues, including CBD focal point, and consider issues discussed in revision of the NBSAP. Will translate the NISSAP into English and provide it to CBD for posting on the portal;

(b) Sudan: invasive alien species has been a concern because it was not included in the previous NBSAP. Happy to have taxonomy included in the agenda. The issue is coming to the surface at the right time – while people are updating the NBSAP. I will meet with the Secretary General, the CBD focal point, to emphasize the need to give attention to this issue;

(c) Ethiopia: Received many ideas from presenters and colleagues. I will transfer information to the CBD focal point and other colleagues. I am happy because we share a common goal to resolve the problem;

(d) Botswana: I have learned a lot from all elements of the workshop. I am ready to share it with the CBD people. For some of us it is the first time to attend this kind of meeting. It would have been helpful to have been briefed on the process in advance of the meeting;

(e) Lesotho: For me it was an eye-opener. I have realized that in my country the invasive alien species issue has not been given the attention it deserves. It is clear that I have much to do when I return home. I will include it in my annual plan so that it will get some funding within the department;

(f) Tanzania: Very thankful to attend. I learned a lot. I am glad that I came and learned that there is much to be done. I know that I can work with my CBD focal point on this. I know that the government will do something with the local organizations. Very glad to have met all of the participants;

(g) Tanzania: This was a very good opportunity for me. Sharing experiences was valuable. We will try to make use of this experience, especially on awareness raising. We need it to come to the attention of decision makers;

(h) Mozambique: Thank you to the organizers and funding body. As someone concerned with forest protection, it is good to see that invasive alien species is on the table. I will pass on the message when I get home to the CBD focal point and other interested entities. Great to meet everyone;

(i) Malawi: This has been one of the most important meetings that I have ever attended and it has been productive. It has been good for me to be updated on the CBD since I was out of the process for some time for a study leave. It is good to see diverse age groups, which is important for the continuity of issues. I will take and communicate the outcomes of this meeting to relevant authorities back home. However, what happens after this meeting will be the most important. Let us continue working together and communicating so that we have a tangible impact on the ground;

(j) Observer (Alex Obara): Very glad to know what is happening in other countries. I learned quite a bit from the presentations. I now know which area to focus my attention on. I hope we will keep this fire burning, so that the things we learned here just don't disappear;

(k) Uganda: It was wonderful learning what is going on in other countries. Good to meet old friends and meet new ones. I look forward to seeing our recommendations transferred into decisions of the Conference of the Parties in the near term and to see those decisions turned into actions;

(l) Kenya: Glad to be part of this team. I learned a lot and made many friends/contacts. I now know that pathways are serious and we need to think about them and see how we can address them. I've also learned that indigenous people and local communities have a role to play in this discussion;

/...

(m) International organisation (OIE): It is a great honour for the OIE to be invited to such a meeting on the regional or global basis. I'm not very familiar with this topic. I was particularly surprised/interested how many subjects of common interests we have – prevention, control, eradication, economic impacts, etc. Please do not hesitate to invite the OIE to give presentations and assist with different things. You may be dealing with a much more difficult subject than us;

(n) Zimbabwe: I've learned a lot. I hope the toolkits will be completed before we finish revising our NBSAP, so that we can include invasive alien species as effectively as possible;

(o) Liberia: Very grateful to everyone. Greatly increased knowledge on invasive alien species. It has given me the desire to pay more attention to the work of invasive alien species. This is my first CBD meeting and it has helped me understand the CBD process. I am grateful to my boss for this capacity-building experience. I will do my best to work on this issue with my colleagues, including the CBD focal point;

(p) South Africa: I want to emphasize gratitude for the financial support for this workshop. I hope the process ends up in a decision of the Conference of the Parties and that we continue working together;

(q) Nigeria: Thanks to the Government of Japan for magnanimously providing funds for us to come here. I was sent here by my government to get it "right" and help Nigeria get it "right." I hope these changes will be seen after this workshop. It was a great opportunity to rub minds with other countries. Learning from other countries is not just a knowledge gaining exercise; it strengthens diplomacy as we understand other countries better and the challenges they face and probably overcome;

(r) Swaziland: Thank you to the organizers. Much has been gained. It is also my first time in the CBD. There is much information that the SCBD has been sharing with Parties, but I realize that much of it isn't reaching us. I am very grateful. There is so much I gained. Swaziland has drafted Invasive Alien Plant Strategy in 2009, but from this workshop I have learned that much was omitted. I will highlight these issues with the relevant people back home;

(s) Gambia: Excited to be part of this team. I learned a lot and made many friends/contacts. When I am back to my country I will report to my institution and see how we can address the situation of invasive alien species in the field. I've also learned that indigenous people and local communities have a role to play in discussion on invasive alien species eradication;

(t) Kenya: Thank you to the SCBD and IUCN for choosing Kenya to host this workshop. Apologies for not being able to be here all the time. I have learned quite a few things. The pathways discussion was particularly useful this morning. We will take it more seriously. The workshop has good timing given the NBSAP revision process. Invasive alien species need to be given attention in this process;
