WORKSHOP REPORT

CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR PILOT COUNTRIES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SYNERGIES AMONG THE RIO CONVENTIONS

29 OCTOBER – 2 NOVEMBER, 2012
CROWN PLAZA HOTEL WEST HANOI, HANOI, VIET NAM

I. OPENING

The workshop was opened at 9 a.m. on October 29, 2012 by Dr. Nguyen Van Tai on behalf of the Government of Viet Nam. Dr. Nguyen welcomed participants to Hanoi – the city of peace and reminded participants of the importance of promoting national level cooperation among the Rio conventions - the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Dr. Nguyen highlighted that the pilot partnership presented a chance for high-level negotiators and politicians in member countries to better recognize the benefits from synergies among the Rio conventions. Furthermore, Dr. Nguyen recognized the opportunity from the partnership to both build capacity and to raise awareness of what was already happening on the ground.

Finally, Dr. Nguyen informed participants about the extensive experience in Viet Nam with regards to implementing multi-focal area projects under the Global Environment Facility (GEF) as well as REDD+ initiatives and integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) programmes, which could serve as lessons learnt to share with other countries.

After the introduction to the workshop, participants introduced themselves through a tour de table. Apologies were extended on behalf of participants who were unable to attend the workshop at the last minute, including those who were absent or delayed as a result of the typhoon.

II. PILOT COUNTRY PRESENTATIONS

Viet Nam

Ms. Kim Thi Thuy Ngoc presented on progress on the implementation of synergies among the Rio conventions in Viet Nam. Ms. Ngoc informed participants that Viet Nam had ratified all three Rio conventions. With regards to implementation, Ms. Ngoc shared examples from the Vietnam National Capacity Self-Assessment for Global Environmental Management (2004-2006), which produced a report on capacity-assessment needs and development of a national strategy and action plan. Ms. Ngoc also presented on the Project on Ecosystem Services (2010-2014) involving the mapping and accounting of ecosystem

services, linking ecosystems and biodiversity to national development planning, and strengthening of the science-policy interface.

Additional examples of implementation presented by Ms. Ngoc included the project on Developing a Framework for Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EBA) on the development of technical guidelines for the integration of EBA into policy development.

Based on the above, Ms. Ngoc identified a number of benefits from synergies among the Rio conventions that had been realized in Viet Nam including: a systematic approach to addressing environmental challenges, avoidance of duplication in reporting, strengthened collaboration, and the mobilization of common resources.

Ms. Ngoc also introduced participants to the challenges to implementation of the three Rio conventions in Viet Nam, including with regards to: communication and collaboration, funding, technical knowledge and capacity, synergies, and differences in reporting requirements.

Finally Ms. Ngoc expressed current needs for additional support on the priority cross-cutting areas of ecosystem-based approaches to adaptation and strengthened links between the institutions addressing different conventions.

New Caledonia

Ms. Anne-Claire Goarant introduced New Caledonia and its unique ecosystems, unique soil substrate and isolation. Major ecosystems included marine areas, mangroves and other wetlands, dry forests, humid forests, and shrublands. Ms. Goarant informed participants that New Caledonia boasted a 75% rate of endemism as a result of its isolation and unique geomorphology. Ms Goarant also presented on threats to biodiversity in New Caledonia, including development and urbanization, forest and shrub fires, mining, climate change, invasive alien species, and over-exploitation and illegal exploitation of threatened species.

Ms. Goarant explained that New Caledonia had developed its own biodiversity strategy targeting increasing knowledge and information on biodiversity, addressing threats to ecosystem services, the development of conservation programmes, assessments and demonstrations of economic values, and legislation on the use of genetic resources.

With regards to governance, Ms. Goarant explained that the management of environmental resources was at the provincial level except for remote islands, which were managed at the federal level, while international environmental regulation was managed by France.

Following Ms. Goarant's presentation, Ms. Nathalie Baillon presented on the establishment of the World Heritage Site in New Caledonia based on the criteria of remarkable natural phenomenon and representative example of biological and ecological processes, high biodiversity and threatened species. The site covered 16,000 square km of wetlands, mangroves, sea grasses and lagoons.

Ms. Baillon explained that management was divided between three different provinces and was coordinated by the central conservatory of nature (CEN). The CEN, supported communication, outreach and coordination and was the focal point for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), but was not responsible for implementation. Rather, each site from each province had its own management committee and management plan.

The objectives of the management plans included strengthening knowledge, monitoring status and trends, addressing threats, conserving biodiversity, promoting sustainable livelihoods and implementing adaptive capacities. Specific activities included consultations with stakeholders (communities, fishers, consumers, etc.) the establishment of agreements with stakeholders, training, and the formation of working groups on specific themes.

With regards to challenges, Ms. Baillon highlighted difficulties with regards to: coordination of different levels of government, the promotion of a participatory process among diverse stakeholder groups, including volunteers, while managing many different projects/processes at the local, sector, provincial, national and international level, and the harmonization of management plans, monitoring and reporting.

Finally, Mr. Christophe Fronfreyde presented on the Coral Sea Marine Protected Area Project in New Caledonia. The project, which was being implemented in cooperation with the Government of Australia, covered the main islands as well as remote islands, sea mounts, etc. Mr. Fronfreyde explained that main management issues included fishing, invasive alien species and lack of information on status and trends, especially when considering the remote islands.

The main activities implemented through the project, as outlined by Mr. Fronfreyde, included biodiversity surveys, invasive alien species eradication, and fisheries management.

Bermuda

Ms. Alison Copeland presented on activities in Bermuda on protected species and protected areas. After introducing Bermuda and its physical features, Ms. Copeland explained the organizational framework for biodiversity including relevant documents: the Biodiversity Country Strategy, the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and a report on the impacts of climate change on Bermuda.

Ms. Copeland explained that the knowledge on the biodiversity in Bermuda was very good as a result of strong historical records. However, the number of endangered species was very high and invasive alien species were a significant threat.

Ms. Copeland further presented examples of activities being carried out in Bermuda including the Cahow Translocation Project, aimed to restore a population that was reduced to only 18 breeding pairs. The project, as explained by Ms. Copeland, included the establishment of protected areas, the creation of underground burrows, and the relocation of pairs to different breeding sites. Results included an increase of population to over 100

breeding pairs. Challenges, however, included competition between species and climate-change impacts on other breeding birds (reduced cliff nesting sites, increasing overlap between the timing of breeding).

Ms Copeland also discussed *ex situ* conservation through the Endemic Lifeboat Projects in which species were sent off-island for breeding programmes. Finally, Ms. Copeland introduced Bermuda's seven Ramsar sites which needed to be managed for climate-change impacts such as storm damage, coastal erosion, invasive alien species, changes in salinity, sea level rise, changes in precipitation and shifts in species composition. As a case-study, Ms. Copeland presented Hungry Bay, which was damaged by a hurricane and suffered significant degradation and erosion. With regards to management decisions, there remained questions as to whether engineered solutions should be considered.

III. PRESENTATIONS ON TOOLS AND ACTIVITIES

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Dr. Musonda Mumba presented the UNEP Decision Support Framework for ecosystem-based approaches to adaptation (EBA) and introduced the products "Draft Principles and Guidelines for Integrating EBA in Project and Policy Design", "EBA Guidance: Moving from Principles to Practice", and "EBA: Building Communities' and Ecosystems' Resilience to Climate Change Impacts".

Dr. Mumba explained that the decision supported framework discussed how to link EBA to other approaches, how to plan and design EBA and how to evaluate long-term effectiveness. The framework recognized the need for guidance to be context specific and based on adaptive monitoring and reporting.

Overall, Dr. Mumba highlighted the main purpose of the framework to set the adaptive context, select the appropriate options for adaptation and assist policymakers and project implementers to design for change and adaptive implementation.

Dr. Mumba advised participants that the next steps in the development of the framework included the official launch and the piloting and field-testing of the tool. The framework can be accessed at:
http://www.unep.org/climatechange/adaptation/Ecosystem-BasedAdaptation/EBADecisionSupportFramework/tabid/102163/Default.aspx

BirdLife International

Mr. Robert Munroe presented on the BirdLife International work on the opportunities for synergies offered through the Aichi Biodiversity Targets especially with regards to ecosystem-based approaches to adaptation and REDD+. Furthermore, in terms of implementing the Aichi Targets, relevant BirdLife International activities include the eradication of invasive alien species, the identification of threatened island biodiversity (in relation to threats from invasive alien species), conserving "Forests of Hope" through sustainable financing, restoring degraded forests, a rapid assessment tool for ecosystem services.

Mr. Munroe highlighted the ways in which BirdLife International could support synergies through it's 117 in-country members, its role as the focal point for birds with the clearing-house mechanism (CHM) and in supporting negotiations. BirdLife further supported the identification of Important Bird Areas (IBAs), which identified gaps in protected area networks, and identifying adaptation needs for species and ecosystems. IBA related tools included a marine e-atlas, country profiles (state of the world's birds), the Asia Climate Change toolkit, and the Africa Climate exchange.

On EBA, Mr. Munroe introduced participants to relevant activities being carried out by BirdLife and its members including the project "Ecosystem Conservation for Climate Change Adaptation in East Africa" in Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda which would increase awareness of EBA, convene training workshops, assess ecosystem services relevant for adaptation, and capture best practice examples in guidance materials.

Finally, Mr. Munroe presented case-studies on work that had served to improve the national level implementation of synergies among the Rio conventions, such as the England Biodiversity Strategy Climate Change Adaptation Principles and the project "Conserving Biodiversity and Delivering Ecosystem Services at Important Bird Areas in Nepal".

UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)

Ms. Jaime Webbe delivered a presentation on behalf of UNEP-WCMC on the UNEP-GEF project "Integrated approaches to national reporting to the Rio conventions". The project was intended to reduce the reporting burden on countries through improving the harmonization of reports to CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC.

The presentation informed participants that outcomes from the project included both global products as well as national actions piloted in Afghanistan, Eritrea, Lao PDR, Liberia, Mauritius, and Palau, such as:

- Global situation analysis on reporting requirements,
- National situational analysis,
- National recommendations on improved information management and national reporting,
- National needs analysis: training & technology,
- Joint reporting to CBD, UNCCD & UNFCCC, and
- National reporting manuals.

Thus far, the project had improved coordination and cooperation at national level and improved mechanisms for managing data & information for reporting and implementation. Additional benefits would be realized through greater stakeholder participation as well as additional training and resources for building national capacity.

IV. ECOSYSTEM-BASED APPROACHES TO ADAPTATION

Introducing EBA, Dr. Musonda Mumba emphasized that almost all ecosystems had been impacted by anthropogenic activities with 60 per cent of ecosystems being degraded or used unsustainably.

Dr. Mumba then defined EBA as the use of biodiversity and ecosystem services as part of an overall adaptation strategy to help people and communities adapt to the negative impacts of climate change at all levels. In doing so, EBA connected ecosystems, people and governance – it recognized the multiple drivers of change. Dr. Mumba continued to outline the three "E's" of EBA: ecosystem resilience, environmental protection and economic development.

Dr. Mumba reminded participants that EBA emerged as a terminology in 2009 and was integrated into CBD and UNFCCC decisions of the Conference of the Parties in 2010. On the ground, Dr. Mumba explained that EBA was being implemented in various ecosystems, using a variety of approaches and through a diverse range of actors. As a result of these experiences, a number of case-studies and best practices were emerging and tools and guidelines were becoming available. Dr. Mumba presented such case-studies including Ecosystem-Based Adaptation in Mountain Ecosystems in Nepal, Peru and Uganda and the Ecosystem-Based Adaptation Programme (www.ebaflagship.org).

Dr. Mumba emphasized that knowledge gaps for discussion include: costs and cost effectiveness, trade-offs, additionality, resilience, thresholds, boundaries and tipping points, limits of the EBA approach, and integration with other adaptation approaches.

Mr. Robert Munroe then introduced participants to the relevant international decisions on EBA focusing on CBD decision X/33 as well as the accompanying publications such as CBD Technical Series no. 41. The decision clarified what was meant by EBA, emphasized that EBA should be part of an overall adaptation strategy, focused on adaptation for humans and on social, economic and cultural benefits. Mr. Munroe also introduced participants to Aichi Biodiversity Targets 14 and 15, which contained indirect and direct references to EBA.

Mr. Munroe informed participants that, under UNFCCC, the Cancun adaptation framework established the national adaptation plan process and calls for building of ecological resilience and the use of environmental impact assessments.

Examples from Participants:

Viet Nam: The national development strategy promotes an ecosystem-based approach to development and EBA itself is being considered during the revision of national environment plans and strategies.

Bermuda: The Government has established an ad hoc working group on climate change, which will soon begin its work.

Following the introductory presentation, discussions on EBA were led by Dr. Mumba and Mr. Munroe and focused on the need to:

- understand what services an ecosystem is providing to begin with;
- develop very specific guidance on what is a very general topic;
- look at overall adaptation through the EBA lens; and
- monitor and report on the effectiveness of EBA.

Participants began by identifying examples of EBA activities such as: mangrove buffers, conservation and restoration of forests to maintain soil structure and water cycles, sustainable land management of uplands to maintain water cycles, establishment of agro-forestry and diversified agricultural systems, conservation of agro-biodiversity for seed stocks and genetic resources, and wetland management to prevent or reduce flooding and storm surges.

Dr. Mumba and Mr. Munroe supported participants in identifying stakeholders who could provide data and information useful for planning and implementing EBA including:

- Local communities,
- Provincial governments,
- Universities / scientists / research institutes,
- Meteorological offices,
- Statistics / census offices,
- Fisheries departments,
- Agricultural departments,
- Insurance companies, and
- Non-governmental organizations.

Additional needs to effectively implement EBA as outlined by the participants include:

- An understanding of ecosystem services and their values;
- Greater awareness concerning EBA among decision-makers including within sectors such as fisheries, agriculture, tourism and mining;
- Information on the vulnerability of ecosystems to the impacts of climate change gathered from observations, modeling, experimental data and field testing / ground truthing; and
- Effective engagement of the private sector.

Main message from discussions

EBA offers opportunities to enhance the resilience of both people and ecosystems to the negative impacts of climate change. In order to be successful, however, EBA must be framed within broader adaptation plans and programmes and analyzed based on the costs and benefits of EBA compared to other approaches. Capturing the concept in a clearer way for decision-makers was also identified as an important step.

V. INTEGRATED COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT (ICZM)

Introducing ICZM, Ms. Alison Copeland highlighted marine and coastal zone management challenges from climate change, urban and infrastructure development, tourism, marine pollution and debris, and invasive alien species. Such threats impact marine areas, sea grasses, reefs, mangroves and other coastal wetlands.

Main management issues to consider through ICZM, as outlined by Ms. Copeland included managing: physical features, species and populations (including species at risk), heritage sites, marine protected areas, fisheries and aquaculture, and boat traffic.

Following the presentation by Ms. Copeland, Mr. Michael Parsons presented the study on building adaptive capacity for coastal ecosystems taking the case of the Tam Glang Lagoon in Hue where fisheries is the major livelihood. Threats in the lagoon include development, aquaculture, and climate change (sudden onset events, changes in precipitation, increased fluctuations from the norm, higher temperatures and sea level rise).

Mr. Parsons emphasized the need for flexible, multiple adaptation strategies in order to respond to diverse and locally specific threats in marine and coastal zones (such as increased salinity in one area coupled with freshening in another). Considerations in this regard included no-regret adaptation measures such as gender mainstreaming, sector-specific measures, livelihood support, and mainstreaming climate-change adaptation and improved research.

Examples from participants:

Bermuda: Proposed high sea protected area in the Sargasso Sea led by the Blue Halo initiative and the Sargasso Sea Alliance.

New Caledonia: Established a mangrove conservatory to assess carbon in mangroves and is implementing a project to protect sea grasses including for carbon value.

Viet Nam: Conducted an assessment of coastal vulnerability in the Ca Mau province based on wave and wind damage, storm surge, geomorphology, natural habitats, and population data.

Following the introductory presentations, Ms. Kim Thi Thuy Ngoc led discussions among participants on threats in marine and coastal zones, which may affect the achievement of the objectives of the CBD and UNFCCC as presented in table 1 below.

Table 1. Threats to marine and coastal zones

Country	Land Based Threats	Marine Threats
Viet Nam	- Land-based sources of marine pollution - Near shore ecosystem management - Mangrove restoration - Ports	- Tourism - Fisheries / aquaculture - Protected areas - Offshore petrol - Lagoon communities - Ocean-floor mining - Ports and shipping land management
New Caledonia	- Sand mining - Terrestrial buffer zone management - Mining - Coastal development - Climate change	- Tourism - Fisheries / aquaculture - Protected areas (60% of lagoon and reef) - Petrol exploration - Research - Ports and shipping land management
Bermuda	- Coastal development - Coastal erosion	- Tourism - Fisheries - Spatial planning - Protected areas - Species management - Ports and shipping land management

In addition to the above, participants identified threats to marine and coastal ecosystems from climate change including:

- Sea-level rise (monitored in Viet Nam and Bermuda),
- Ocean acidification (monitored in Bermuda),
- Coral bleaching (monitored in New Caledonia),
- Changes in sea temperature (monitored in all),
- Changes in ocean currents (monitored in New Caledonia and Bermuda),
- Storm surges/extreme weather (monitored in Viet Nam), and
- Changes in tidal heights and saline intrusion (monitored in Viet Nam).

Finally, participants discussed examples of ICZM activities that address threats to fisheries and aquaculture including:

- Improved production planning,
- Additional research on status, trends and threats,
- The introduction of better-adapted species,
- Sea wall and green wall construction,

- Improved water storage and management,
- Protection of elevated land,
- Linking similar communities to exchange lessons learned and good practices, and
- Local level hazard mapping linked to provincial/national level planning.

Main message from discussions

ICZM offers a natural nexus for synergies among the Rio conventions. However, marine and coastal ecosystems are facing increasing threats from climate change, biodiversity loss and land degradation. As such, while ICZM can contribute to the achievement of the Rio conventions, the long-term health of marine and coastal zones is dependent upon the achievement of the Rio convention objectives both within and beyond the marine and coastal environment.

VI. REDD+

Ms. Jaime Webbe introduced participants to reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries (REDD+) and associated opportunities for synergies including through safeguards. In particular, Ms. Webbe presented on the ongoing discussions under the CBD on the integration of biodiversity safeguards within REDD+ investments.

Ms. Webbe also introduced participants to decision IX/5, which called on Parties to ensure that REDD+ activities: (i) did not run counter to the objectives of the CBD and implementation of the forest programme of work, (ii) support implementation of the CBD, and (iii) provide benefits for forest biodiversity and indigenous and local communities. In support of this, Ms. Webbe suggested that participants might wish to consider Aichi Targets 5, 7, 11 and 15 when implementing REDD+ activities.

Following Ms. Webbe's presentation, a representative of Viet Nam presented its InVEST carbon storage and sequestration project. The project assessed above and below ground carbon as well as harvested wood products and decay. Projections were made based on three scenarios: (i) forest protection, (ii) aquaculture planning, and (iii) land-use planning. The project relied on data from satellites, national data (including census) and local knowledge and used both models and Geographic Information System (GIS). Outputs include current and future carbon value and carbon change.

Examples from participants:

Viet Nam: Payments for Forest Ecosystem Services (PFES) programme, which targets the conservation and sustainable use of forests both to sequester carbon and to protect watersheds and hydrologic flows.

Following the introductions, Mr. Robert Munroe led discussion on REDD+ focusing on examples of payments for carbon sequestration and potential benefits and risks associated with REDD+ as outlined in table 2 below.

Table 2: Potential benefits and risks from REDD+

Potential Benefits	Potential Risks
Additional resources for forest conservation and sustainable use	Other ecosystem services will be given lower priority compared to carbon sequestration
Increased policy support for forest ecosystem services	Increase in competing pressures on forest use
Achievement of co-benefits (social, economic and environmental)	Coordination issues between different ministries and sectors

Participants also discussed two challenges with regards to achieving synergies among the Rio conventions through REDD+. First, there was a need for additional information on emerging simple methodologies for measuring above and below-ground carbon. Second, the restoration side of REDD+ remained challenging as it was not always clear whether restoration should be focused on realizing the same composition of species or the same ecosystem structure and functioning of the original habitat.

Main Messages from Discussions

Achieving synergies through REDD+ requires the careful consideration of relevant safeguards and planning and monitoring to achieve co-benefits as well as an understanding of tradeoffs between carbon sequestration and other ecosystem services.

VII. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING FOR SYNERGIES

The session benefited from the participation of Ms. Dominique Benzaken on behalf of IUCN and discussed many of the challenges and opportunities from enhancing institutional capacity for the implementation of synergies among the Rio conventions.

Examples from participants:

Bermuda: A climate change ad hoc working group has been established within the Government however it is not yet clear whether the group will include a biodiversity expert.

New Caledonia: The CEN has been established as a coordinating body responsible for communication. In order to support cross-cutting issues, CEN has established a number of expert groups on topics such as invasive alien species.

Viet Nam: The Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment is responsible for UNFCCC and CBD, however, responsibility for the UNCCD lies with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

Main challenges that could be addressed by institutional capacity-building as identified by participants include:

- High staff turnover,
- Limited allocation of time and financial resources for coordination activities,
- Low levels of two-way information flows within and between different organizational levels,
- Difficulty in managing donor preferences, limited understanding among staff of complex environmental issues beyond their area of expertise,
- The lack of direct links between the bodies of the three Rio conventions, and
- Limited communication between those responsible for implementation and those responsible for international policy setting.

Additional country-specific challenges are outlined in table 3 below.

Table 3: Gaps and needs in institutional capacity for synergies

Country	Gaps and Needs
Bermuda	- Increased participation in regional work and stronger links with other UK territories, - The identification of possible entry points for synergies such as the addition of biodiversity considerations to the farming working group on climate change, - Support for integrating climate change into the updated biodiversity strategy and action plan and protected species policy, - Representation from the biodiversity community within the climate change working group, and - Improved two-way communication with convention focal points in order to enhance the 'briefing down' aspect.
New Caledonia	- More formalized relationship with Rio Convention focal points, - A means to increase awareness in Europe of the contribution of Overseas Countries and Territories / Outermost Regions to the implementation of the Rio conventions, and - A better understanding of how climate change elements could be best integrated into implementation of the CBD.
Viet Nam	- Clarity on the overlapping areas of responsibility between the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment, and - A coordination mechanism to identify opportunities for synergies to contribute to the formulation of policy documents at the national and provincial level.

Main messages from discussions

Coordination among organizations is more difficult at larger scales and higher levels. It is also more difficult to link policy processes to implementation. The solutions, however, will be different for each country.

VIII. INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Discussions on invasive alien species (IAS) and climate change focused on the fact that climate change is leading to species change and to the spread of IAS. Each participating country shared information on their experience with IAS as outlined in table 4 below.

Table 4: Country Examples of IAS and Climate Change

Country	Examples of IAS	IAS Management	Issues / Needs
Bermuda	Large number of plants, snails, birds, ants, microscopic organisms	Department of Environmental Protection (control entry of IAS), Department of Conservation Services (management of IAS), Department of Environmental Health (vector control), Regional organizations (lionfish)	Climate change integration in IAS is limited to Lionfish
New Caledonia	Deer, wild pig, fire ants, rats	Invasive species informal group wrote a strategy for IAS management, Specific IAS management plans IAS database	IAS plans and surveys have not integrated climate change
Viet Nam	Water hyacinth, red turtle, snails	National action plan for biodiversity includes IAS, Regional project for forest IAS	Lack of a coordination unit for data management or response activities

Further discussions considered the impact of climate change on IAS and therefore ecosystem services. Finally, participants agreed that attribution is an important issue – there is a need to establish credible relationships between climate change and IAS without assuming that a causal relationship exists in all cases.

Main messages from discussions

The organizational management of IAS can be quite complex and is made even more so by climate change. Especially when considering the need to integrate the impacts of climate change within IAS management as well as linking IAS to climate-change mitigation and adaptation.

IX. SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Discussions on sustainable land management (SLM) began with a presentation by Ms. Jaime Webbe who highlighted that, in addition to being the main focus of the UNCCD, SLM was related to CBD and UNFCCC, particularly with regards to agricultural biodiversity, soil biodiversity, sustainable livelihoods, indigenous peoples and carbon sequestration.

Ms. Webbe introduced participants to SLM approaches including ecosystem and soil restoration, improved protected areas management, the application of the ecosystem approach and economic valuation. Ms. Webbe also informed participants about the joint work programme between UNCCD and CBD as well as the recently signed Memorandum of Understanding between the two Secretariats.

Participants discussed a number of un-realized synergies between the Rio conventions when considering SLM including:

- Translating lessons learned from SLM to REDD+,
- Mainstreaming SLM into marine and coastal management, and
- Exploring opportunities for transboundary collaboration on SLM.

Finally participants discussed challenges in achieving synergies in SLM including:

- The compartmentalization of land issues,
- The difficulty in applying the ecosystem approach where there was both public and private land, including traditional land tenure systems, and
- Combining species or site-specific conservation plans with broader SLM.

Main Messages from Discussions

SLM captures many of the main issues linking conservation and sustainable use to livelihoods and production. As such, it presents a useful entry point for synergies among the Rio conventions.

X. ECONOMIC VALUATION

Based on a case-study on the valuation of ecosystem services in Viet Nam, participants discussed opportunities and challenges. In particular, it was highlighted that some values are easy to capture such as provisioning services (fisheries, timber production, etc.) while others remain difficult, such as cultural services (aesthetic value, traditional use value, etc.).

Participants also acknowledged difficulties with regards to recognizing and accounting for the potential difference between the local, national and global value of a given ecosystem service. Furthermore, communicating the value of off-site ecosystem services is often a policy and political challenge. For example, in New Caledonia the original environmental impact assessment (EIA) for a mine only covered the areas on which the mine, and associated infrastructure, would be located. After highlighting the off-site impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services, however, the area covered by the EIA was expanded significantly.

Main messages from discussions

Valuation is very important in order to ensure that good decisions are made when considering the often-competing priorities of conservation and development. Key to any valuation, however, is a clear understanding and acceptance of ecosystem services.

XI. EMERGING ISSUES

Ms. Jaime Webbe delivered presentations on a number of emerging issues including: climate-related geoengineering, financing, blue carbon and gender mainstreaming.

Ms. Webbe briefed participants on the recent study on potential biodiversity impacts of climate-related geoengineering conducted by the Secretariat of CBD. The report covered both solar radiation management and carbon dioxide removal and highlighted potential risks from competing land uses, changes in weather patterns, changes in ocean chemistry and the lack of impacts on CO_2 concentrations from solar radiation management.

Discussions following the presentations focused on the upcoming consideration of climate related geoengineering by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) as well as ocean fertilization experiments and their potential impact on marine and coastal zones.

With regards to blue carbon, a presentation was delivered on behalf of Ms. Dorothee Herr from IUCN defining blue carbon as carbon storage, emissions and removals by coastal ecosystems - primarily tidal marshes, mangroves and seagrass meadows. The presentation highlighted the work of the Blue Carbon Initiative consisting of the International Blue

Carbon Policy Working Group, the International Blue Carbon Science Working Group, blue carbon research projects, national pilot projects and capacity-building.

Following the introduction, case-studies from Bermuda and New Caledonia on assessing carbon storage in sea grasses and mangroves were discussed. Participants highlighted the fact that the science to assess carbon sequestration and storage was now well-developed and that such science contributes to political support for the conservation and restoration of marine ecosystems within the pilot countries

Finally, discussions were held on the importance of gender mainstreaming to the implementation of synergies among the Rio conventions. In particular, the meeting considered a number of biodiversity based livelihoods in which women could be the main actors including:

- handicrafts,
- the harvesting on non-timber forest products or shellfish,
- farming (70% of new entrants to farming in Viet Nam are women), and
- conservation and firewood collection.

Such activities may be negatively impacted by climate change through:

- changing species composition,
- changing timing of events,
- reduced habitat and populations,
- increased drought and flooding, and
- increased variability in weather conditions.

Climate change is, however, spurring increased investment in some biodiversity-based livelihoods as an adaptation mechanism and, as such, may increase the availability of resources to support gender mainstreaming.

Accordingly, for all of the above activities, participants recognized that considering gender issues through, for example, ensuring that women participate in decision-making, capturing gender disaggregated data, recognizing the different gender roles in natural resource management and capturing knowledge and information from both men and women, could strengthen synergies.

XII. GAPS, NEEDS AND NEXT STEPS

In order to ensure that the pilot partnership continues to deliver benefits to the pilot countries, a discussion was held on gaps, needs and next steps. Each pilot country began the process of identifying gaps preventing the enhanced implementation of synergies among the Rio conventions such as: the lack of baseline biodiversity data (especially from remote islands), the lack of studies on impacts and vulnerability of biodiversity to climate change, poor two way communication between policy-makers and scientists, and a lack of resources (human and financial) assigned to coordination and collaboration.

Examples of comments from participants on gaps and needs

I'm not sure who is responsible for climate change in our government;

We don't have access to academic journals so how are we supposed to integrate science into policy-making;

Information flows well from the bottom up but we never hear back on what has been done with the information we communicate or what decisions have been taken based on it;

We continue to face significant gaps in data such as on recreational fisheries and from remote islands which hampers our ability to draw conclusions on biodiversity – climate change links.

Participants identified a number of priority investments and activities for the next step of the pilot partnership including (in order of priority):

1. Access to methodologies for the valuation of ecosystem services and
2. Tools for assessing the vulnerability of ecosystems to climate change,
3. Awareness raising tools to inform policy-makers about EBA,
4. Bibliographic compilations of country-specific information on biodiversity climate change links and access to relevant journals/journal articles,
5. Learn from/participate in UNEP-WCMC et al. synergistic reporting project, and
6. In-country policy dialogues on the three Rio Conventions, including through the Rio Convention Secretariats doing more with Overseas Territories.

Participants also agreed to provide and share the following:

- Convention text,
- Tools,
- Guidelines/decision frameworks,
- Research,
- Case studies,
- Contacts in international organizations (including the convention Secretariats), and
- Contacts in regional and country offices.

XIII. CLOSING

The workshop was closed by Dr. Nguyen Van Tai on behalf of the Government of Viet Nam. Dr. Tai reminded participants that they had spent five days working on synergies among the Rio conventions. The meeting, Dr. Tai concluded, was a good opportunity to establish partnerships for the implementation of the conventions in that it portrayed a picture of the benefits of the pilot partnership addressing topics ranging from EBA to synergies in marine and coastal zones. Dr. Tai expressed his appreciation to participants for providing lessons learned from examples of synergies in all of countries.

Dr. Tai reminded participants that challenges remained however, especially with regards to monitoring ecological and economic tradeoffs. As such, Dr. Tai recognized the importance of continuing the partnership. Closing the meeting, on behalf of the host country, Dr. Tai extended his thanks to all participants.

The meeting closed at 4 p.m. on 2 November, 2012.

ANNEX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

PARTIES

Bermuda (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

18. Ms. Alison Copeland
Biodiversity Officer
Department of Conservation Services
Ministry of Public Works
Flatts, Bermuda
Email: aicopeland@gov.bm

New Caledonia (France)

2. Ms. Nathalie Baillon
Directrice du Conservatoire des espaces naturels
Nouvelle Calédonie
Email : dircen@cen.nc

3. Ms. Dolores Bodmer
Province Nord
Nouvelle Calédonie
Email : d.bodmer@province-nord.nc

4. Mr. Christophe Fronfreyde
Adjoint au service de la marine marchande et des pêches maritimes
Gouvernement de la Nouvelle Calédonie
Email : christophe.fonfreyde@gouv.nc

5. Anne-Claire Goarant
Chargée de mission pour la coopération multilatérale et les organisations régionales
Service de la coopération régionale et des relations extérieures du Gouvernement de la Nouvelle-Calédonie
Email: anne-claire.goarant@gouv.nc

Viet Nam

18. Dr. Nguyen Van Tai,
Director General of Institute of Strategy and Policy on natural resources and environment

Email: nvtai@isponre.gov.vn

18. Kim Thi Thuy Ngoc
Head of International Cooperation Division,
Institute of Strategy and Policy on natural resources and environment
Email: kttngoc@isponre.gov.vn

18. Nguyen Thi Ngoc Anh
GEF Viet Nam Office
Email : ntnganh@yahoo.com

9. Le Thi Le Quyen
GEF Viet Nam Office
Email: llquyen@isponre.gov.vn

10. Nguyen Khac Hieu (participating one of five meeting days)
Deputy Director General of Department of Meteorology, Hydrology and Climate Change
Email: ngkhachieu@yahoo.com

11. Hoang Manh Hoa (participating one of five meeting days)
Department of Meteorology, Hydrology and Climate Change
Email: vnccoffice@fpt.vn; vnccoffice@viettel.vn

12. Pham Manh Cuong (participating on 1-2 November, 2012)
REDD Office
Email: manhcuongpham@vnforest.gov.vn

13. Vu Thi Luyen
Viet Nam Financial Times
Email: vuthiluyentb@gmail.com

14. Do Song Ha
Viet Nam Television – Channel 4
Email: dosongha029@gmail.com

UNITED NATIONS

United Nations Environment Programme

15. Dr. (Ms.) Musonda Mumba, PhD
Programme Officer
Ecosystem Based Adaptation (EBA)
Flagship Programme Focal Point
Climate Change Adaptation Unit

Division of Environmental Policy Implementation, UNEP
Email : Musonda.Mumba@unep.org

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

16. Ms. Jaime Webbe
Consultant, Synergies among the Rio Conventions
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
Email: jaime.webbe.consultant@cbd.int

INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

IUCN (via remote connection)

17. Dominique Benzaken
IUCN Commission on Ecosystems
Po Box 5228, Kingston, ACT 2604 Australia
email:dobenzaken@gmail.com
PH:+61 417 295 625

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

BirdLife International

18. Mr. Robert Munroe
Climate Change Officer
Policy Division
BirdLife International
Email: robert.munroe@birdlife.org
