



**Convention on  
Biological Diversity**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/11/14/INF/6  
26 September 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE  
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Eleventh meeting  
Hyderabad, India, 8-19 October 2012  
Agenda item 4.1

**RESOURCE MOBILIZATION: COMPILATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF DATA  
PROVIDED BY PARTIES THROUGH THE PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK**

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

1. The present compilation has collected all the submissions on resourcing indicators and associated reporting framework, which have been made available by Parties during the past biennium, in response to paragraph 8 of decision X/3 A, of the Conference of the Parties.
2. The document is being circulated in the form and language in which it provided to the Secretariat.

/...

In order to minimize the environmental impacts of the Secretariat's processes, and to contribute to the Secretary-General's initiative for a C-Neutral UN, this document is printed in limited numbers. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

## Contents

European Union on resourcing indicators, received on 30 June 2011.....	3
Finland and United Kingdom, received on 3 August 2011 .....	8
Japan, received on 23 August 2011 .....	9
Canada, received on 30 September 2011 .....	14
India, received on 21 October 2011 .....	39
China, received on 21 November 2011.....	46
Japan, received on 6 December 2011 .....	48
Norway, received on 22 December 2011.....	50
Myanmar, received on June 22, 2012 .....	54
Ethiopia, received on 29 June 2012 .....	55
Norway, received on 29 June 2012.....	68
European Union and Member States, received on 6 July 2012 .....	77
Belgium in the EU submission .....	83
Bulgaria in the EU submission .....	90
Denmark in the EU submission .....	106
Estonia in the EU submission .....	125
Finland in the EU submission.....	133
France in the EU submission .....	139
Germany in the EU submission .....	149
Italy in the EU submission.....	160
Netherlands in the EU submission.....	168
Poland in the EU submission .....	178
Spain in the EU submission .....	184
Sweden in the EU submission.....	200
Switzerland, received on 20 July 2012 .....	201
Canada, received on 25 July 2012 .....	233
United Kingdom, received on 26 July 2012 .....	260
Costa Rica, received on 27 August 2012 .....	277
Brazil, received on 24 September 2012 .....	281

## EUROPEAN UNION ON RESOURCING INDICATORS, RECEIVED ON 30 JUNE 2011

### EU submission on indicators for monitoring the implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization based on its mission and eight goals (COPX/3, §7)

29 June 2011

In Decision COPX/3, COP invited Parties, other Governments and levels of governments, relevant international organizations, and civil-society organizations, in response to the indicators contained in paragraph 7 of the decision, and other information pertinent to the indicators, to submit information not later than 30 June 2011 for the Executive Secretary to compile and present a synthesis of this information.

In CBD Notification 2011-061 the Executive Secretary (SCBD) indicates that this information should be provided by 31 July 2011. This information will enable the SCBD to give methodological guidance on the use of the 15 indicators.

#### General remarks

- In COP 10 Decision X/3, the COP requested the Executive Secretary to compile information from all sources including but not limited to the Biodiversity Indicator Partnership to give methodological guidance to the fifteen resource mobilisation indicators including collaborating with OECD/DAC and informed by the work of the AHTEG on indicators for the Strategic Plan of the Convention for the period 2011-2020. The EU and its Member States are committed to their engagement made at the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Conference of the Parties in October 2010. We are convinced of the need to better quantify the resource flows, to identify gaps and to explore options for an improved and more efficient use of available resources in order to effectively meet the objectives of the CBD. To do so it is essential to develop a common methodology to apply the indicators for the Strategy for Resource Mobilization and we therefore consider that this exercise is critical to provide a solid basis for the adoption of resource mobilisation targets.

Given the complexity of the matter, establishing robust baselines and an effective reporting framework will depend on thorough preparations and we are therefore concerned that while in the Decision X/3, 8(b) the deadline for the submission is set for 30 June 2011, the Notification 2011-061 is setting a new deadline for 31 July 2011. In order not to jeopardize preparations, this extension of the deadline should not delay the already extremely tight process ahead of COP11.

- The development of the methodology for the application of indicators and its implementation by Parties is of utmost importance in the context of the Resource Mobilisation Strategy, especially for allowing the establishment of robust baselines and an effective, meaningful and reliable reporting framework. It will be therefore important to receive guidance as soon as possible. In particular clarification is needed regarding questions related to the overlaps, as well as the meaning and use of certain indicators.
- We furthermore look forward to any advice to be provided by the AHTEG on the further development of the indicators for measuring progress in the achievements of the 2020 targets of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and in particular target 20, based, *inter alia*, on the indicators agreed through Decision X/3. Also the discussions of the AHTEG on indicators for some of the other targets, e.g. related to harmful subsidies, could provide very valuable information for our discussions. It will be important to connect both discussions in order to maximize the mutual benefit and avoid overlap or contradictions under these separate discussions on COP10 decisions.
- As a general principle, the EU and its Member States promote using already available and/or generated information by other institutions and processes in order to keep the burden of reporting for

the Parties at a minimum, and to encourage multilateral institutions to improve their reporting on this issue.

The EU and its Member States believe that it is important to learn from other processes. Considerable work is currently carried out on the monitoring and tracking of climate finance and in particular its use. The challenges in tracking climate funding from different sources are similar to the challenges the CBD is facing in monitoring biodiversity financing. It needs to be ensured that monitoring approaches of different processes are harmonised in order to ensure consistency and minimise the reporting burden for Parties.

In that regard, the EU and its Member States also noted that there might be several overlaps between the indicators which could limit their cost-effective application in a timely manner. Therefore, to avoid multiplication of work, we would encourage using existing systems whenever possible for generating data for reporting on the indicators.

- Decision X/3 requests the SCBD to provide guidelines for the establishment of a baseline year 8§ (e)). In order to identify robust baselines at COP 11, it will be necessary to prepare for this during the Working Group on the Review of Implementation (WGRI4). The EU and its Member States were pleased to see that in notifications 2011-071 and 2011-070, information on the implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilisation and in particular for the development of targets is requested to support our deliberations at WGRI4.

In this regard we also believe that an electronic consultation in general on the guidance/methodology and specifically on the determination of baselines before WGRI4 could further contribute to our deliberations at WGRI4 and at COP11.

### **Decision X/3, §7: the 15 indicators**

The EU and its Member States have reviewed the 15 indicators and would like to provide the following comments on certain indicators for the development of the guidance by the SCBD:

- **Indicator 1 - Aggregated financial flows, in the amount and where relevant percentage, of biodiversity-related funding, per annum, for achieving the Convention's three objectives, in a manner that avoids double counting, both in total and in, inter alia, the following categories:**
  - (a) **Official Development Assistance (ODA);**
  - (b) **Domestic budgets at all levels;**
  - (c) **Private sector;**
  - (d) **Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia;**
  - (e) **International financial institutions;**
  - (f) **United Nations organizations, funds and programmes;**
  - (g) **Non-ODA public funding;**
  - (h) **South-South cooperation initiatives;**
  - (i) **Technical cooperation**

Several of the sub-items under the first indicator could provide overlapping results. The guidance from the SCBD should therefore foresee a methodology to avoid this. A matrix approach could be developed, which would display the contribution of each indicator to information on biodiversity financing, and areas of duplication. In view of the apparent overlap of the indicators the EU and its Member States suggest to consider a further consolidation of the current set of indicators. Regarding indicator 1(a): the Rio markers as designed by the OECD/DAC are used by most donor countries to monitor Official Development Assistance (ODA) but they cannot provide adequate quantitative information, regarding ODA. These markers do not allow reliable quantification of funding that benefits biodiversity as a co benefit of other purposes. The system in place therefore does not provide

enough information regarding the amount of funding. The possibilities and challenges of using OECD/DAC statistics as an indicator have been well described by the Biodiversity Indicator Partnership<sup>1</sup>. The OECD/DAC system uses accounting methods used by the private sector, and it has therefore the potential to incorporate private sector commitments, in addition to ODA. A discussion on refining the Rio markers, and make them more directly useful in this context, should be suggested to the OECD, as requested in Decision X/3 §8 (d) and §12. The EU and its Member States believe that this could be taken up by members of the OECD directly as well as through a closer cooperation between the CBD Secretariat and the OECD/DAC. We therefore feel that it would be beneficial for this process if the SCBD could start discussions with the OECD/DAC in order to explore possible ways for generating more adequate quantitative data.

The EU and its Member States would like to highlight that considerable expert work on the indicator "Official Development Assistance provided in support of the Convention" has already been carried out in the framework of the CBD over the past years. The methodological guidance should be developed on the basis of the existing experience and in co-operation with the Biodiversity Indicator Partnership and the OECD.

Given the urgency of collecting quantitative information before COP11, it will be crucial to receive information from recipient countries on amounts of ODA and other public funding for biodiversity and how it was spend. As explained above the OECD/DAC system does not allow such reporting. Furthermore this will be in line with the commitment made in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness to strengthen public financial management capacity and report on budget execution.

Regarding indicator 1(c) on the private sector we would welcome if the CBD methodological guidance on the use of the 15 indicators could contain general guidelines on the involvement of private sector and promotion of public-private collaboration.

It is important to also pay enough attention to the indirect financial flows, in particular from key sectors for biodiversity. However, current indicators for sectoral funds are very seldom sensitive enough for biodiversity and at best cover 'environmental factors'. It will be necessary to identify the biodiversity spending in key sectors (e.g. agriculture, forestry, tourism, fisheries, research) as this is crucial information to further develop a sustainable funding basis for biodiversity. The importance of the issue is receiving more and more attention but collecting the information has proven very difficult. To counter this, some efforts are ongoing within the EU (e/g. the Classification of Environmental Protection Activities and Expenditure 2000, CEPA 2000) improvement of tracking tools for biodiversity related spending in sectoral funds<sup>2</sup>) but they will need to be taken up on a wider scale to look for and encourage indirect benefits for biodiversity from financial flows that have a broader scope. The lack of standardised approaches for defining biodiversity expenditures leads to significant challenges in tracking overall biodiversity funding and needs to be addressed.

- **Indicator 2 - Number of countries that have:**

- (a) Assessed values of biodiversity, in accordance with the Convention;**
- (b) Identified and reported funding needs, gaps and priorities;**
- (c) Developed national financial plans for biodiversity;**
- (d) Been provided with the necessary funding and capacity building to undertake the above activities**

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.bipindicators.net/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=v%2fCkif8Ig30%3d&tabid=116>

<sup>2</sup> CEPA 2000: European method for classifying biodiversity spending. This is a generic classification for environmental protection. It is used to classify activities, products, real spending and other operations at the European level.

Regarding indicator 2 sub-items (a), (b), (c) and (d), the EU and its Member States would suggest to the SCBD to develop a questionnaire together with guidelines that would help Parties in their reporting.

It will be important to identify exactly what is measured here and how the information will be used to monitor the effect of the specified measures with regard to resource mobilisation.

- **Indicator 3 - Amount of domestic financial support, per annum, in respect of those domestic activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of this Convention**

It is necessary to clarify the difference between indicator 3 and 1 (b).

Regarding indicator on domestic budget/financial support, the SCDB could take on board methodological inputs from the CEPA 2000, where relevant.

- **Indicator 4 - Amount of funding provided through the Global Environment Facility and allocated to biodiversity focal area**

While monitoring the amount of funding provided through the GEF and allocated to biodiversity focal area is needed, funding allocated to other focal areas of GEF, such as the international waters focal area, can also contribute to biodiversity. Therefore, we suggest that guidelines and methodologies are provided in order to monitor also this funding allocated through other focal areas of the GEF. This is a similar approach as what is described under Indicator 1 regarding the need to look at indirect benefits for biodiversity of financial flows with a broader scope.

- **Indicator 5 - Level of CBD and Parties' support to other financial institutions that promote replication and scaling-up of relevant successful financial mechanisms and instruments**

The EU and its Member States see a couple of methodological challenges in relation to this indicator and believes it to be very important that the guidance provided by the SCBD provides an indication of how to interpret "level of support", "other financial institutions", "replication and scaling-up" and "successful financial mechanisms and instruments", in order to develop a common understanding.

- **Indicator 6 - Number of international financing institutions, United Nations organizations, funds and programmes, and the development agencies that report to the Development Assistance Committee of Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/DAC), with biodiversity and associated ecosystem services as a cross-cutting policy**

The EU and its Member States are of the view that the SCBD should analyse and utilize available information from relevant organizations (OECD, Global Indicator Partnership, UNDP, World Bank).

The annual questionnaire on Financing for Development that provides the basis for the report on "Enhancing EU Accountability on Financing for Development: towards the EU Official Development Assistance Peer Review – Annual Report 2011" EU Member States and the European Commission where asked whether biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services were considered a cross-cutting or sectoral policy issue in development co-operation. (Their answers can be found here: [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/accountability/eu-annual-accountability-reports/country\\_answers\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/accountability/eu-annual-accountability-reports/country_answers_en.htm))

- **Indicator 8 and 9**

- **Number of South-South cooperation initiatives conducted by developing country Parties and those that may be supported by other Parties and relevant partners, as a complement to necessary North-South cooperation**

- **Amount and number of South-South and North-South technical cooperation and capacity building initiatives that support biodiversity**

What is the added value of indicators 8 & 9 compared to indicators 1(h) and 1(i)? We would suggest that given the fact that this is about aggregated financial flows, the sub items 1 (h) and 1 (i) do not need separate action. When applying the indicators, it might be better to combine all 4 to avoid repetition of data and work.

- **Indicator 11 and 12**

**Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries to contribute to achieving the Convention's objectives;**

**Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020**

The view of the EU and its Member States is that these are identical indicators and thus should not be dealt with separately.

- **Indicator 13 - Resources mobilized from the removal, reform or phase-out of incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity, which could be used for the promotion of positive incentives, including but not limited to innovative financial mechanisms, that are consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations, taking into account national social and economic conditions**

We would like to stress particularly the need to ensure the connection with the outcomes of the AHTEG on indicators, in particular for Target 3 of the Strategic Plan 2011-2020.

In 2008 the European Commission commissioned a study on the identification and assessment of environmental harmful subsidies<sup>3</sup>. Its findings are relevant for the development of guidance related to indicator 13.

- **Indicator 14 - Number of initiatives, and respective amounts, supplementary to the financial mechanism established under Article 21, that engage Parties and relevant organizations in new and innovative financial mechanisms, which consider intrinsic values and all other values of biodiversity, in accordance with the objectives of the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization**

The SCBD should be able to aggregate relevant information for this indicator from the submissions on innovative financial mechanisms.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/enveco/taxation/pdf/Harmful%20Subsidies%20Report.pdf>

**FINLAND AND UNITED KINGDOM, RECEIVED ON 3 AUGUST 2011**

**Notification of a Scoping Study Underway to Review the Feasibility of the Adopted Indicators for Implementation of the Strategy on Resource Mobilization of the Convention on Biological Diversity**

In the CBD Notification dated the 18<sup>th</sup> March 2011, the Executive Secretary invited Parties, other Governments, relevant international organizations, and civil society organizations to submit views and comments on the 15 indicators identified in paragraph 7 of decision X/3 by 31 July 2011. This is a combined letter from the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finnish Ministry of the Environment and the UK Department of Environmental and Rural Affairs (Defra), to announce that financial support has been provided for a scoping study review to be undertaken on the 15 adopted indicators.

The study is being conducted by UNEP-WCMC and will review the feasibility of the adopted indicators by assessing the availability of data at different scales, the existing capacity for indicator reporting, and the lessons learnt from similar processes. A copy of the Terms of Reference for the study has been provided along with this letter. The CBD Secretariat has already been notified of the work and various staff members form part of a specialist advisory group for the study.

A first draft report of the scoping study will be available at the beginning of September 2011 and will be directly shared with the Executive Secretary so that it may feed into consultations regarding the adopted indicators. We hope that this useful report will significantly assist the Executive Secretary in providing methodological guidance on the indicators, as stated in paragraph 8(d).

**JAPAN, RECEIVED ON 23 AUGUST 2011**

**Submission of views concerning  
Strategy for resource mobilization from JAPAN**

**Introduction**

With reference to the Notification SCBD/ITS/RS/fb/75381, pursuant to paragraph 8 (b) of Decision X/3, the Government of Japan submits its views on Strategy for resource mobilization. Japan wishes that the following views would contribute to the creation of methodological guideline on indicators and subsequent discussions.

**(1) Aggregated financial flows, in the amount and where relevant percentage, of biodiversity-related funding, per annum, for achieving the Convention's three objectives, in a manner that avoids double counting, both in total and in, inter alia, following categories:**

**(a) Official Development Assistance (ODA);**

Rio marker

With regards to the DAC Countries, OECD-DAC provides detailed data of “Rio marker” on Biodiversity-related assistance. Japan considers this data as an efficient method to grasp the financial flow of biodiversity-related ODA.

ODA from non-DAC countries

The ODA contribution from non-DAC countries has increased its importance. Therefore, the amount of ODA from non-DAC countries should be taken into consideration, in discussing financial flow of ODA in biodiversity. The calculation method of Rio marker could be applied to this purpose with necessary changes.

Mainstreaming biological diversity

In order to expand financial flows on biodiversity, it is advisable to mainstream biodiversity in ODA policies of the Party. Therefore, it is desirable that method and specific examples of mainstreaming biodiversity in ODA policies are presented in the guideline.

The Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) has been providing support to enhance public knowledge and to raise awareness of biodiversity conservation through environmental education and other methods with a view to “mainstreaming biodiversity”. At the COP 10, JICA organized “the High Level Forum on Biodiversity in Development Cooperation in Nagoya” whose objective was to mainstream biodiversity in process of development assistance.

**(b) Domestic budgets at all levels;**

It is expected that “domestic budgets” on biodiversity are aggregated at all levels of government, including national, prefectural and municipal levels. However, further efforts are required to aggregate the amount of budget at all levels, since the level of consideration on biodiversity is different at each level of local government. Also, as methods of aggregation of domestic budgets could vary with countries, it should be noted that the simple aggregation of submitted data from each Party is not necessarily useful. Therefore, in order to set the robust baseline, further researches and discussions would be needed.

It is also important to establish and enhance collaboration mechanisms for each municipality in the field of biodiversity. Such initiatives are ongoing in Japan and have been proven effective in grasping financial flows which are increasing steadily in the field of biodiversity.

In November 2009, the “Local Government Conference on Biodiversity 2009” was held in Nagoya, Aichi Prefecture, with the participation of 103 local governments in Japan. As a result of the series of these initiatives, municipalities have identified common areas of concerns and intensified the exchange of information in these areas, which contributed to the mainstreaming of biodiversity related policies.

Japan considers, in light of the complexity in grasping the trend of financial flows on biodiversity at each local level, utilizing existing mechanisms regarding local level initiatives such as ICLEI (International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives) could be recommended. It is recommendable that the CBD secretariat requests ICLEI to establish a system (or mechanism) to grasp financial flows on biodiversity in order to gather the information on the trend of related financial flows in local levels.

**(c) Private Sector;**

Japan considers that categorization, summarization and information gathering related to biodiversity in private sector is required to figure out the aggregated financial flows of private sector comprehensively. Since methods of aggregation of private sector capitals could be vary with countries/organizations, it should be noted that the simple aggregation of submitted data on this indicator from each Party is not necessarily useful, but further researches and discussions on qualitative level of each case will be needed to set the robust baseline.

Japan considers that information on national experiences or best practices of the private sector will greatly contribute to the implementation of the Convention. In this context, it is recommended for Party to formulate a platform for promotion of private participation at national level or to adopt an initiative toward comprehensive private participation. The Government of Japan formulated “Guidelines for Private Sector Engagement in Biodiversity”. Under this platform, specific initiative named “Private Sector Engagement Initiative on Biodiversity” was adopted from the standpoint to promote the participation of various types of companies including small and medium-sized ones, and information on many such cases and experiences have been accumulated.

**(d) Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia;**

It is advisable that Parties create an agency or a system to collect information or data on NGO, which promotes biodiversity conservation. Regarding NGO activities, in Japan, Environmental Restoration and Conservation Agency of Japan (ERCA) is collecting data on NGOs activities in the environmental area. According to its data, among relevant 4,532 organizations, 2,208 (44.30% of the total) are active in the field of environmental education, which can be regarded as contributive to biodiversity; 1,792 (39.54%) are active in nature protection; and 1,220 (26.91%) are active in forest conservation.

As for the number of NGOs and their financial scales in each country, it is necessary to address the scope of data collection as well as the nature of activities.

**(e) International financial institutions;**

With a view to aggregate financial flows of international financial institutions, Japan recommends the CBD Secretariat to summarize information on related institutions and funds or financial mechanisms managed by those institutions, rather than asking Party to submit their information. It is advisable that the CBD secretariat pursues new contributing opportunities, formulating a guideline which leads each Party to follow and contribute to good practices. The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) and the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) may be worth mentioning for this purpose as cases that Japan is contributing to biodiversity and related matters through the World Bank.

**(f) United Nations organizations, funds and programmes;**

The CBD secretariat would be able to collect data, funds and programmes from these organizations.

**(g) Non-ODA public funding;**

It is understood that “non-ODA public funding” means “other official flows (OOF)”, OECD defines OOF as “Transactions by the official sector with countries on the List of Aid Recipients which do not meet the conditions for eligibility as Official Development Assistance or Official Aid, either because they are not primarily aimed at development, or because they have a Grant Element of less than 25 per cent”.

Although OOF has attracted attention because its amount and ratio of financial flow from developed to developing countries are increasing, it is often the case that this flow directly reflects industrial or economic interests. For this reason, it is recommended that relevant precedents are reviewed before a guideline on indicator is finalized.

**(h) South-South cooperation initiatives;**

Given that some developing countries have enough economic potential to give aid and actually implement bilateral ODA to other developing countries, it is desirable for developing countries to grasp the financial flows on South-South cooperation initiatives and submit related data to the CBD Secretariat. At the same time, from our experiences, Japan considers that, when the cooperation is formed as a triangular cooperation, close cooperation between donor and recipient countries is necessary.

Japan has implemented a project “Bornean Biodiversity & Ecosystems Conservation Programme (BBEC),” which assisted the local government and university of the State of Saba in developing a mechanism for systematically and sustainably conserving biodiversity and related ecosystem in Borneo.

In 2002, for BBEC project, JICA invited 18 officials engaged in the nature and biodiversity conservation, from Indonesia, Vietnam, Philippines, Papua New Guinea, Tanzania and Malaysia, to the State of Saba, and conducted a training course at the Institute of Tropical and Biological Conservation. In 2010, in cooperation with the Malaysian Foreign Ministry, JICA also conducted a third country training course, Aggregated Biodiversity and Ecosystem Conservation, for officials from 6 countries. This way, JICA has been implementing the triangular cooperation with a long-term vision.

It shows that the involvement of donor side contributes to both recipient countries and countries where projects are conducted.

**(i) Technical cooperation;**

It seems that the indicators for “technical cooperation” could be overlapping with the indicator of (9) below. It is recommended that the classification method to avoid overlaps should be elaborated.

**(2) Number of countries that have:**

**(a) Assessed values of biodiversity, in accordance with the Convention;**

“Wealth Accounting and the Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES) Partnership” launched by the World Bank plans to develop tools required for integration of economic values of ecosystems into the system for national economic accounting, thereby contributing to the assessment of biodiversity values in developing countries. Government of Japan is a member of this partnership and plans to advance efforts including experimental value assessment and integration into national accounting.

**(b) Identified and reported funding needs, gaps and priorities;**

It is desirable that the CBD Secretariat collects and publicizes information belonging to countries that identifies and reports funding needs, gaps and priorities, since such information can be a guidance for countries which have not reported them.

**(c) Developed national financial plans for biodiversity;**

Government of Japan aggregates budgets for conservation of natural environments and promotion of close contact with nature. For the FY2011, a total of eight ministries and agencies have secured a sum of 144.7 billion yen as their budgets for conservation of biodiversity, improvement of forests, water-area resources evaluation, etc.

**(d) Been provided with the necessary funding and capacity building to undertake the above activities;**

The CBD secretariat would be able to collect data.

**(3) Amount of domestic financial support, per annum, in respect of those domestic activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of this Convention;**

This indicator may overlap with others like “Domestic budgets at all levels”. It is recommended to elaborate what this indicator means in a manner avoiding overlaps with other indicators.

**(4) Amount of funding provided through the Global Environmental Facility and allocated to biodiversity focal area;**

The CBD secretariat would be able to collect data.

**(5) Level of CBD and Parties' support to other financial institutions that promote replication and scaling-up of relevant successful financial mechanisms and instruments;**

The CBD secretariat would be able to collect data.

**(6) Number of international financing institutions, United Nations organizations, funds and programmes, and the development agencies that report to the Development Assistance Committee of Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/DAC), with biodiversity and associated ecosystem services as a cross-cutting policy;**

The CBD secretariat would be able to collect data.

**(7) Number of Parties that integrate considerations on biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services in development plans, strategies and budgets;**

This indicator should grasp the number of Parties which integrate consideration on biodiversity into the national biodiversity strategy.

The National Biodiversity Strategy of Japan 2010 aims to restore ecosystem in our country over the next 100 years, in consideration of the time required to rehabilitate natural environment.

**(8) Number of South-South cooperation initiatives conducted by developing country Parties and those that may be supported by other Parties and relevant partners, as a complement to necessary North-South cooperation;**

Developing countries are assumed to show information on south-south cooperation in accordance with the 1 (h) above. Other information could be submitted by developing countries or other appropriate bodies including the CBD secretariat.

**(9) Amount and number of South-South and North-South technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives that support biodiversity;**

The CBD secretariat would be able to collect data on technical cooperation implemented by secretariat itself like National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) Capacity-building Workshops and such data are useful to be presented. If this indicator intends to collect information on all amount and number of South-South and North-South technical cooperation among Parties, however, it overlaps with other indicators like (1) (h) South-South cooperation initiatives and (1) (i) technical cooperation. When such overlaps are expected, differences between these indicators should be explained.

**(10) Number of global initiatives that heighten awareness on the need for resource mobilization for biodiversity;**

The CBD secretariat would be able to collect data.

**(11) Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries to contribute to achieving the Convention's objectives;**

This indicator may overlap with others like, at least, aggregated financial flow of ODA, Non-ODA public funding (1) (g). It is recommended to redefine in the manner avoiding overlaps.

**(12) Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;**

This indicator may overlap with others like, at least, aggregated financial flow of ODA (1) (a), Non-ODA public funding (1) (g). It is recommended to redefine in the manner avoiding overlaps appropriately.

**(13) Resources mobilized from the removal, reform or phase-out of incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity, which could be used for the promotion of positive incentives, including but not limited to innovative financial mechanisms, that are consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations, taking into account national social and economic conditions;**

While OECD has already developed a way to check harmful subsidies, it is advisable that more usable and favorable method be elaborated for the indicator of resources mobilization. Japan notes that it is important to turn harmful subsidies to appropriate ones, thereby contributing to the expenditures for the achievement of the Convention on Biological Diversity as well as the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and this requires a way to define harmful subsidies and the guidelines to make such subsidies into proper ones.

**(14) Number of initiatives, and respective amounts, supplementary to the financial mechanism established under Article 21, that engage Parties and relevant organizations in new and innovative financial mechanisms, which consider intrinsic values and all other values of biodiversity, in accordance with the objectives of the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization;**

The CBD secretariat would be able to collect data.

**(15) Number of access and benefit-sharing initiatives and mechanisms, consistent with the Convention and, when in effect, with the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization, including awareness-raising, that enhance resource mobilization;**

The CBD secretariat would be able to collect data.

**CANADA, RECEIVED ON 30 SEPTEMBER 2011**

**Preliminary Assessment of Canadian Public and Private Financial Contributions Relevant to the Objectives of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity**

**Environment Canada**

**Final Version: August 4, 2011**

**CONTEXT:**

- In response to a decision made by the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), this report focuses on providing a preliminary assessment of data regarding Canadian public and private financial contributions that support the objectives of the CBD, using a diverse range of publicly available source data and information.
- This preliminary assessment has not undergone a comprehensive review process within Canada and should not be cited or used to make comparisons within or between organizations referenced in the report.
- The CBD Secretariat will use this and other Parties' preliminary assessments as input to:
  - i) better understand the challenges associated with collecting data of this nature;
  - ii) develop and propose methodological guidelines, definitions for Parties to follow in collecting this data;
  - iii) subsequently request Parties to re-submit their data, using agreed upon methodological guidelines.
- As a result, this first initial and preliminary submission is not meant to represent a final, comprehensive assessment of all of Canada's financial contributions towards the CBD. It is presented as part of a process needed to inform the CBD Secretariat, Canada and all other Parties in discussing how to develop an efficient and effective method to assess progress in implementing the CBD's Strategy for Resource Mobilization.

**KEY POINTS:**

- This exercise found that annual Canadian financial flows related to the objectives of the CBD range between \$5.4 billion and \$11.1 billion.
- Data sources captured in this study indicate that private businesses channel between \$140.8 million and \$278.16 million annually in activities related to the CBD. Additional effort is required to collect and collate data from the private sector to be able to provide a more realistic appreciation of this sector's efforts.
- Canada provides an estimated \$38.25 million - \$233.29 million annually in Official Development Assistance to support developing countries' efforts under the CBD.
- Discussion and agreement on how to identify activities that support the objectives of the CBD with greater precision would make it possible to reduce the range of estimates.

	Millions of CAN\$ annual (FY 2009-2010)		
	Low estimate	High estimate	Average estimate
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	\$ 38.25	\$ 233.29	\$ 135.77
Government of Canada	\$ 14.34	\$ 148.61	\$ 81.48
International financial institutions and United Nations	\$ 23.91	\$ 84.68	\$ 54.30
Domestic public budgets at all levels	\$ 4,189.62	\$ 9,421.86	\$ 6,805.74
Federal	\$ 2,442.81	\$ 2,998.51	\$ 2,720.66
Provincial	\$ 1,463.42	\$ 2,835.14	\$ 2,149.28
Local governments	\$ 283.39	\$ 3,588.21	\$ 1,935.80
Private sector	\$ 686.80	\$ 824.16	\$ 755.48
Business expenditures	\$ 140.80	\$ 278.16	\$ 209.48
User fees (parks fees, licenses)	\$ 546.00	\$ 546.00	\$ 546.00
Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia	\$ 508.46	\$ 614.63	\$ 561.55
Non-governmental organizations, foundations	\$ 446.01	\$ 446.01	\$ 446.01
Academia	\$ 62.45	\$ 168.62	\$ 115.54
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 5,423.13</b>	<b>\$ 11,093.94</b>	<b>\$ 8,258.54</b>

## BACKGROUND:

The United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) entered into force in 1993. It has three main objectives: the conservation of biological diversity; the sustainable use of the components of biological diversity; and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources.

At the Ninth Conference of the Parties (COP-9) of the CBD, Parties established a Strategy for Resource Mobilization to assist the Parties and relevant organizations to mobilize adequate and predictable financial resources to support the achievement of the Convention's three objectives. The Strategy considers the full range of possible local, national, regional and international funding sources, both public and private.

At the Tenth Conference of the Parties (COP-10) in October 2010, Parties agreed on a set of indicators to measure progress on implementing the Strategy for Resource Mobilization (Decision X/3). The indicators were based on the Strategy's mission and eight goals. It was further agreed that additional effort was required to establish methodologies and guidelines for collecting data on these indicators and to set baselines. Accordingly, Parties to the Convention were requested to submit data by July 31, 2011 on the following set of indicators that are outlined in Section A, Paragraph 7 of Decision X/3 (*Adopts the following indicators for monitoring the implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization, based on its mission and eight goals*):

(1) Aggregated financial flows, in the amount and where relevant percentage, of biodiversity-related funding, per annum, for achieving the Convention's three objectives, in a manner that avoids double counting, both in total and in, inter alia, the following categories:

- (a) Official Development Assistance (ODA);
- (b) Domestic budgets at all levels;
- (c) Private sector;
- (d) Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia;
- (e) International financial institutions;
- (f) United Nations organizations, funds and programmes;
- (g) Non-ODA public funding;
- (h) South-South cooperation initiatives;
- (i) Technical cooperation;

(2) Number of countries that have:

- (a) Assessed values of biodiversity, in accordance with the Convention;

- (b) Identified and reported funding needs, gaps and priorities;
  - (c) Developed national financial plans for biodiversity;
  - (d) Been provided with the necessary funding and capacity-building to undertake the above activities;
- (3) Amount of domestic financial support, per annum, in respect of those domestic activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of this Convention;
- (4) Amount of funding provided through the Global Environment Facility and allocated to biodiversity focal area;
- (5) Level of CBD and Parties' support to other financial institutions that promote replication and scaling-up of relevant successful financial mechanisms and instruments;
- (6) Number of international financing institutions, United Nations organizations, funds and programmes, and the development agencies that report to the Development Assistance Committee of Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/DAC), with biodiversity and associated ecosystem services as a cross-cutting policy;
- (7) Number of Parties that integrate considerations on biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services in development plans, strategies and budgets;
- (8) Number of South-South cooperation initiatives conducted by developing country Parties and those that may be supported by other Parties and relevant partners, as a complement to necessary North-South cooperation;
- (9) Amount and number of South-South and North-South technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives that support biodiversity;
- (10) Number of global initiatives that heighten awareness on the need for resource mobilization for biodiversity;
- (11) Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries to contribute to achieving the Convention's objectives;
- (12) Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;
- (13) Resources mobilized from the removal, reform or phase-out of incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity, which could be used for the promotion of positive incentives, including but not limited to innovative financial mechanisms, that are consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations, taking into account national social and economic conditions;
- (14) Number of initiatives, and respective amounts, supplementary to the financial mechanism established under Article 21, that engage Parties and relevant organizations in new and innovative financial mechanisms, which consider intrinsic values and all other values of biodiversity, in accordance with the objectives of the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization;
- (15) Number of access and benefit-sharing initiatives and mechanisms, consistent with the Convention and, when in effect, with the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable

Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization, including awareness-raising, that enhance resource mobilization.

### GENERAL NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

This report focuses on providing a preliminary assessment of data regarding Canadian public and private financial resources that support the objectives of the CBD, using a diverse range of source data and information, in response to CBD COP Decision X/3 (1). An estimate is provided of expenditures on biodiversity by both public and private sector sources using the categories agreed to in this Decision. All figures in this report were obtained from publicly available, previously published data sources. To ensure reliability, official reports such as government reports, annual reports and audited financial statements were used as a basis for collecting the information, with references provided. Data from surveys undertaken by Statistics Canada were also extremely important for some categories. Additional methodological details are provided under each specific indicator and category below.

Note that the vast majority of activities that contribute to the implementation of the CBD are diverse in nature. In a best case scenario, determining implementation of the CBD should, in addition to examining the traditional biodiversity sectors of environment, wildlife and protected areas, consider actions and expenditures in the resource sectors of agriculture, forestry and fisheries, and eco-tourism, as well as development assistance projects that focus on natural resources and sustainable livelihoods. In addition, actions by industrial sectors, municipalities, urban and rural areas that contribute to protection of lands, aquatic areas, wildlife, and sustainable use of biological resources, etc., all make contributions to the CBD. Expenditures on planning, environmental impact assessments, environmental education are additional examples of activities and expenditures that contribute to both the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of biological resources. However, in most cases detailed expenditure information was not available at this level. As a result, many of these expenditures have not been fully counted in this study in order to ensure that overall results are not over-estimated.

All figures in this document are in Canadian dollars.

### 1. Financial flows for achieving the Convention's three objectives, by category:

#### (a) Official Development Assistance (ODA): \$38.25 million - \$233.29 million

	Millions of CAN\$ annual (FY 2009-2010)		
	Low estimate	High estimate	Average estimate
<b>Official Development Assistance (ODA)</b>	<b>\$ 38.25</b>	<b>\$ 233.29</b>	<b>\$ 135.77</b>
<b>Government of Canada</b>	<b>\$ 14.34</b>	<b>\$ 148.61</b>	<b>\$ 81.48</b>
<i>CIDA</i>	\$ 10.80	\$ 103.46	\$ 57.13
<i>Finance Canada</i>	\$ 0.92	\$ 20.74	\$ 10.83
<i>IDRC</i>	\$ 1.45	\$ 23.24	\$ 12.35
<i>Environment Canada</i>	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.70
<i>Parks Canada</i>	\$ 0.47	\$ 0.47	\$ 0.47
<b>International financial institutions and United Nations</b>	<b>\$ 23.91</b>	<b>\$ 84.68</b>	<b>\$ 54.30</b>
<i>Global Environment Facility</i>	\$ 16.63	\$ 22.05	\$ 19.34
<i>CGIAR</i>	\$ 2.85	\$ 48.32	\$ 25.59
<i>FAO</i>	\$ 3.92	\$ 10.53	\$ 7.23
<i>UNDP</i>	\$ -	\$ 3.01	\$ 1.51
<i>UNESCO</i>	\$ 0.51	\$ 0.77	\$ 0.64

#### i. Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA): \$10.80 - \$103.46 million (FY 2009-2010)

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) is the largest government department provider of ODA in Canada, contributing \$3,575.19 million, of which \$2,666 million is bilateral aid.

Financial allocations can be identified by sector<sup>4</sup>, with significant contributions to areas supportive of the implementation of the CBD.

The Statistical Report on International Assistance, Fiscal Year 2009-2010 Canadian International Development Agency, indicates a number of investments by channel and by sector in areas that contribute directly to the implementation of the CBD. These are:

	<u>Millions</u>
Low-range estimate:	
014015: Water Resources Protection:	\$6.13
041020: Biosphere Protection	\$3.10
041030: Bio-diversity	\$1.47
041040: Site preservation	\$0.10
Sub-total Low-range estimate:	\$10.80
High-range estimate:	
014015: Water Resources Protection:	\$6.13
041020: Biosphere Protection	\$3.10
041030: Bio-diversity	\$1.47
041040: Site preservation	\$0.10
031100 Agriculture, forestry and fishing	\$558.23 x 10% = \$55.82
041010 Environmental policy and admin mgt	\$29.05
041050 Flood prevention/control	\$0.84
041081 Environmental education/training	\$6.24
041082 Environmental Research	\$0.71
Sub-total High-range estimate:	\$103.46

CIDA's core contribution to the Global Environment Facility has not been taken into account in these figures and will be listed separately in the section on International Organizations.

**ii. Department of Finance Canada: \$0.92 - \$20.74 million (FY 2009-2010)**

The Department of Finance Canada is a large contributor to ODA, including the provision of financial resources to the World Bank Group. The International Development Association of the World Bank (IDA) is the largest multilateral channel of concessional financing to the world's poorest countries, providing funding supports to boost economic growth, reduce poverty, and improve the living conditions.<sup>5</sup> Finance Canada channels Canada's contribution to IDA. In fiscal year 2009-2010 this amounted to \$435.8 million.<sup>6</sup>

A portion of IDA resources, estimated at 7 percent, is directed toward its Environment and Natural Resource Management sector.<sup>7</sup> Of this, approximately 3% is invested directly in biodiversity activities, with up to 68% related to the three objectives of the CBD.<sup>8</sup> Based on this and the contribution of \$435.8 million provided to IDA from the Department of Finance, at least \$0.915

<sup>4</sup> Statistical Report on International Assistance. Fiscal Year 2009-2010. Canadian International Development Agency

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.worldbank.org/IDA>

<sup>6</sup> Statistical Report on International Assistance. Fiscal Year 2009-2010. Canadian International Development Agency. P.15.

<sup>7</sup> The World Bank Annual Report 2010 Table 1, page 7

<sup>8</sup> World Bank. IDA at Work. Environment: Protecting National and Global Resources. P. 3. [siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/IDA-Environment.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/IDA-Environment.pdf)

million and up to \$20.744 million could be considered as a contribution to implementation of the CBD.

Note that data for other World Bank Group expenditures was not included here. Most of the World Bank's additional expenditures related to biodiversity are loans that will eventually be paid back, amounting to a net flow of zero. The World Bank also provides a substantial amount of funding to biodiversity through various thematic trust funds. However, any contribution to these from Canada would be captured in CIDA's annual reports on ODA and likely covered in the previous section.

**iii. International Development Research Centre (IDRC):<sup>9</sup> \$1.45 million - \$23.24 million (FY 2009-2010)**

IDRC is a significant contributor to ODA, providing \$205.4 million in 2008-2009, of which 85.5 percent or \$175.8 million was provided from the Government of Canada. One of IDRC's major research area is Environment and Natural Resource Management, which includes five sub-areas. One of the sub-areas is directed at climate change adaptation in Africa.

In FY 2009-2010 \$29.051 million was allocated to the program area Environment and Natural Resource Management, however the annual report does not break allocations into sub-areas. As four of the five sub-areas (80%) appears to be relevant to the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the contribution of IDRC to the objectives to the CBD could be estimated at 80 percent of \$29.051 million = \$23.240 million. Research by IDRC in its four other program areas could also be contributing to the implementation of the Convention, but to determine this would require reviewing over 1000 projects.

Alternatively, the Statistical Report on International Assistance, Fiscal Year 2009-2010 also provides ODA data for other government departments, agencies and entities by sector in areas that contribute directly to implementation of the CBD. For IDRC these are:

	<u>Millions</u>
Low-range estimate:	
041020: Biosphere Protection	\$0.28
041030: Bio-diversity	\$0.94
041040: Site preservation	\$0.23
Sub-total Low-range estimate:	\$1.45
High-range estimate:	
041020: Biosphere Protection	\$0.28
041030: Bio-diversity	\$0.94
041040: Site preservation	\$0.23
031100 Agriculture, forestry and fishing	\$6.53 x 10% = \$0.65
041010 Environmental policy and admin mgt	\$2.19
041050 Flood prevention/control	\$0.07
041082 Environmental Research	\$0.49
Sub-total High-range estimate:	\$4.85

As a result, IDRC's contribution to ODA that contributes to the objectives of the CBD could be estimated at \$1.45 million - \$23.24 million.

<sup>9</sup> IDRC Annual Report. The year in review 2009-2010

**iv. Environment Canada (EC): \$0.7 million<sup>10</sup> (FY 2009-2010)**

EC provided \$4.04 million in ODA. This amount is divided among a number of areas including support for environmental groups in developing countries and providing wildlife, bird and fish technical support and cooperation. Contributions also include activities not related to the objectives of the CBD, such as EC's contribution to the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund. These were not counted. Additionally, only a portion of EC's annual contribution to UNEP has been included as contributing to the CBD – 18.9% based on UNEP's 2010 Programme of Work. As a result, \$0.7 million has been included as an estimated contribution from EC.

**v. Parks Canada: \$0.47 million<sup>11</sup> (FY 2009-2010)**

Parks Canada provided \$0.47 million in FY 2008-2009 in ODA. The contribution was for protected areas and heritage initiatives. Activities, such as park operations management and use of science and conservation tools are directly supportive of the implementation of the CBD, and thus, all of the \$0.47 million is included in the total ODA contribution.

**International Financial Institutions and United Nations Organizations, Funds and Programmes**

**vi. Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR): \$2.85 million - \$48.32 million (2009)<sup>12</sup>**

CGIAR contributes significantly to efforts to reduce poverty and hunger, improve human health and nutrition, and enhance ecosystem resilience through high-quality international agricultural research, partnership and leadership. As its research is on sustainable agriculture, sustainable forestry and sustainable fishery, all of their research could be considered as a contribution to implementing the objectives of the Convention, in particular, the sustainable use of biological resources objective. However, in 2009 only 5.89% was programmed specifically for its biodiversity research center.

Canada was the third largest contributor to CGIAR with an annual contribution of \$48.32 million. 5.89% of \$48.32 million = \$2.85 million. While this amount is embedded in CIDA's Official Development Assistance reports, it is not normally classified as "biodiversity funding". As a result, this amount has not been included in the section above on CIDA's ODA, but included here in the section on International Financial Institutions and United Nations Organizations.

**vii. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO): \$3.92 - \$10.53 million (FY 2009-2010)**

Canada's annual contribution to the FAO in FY 2009-2010 was \$10.53 million<sup>13</sup>. While this amount is embedded in CIDA's Official Development Assistance reports, it is not normally classified as "biodiversity funding". As a result, this amount has not been included in the section above on CIDA's ODA, but included here in the section on International Financial Institutions and United Nations Organizations. It is also important to note that a large portion of Canada's contribution to the FAO is provided by DFAIT.

---

<sup>10</sup> Report to Parliament on the Government of Canada's Official Development Assistance 2008-09

<sup>11</sup> Report to Parliament on the Government of Canada's Official Development Assistance 2008-09

<sup>12</sup> CGIAR Financial Report 2009. <http://www.cgiar.org>

<sup>13</sup> Statistical Report on International Assistance. Fiscal Year 2009-2010. Canadian International Development Agency. P. 14.

Much of the FAO's activities appear to be related to the objectives of the CBD. The FAO's 2012-2013 proposed Programme of Work details 12 key areas of work<sup>14</sup>, of which the following are directly related to meeting the objectives of the CBD:

- Sustainable intensification of crop production
- Increased sustainable livestock production
- Sustainable management and use of fisheries and aquaculture resources
- Sustainable management of forests and trees
- Sustainable management of land, water and genetic resources

These 5 areas represent approximately 37.2% of the FAO's budget. Therefore, if Canada provided \$10.53 million to the FAO in FY 2009-2010, one could estimate that at least \$3.92 million contributed to meeting the objectives of the CBD.

**viii. Global Environment Facility (GEF): \$16.63 million - \$22.05 million (2010)**

Canada's annual contribution to the GEF is \$59.6 million under GEF-5 (2010-2014). 27.9 percent of these resources is programmed directly for the biodiversity focal area, including sustainable forest management = US\$16.63 million. However, there are substantial levels of funding included in the GEF's international waters and land degradation focal areas that are biodiversity activities. This would bring the proportion of GEF-5 biodiversity-related resources up to 37%, of which Canada's share would be \$22.05 million.

While this amount is embedded in CIDA's Official Development Assistance reports, it is not normally classified as "biodiversity funding". As a result, this amount has not been included in the section above on CIDA's ODA, but included here in the section on International Financial Institutions and United Nations Organizations.

**ix. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP): \$0 - \$3.01 million (FY 2009-2010)**

In FY 2009-2010, the Government of Canada provided a total of \$176.54 million to UNDP<sup>15</sup>. It is not clear however how much of this may have contributed directly to the objectives of the CBD.

UNDP reports that its "portfolio of biodiversity projects consists of 177 initiatives under implementation, with a value of US\$ 1.879 billion. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) is the largest financier of these projects, contributing US\$ 533 million in funds administered by UNDP. Other financiers of projects include the German-funded International Climate Initiative, bilateral agencies, governments and the private sector. In addition, the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP), implemented by UNDP has established operations in over 120 countries. A number of other UNDP environment programmes also contribute towards biodiversity management, including the Poverty–Environment Initiative, the UN–REDD Programme, UNDP's GEF supported International Waters Programme and initiatives of the Nairobi based Drylands Development Centre."<sup>16</sup>

It would appear, therefore, that almost all of UNDP's biodiversity-related activities are funded through the GEF or through specific funding from bilateral donors. As Canada's contribution to the GEF has already been counted above, it would not be consistent to attempt to count any resources reported by UNDP.

---

<sup>14</sup> FAO. Medium Term Plan 2010-13 and Programme of Work and Budget 2010-11. [www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/017/K5831E.pdf](http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/017/K5831E.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> Statistical Report on International Assistance. Fiscal Year 2009-2010. Canadian International Development Agency. P. 15.

<sup>16</sup> UNDP (2010). UNDP's Work on Biodiversity Management. P. 4.

However, of the \$176.54 million noted above as Canada's contributions to UNDP in FY 2009-2010 \$73.00 million was reported as a core contribution made by CIDA to UNDP – and thus definitely additional to any funding that CIDA counts as a contribution to the GEF. From 2004-2007, UNDP disbursed US\$1.58 billion on environmental programming, of which US\$181.8 million came from regular resources<sup>17</sup>. Over this same time period US\$1.1 billion was contributed to UNDP as regular, core resources by donors. Therefore, it could be estimated that on average 16.52% of UNDP's core resources are used for environmental programming. With current focus on climate change at UNDP, one could estimate that no more than 25% of this funding would contribute directly to the CBD. As a result, an estimated 4.13% of Canada's contributions to UNDP's core funding, or \$ 3.01 million in FY 2009-2010 could be counted as biodiversity-related funding.

**x. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO): \$0.51 million – \$0.77 million (FY 2009-2010)**

In FY 2009-2010 Canada provided a total of \$6.13 million to UNESCO. However it is not clear how much of this overall contribution was allocated to biodiversity-related activities. UNESCO does state that in 2009 US\$34 million of its resources paid from assessed contributions was used to fund its "Natural Sciences" program, much of which – between 50% - 75% - is related to biodiversity and water management issues<sup>18</sup>. Canada's assessed scale of contribution to UNESCO is 2.99%. As a result, approximately \$1.02 million x 50% to 75% = \$0.51 million to \$0.77 million could be counted as contributing to the CBD.

**xi. Multilateral Development Banks:**

In FY 2009-2010 Canada provided substantial levels of funding (over \$500 million) to several multilateral development banks such as the Asian Development Bank, the Interamerican Development Bank, the African Development Bank and the World Bank, amongst others. While these entities provided substantial support for the objectives of the CBD, it was ultimately deemed not possible at this point to arrive at a credible estimate for this contribution. On one hand, it was difficult to differentiate between what these entities provided as grants and what was provided as loans. Additionally, it was challenging to identify what portion of each organization's "environment" or "natural resources" portfolios was directly related to biodiversity activities.

**(b) Domestic budgets at all levels:**

---

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.undp.org/publications/fast-facts/FF-environment.pdf>

<sup>18</sup> <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001918/191870e.pdf>

	Millions of CAN\$ annual (FY 2009-2010)		
	Low estimate	High estimate	Average estimate
<b>Domestic public budgets at all levels</b>	<b>\$ 4,189.62</b>	<b>\$ 9,421.86</b>	<b>\$ 6,805.74</b>
<b>Federal</b>	<b>\$ 2,442.81</b>	<b>\$ 2,998.51</b>	<b>\$ 2,720.66</b>
<i>Agriculture and Agri-food Canada</i>	\$ 177.90	\$ 177.90	\$ 177.90
<i>Environment Canada</i>	\$ 178.90	\$ 372.10	\$ 275.50
<i>Parks Canada</i>	\$ 716.07	\$ 716.07	\$ 716.07
<i>Natural Resources Canada</i>	\$ 10.90	\$ 280.90	\$ 145.90
<i>Fisheries and Oceans Canada</i>	\$ 1,270.10	\$ 1,270.10	\$ 1,270.10
<i>Indian and Northern Affairs</i>	\$ 55.50	\$ 148.00	\$ 101.75
<i>Canadian Museum of Nature</i>	\$ 33.44	\$ 33.44	\$ 33.44
<b>Provincial</b>	<b>\$ 1,463.42</b>	<b>\$ 2,835.14</b>	<b>\$ 2,149.28</b>
<i>British Columbia</i>	\$ 415.08	\$ 858.84	\$ 636.96
<i>Alberta</i>	\$ 182.09	\$ 231.22	\$ 206.66
<i>Saskatchewan</i>	\$ 22.08	\$ 187.30	\$ 104.69
<i>Manitoba</i>	\$ 141.48	\$ 168.43	\$ 154.96
<i>Ontario</i>	\$ 253.16	\$ 358.98	\$ 306.07
<i>Quebec</i>	\$ 179.58	\$ 718.18	\$ 448.88
<i>New Brunswick</i>	\$ 27.87	\$ 57.68	\$ 42.78
<i>Prince Edward Island</i>	\$ 10.61	\$ 10.61	\$ 10.61
<i>Nova Scotia</i>	\$ 82.75	\$ 95.18	\$ 88.97
<i>Newfoundland &amp; Labrador</i>	\$ 51.37	\$ 51.37	\$ 51.37
<i>Yukon</i>	\$ 27.50	\$ 27.50	\$ 27.50
<i>Northwest Territories</i>	\$ 54.12	\$ 54.12	\$ 54.12
<i>Nunavut</i>	\$ 15.73	\$ 15.73	\$ 15.73
<b>Local governments</b>	<b>\$ 283.39</b>	<b>\$ 3,588.21</b>	<b>\$ 1,935.80</b>

### Federal:

Data was examined from federal departments' annual performance reports. These reports identify expenditures carried out in each program area. The sections below identify annual expenditures made in program areas directly related to the objectives of the CBD. In cases where biodiversity-related funding was evident, but a clear, direct relationship to the objectives of the CBD was not evident, attempts were made to estimate a low-range and a high-range of funding.

#### i. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada \$177.9 million (2009-10)<sup>19</sup>

- Environmentally sustainable agriculture, agri-food and agri-based products: Environmental Knowledge, Technology, Information, and Measurement: \$92.9 million
- Environmentally sustainable agriculture, agri-food and agri-based products: On-farm action \$85.0 million

#### ii. Environment Canada: \$178.9 million – \$372.1 million (2009-10)<sup>20</sup>

Low-range:

- Biodiversity and Wildlife Program: \$143.5 million
- Ecosystem Initiatives Program: \$35.4 million

<sup>19</sup> Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada 2009-10 Departmental Performance Report. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/dpr-rmr/2009-2010/inst/agr/agr02-eng.asp#sect2>

<sup>20</sup> Environment Canada 2009-2010 Departmental Performance Report. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/dpr-rmr/2009-2010/inst/doe/doetb-eng.asp>

High-range

- Environmental Science and Monitoring Program \$113.9 million
- Water Program: \$87.4 million

**iii. Parks Canada \$716.07 million (2009-10)<sup>21</sup>**

- The entire annual budget for Parks Canada was included given that 100% of its activities have the objective of managing Canada's protected areas.
- This figure does not take into revenue generated by Parks Canada. This will be included under "Private sector" contributions.

**iv. Natural Resources Canada \$10.9 million - \$280.9 million (2009-10)<sup>22</sup>**

Low-range:

- Natural Resource-based Communities: \$10.9 million

High –range:

- Ecosystem Risk Management: \$156.5 million
- Natural Resource and Landmass Knowledge and Systems: \$113.5 million

**v. Fisheries and Oceans Canada \$1,270.1 million (2009-10)<sup>23</sup>**

- Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture Management: \$474.5 million
- Fisheries and Aquaculture Management: \$339.6 million
- Science for Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture: \$134.9 million
- Healthy and Productive Aquatic Ecosystems \$160.6 million
- Oceans Management: \$15.8 million
- Habitat Management: \$62.0 million
- Species at Risk Management: \$21.8 million
- Science for Healthy and Productive Aquatic Ecosystems: \$60.9 million

**vi. Indian and Northern Affairs \$55.5 million - \$148.0 million (2009-2010)<sup>24</sup>**

Low-range:

- Northern Land and Resources: \$55.5 million (\$222 million x 25%; 3 of the 4 sub-programs associated with this program are related to oil, gas and mineral development, and contaminated sites. One program is related to protected lands and resources)

High-range:

- Responsible Federal Stewardship: \$91.5 million (\$126.9 million - \$35.4 million associated with contaminated sites)
- Canadian Polar Commission: \$1.0 million

---

<sup>21</sup> Parks Canada 2009-2010 Departmental Performance Report. <http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/pc/rpts/rmr-dpr/03312010.aspx>

<sup>22</sup> Natural Resources Canada 2009-2010 Departmental Performance Report. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/dpr-rmr/2009-2010/inst/rsn/rsn02-eng.asp#secIII2>

<sup>23</sup> Fisheries and Oceans Canada 2009-2010 Departmental Performance Report. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/dpr-rmr/2009-2010/index-eng.asp?acr=1674>

<sup>24</sup> 2009-2010 Departmental Performance Report. Indian Affairs and Northern Development. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/dpr-rmr/2009-2010/inst/ian/iantb-eng.asp>

**vii. Canadian Museum of Nature \$33.4 million (2009-10)<sup>25</sup>**

- The Museum received \$33.44 million in parliamentary appropriations in 2009-2010.

**Canadian Provinces and Territories:**

Data was examined from relevant provincial ministries' annual reports. These reports identify expenditures carried out in each program area. The sections below identify annual expenditures made in program areas directly related to the objectives of the CBD. In cases where biodiversity-related funding was evident, but a clear, direct relationship to the objectives of the CBD was not evident, attempts were made to estimate a low-range and a high-range of funding.

Annual expenditures by provinces and territories to enhance and protect to biodiversity were determined through an analysis of departmental annual reports and Finance Department reports for FY 2009-2010 (2008-2009 for P.E.I.). In many cases, annual reports were available for those ministries and departments responsible for biodiversity-related activities. When these reports were not available, either year-end lists of expenditures prepared by finance departments, or backward-looking budget estimates for 2011-2012 were used to extract biodiversity-related expenses.

The organizational structures of each jurisdiction were initially reviewed to identify the most relevant biodiversity related Ministries or Departments. The range of Ministries or Departments included: energy, mines, natural resources, environment, sustainable development, agriculture, tourism, parks, conservation, forestry, range management, fisheries and aquaculture, with significant variation among jurisdictions. Departments of agriculture proved most challenging in determining expenditures on biodiversity related activities. Departments that included several resources (energy, mines, tourism and aquaculture, etc.) were also sometimes difficult to determine expenditures on biological resources, likely leading to underestimating expenditures.

Additional time would be required to further refine estimated contributions of provinces and territories, and would in some cases, require contacting various government agencies to obtain more detailed information than is available online. Forest fire control was included when this information was available. Fire control has both a positive and negative influence on forest biodiversity, but is particularly important in achieving the sustainable use of forest resources. Fire control is an element of the CBD programme of work on forest biodiversity.

**viii. British Columbia: \$415.1 million - \$858.8 million (FY 2009-2010)**

- Ministry of Environment - biodiversity expenditures estimated at \$42,743,000 (low-range) - \$104,371,000 (high-range) of the total budget of \$189,491,000<sup>26</sup>
- Ministry of Forest and Range – biodiversity expenditures estimated at \$ 372,337,000 (low-range) - \$ 754,471,000 (high-range)<sup>27</sup> (NOTE: The high-range estimate includes direct expenditures incurred for fighting forest fires).

**ix. Alberta: \$182.09 million - \$231.22 million (FY 2009-2010)**

---

<sup>25</sup> Canadian Museum of Nature. 2010 Annual Report. <http://nature.ca/en/about-us/museum-corporation/annual-reports-corporate-publications>

<sup>26</sup> Ministry of Environment 2009/10 Annual Service Plan Report. p 36. British Columbia

<sup>27</sup> Ministry of Forest and Range (2009/10 Annual Service Plan Report, p. 25

- Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development - Policy and Environment Program (50%) - biodiversity expenditure estimated at \$21,884,500<sup>28</sup>
- Ministry of Environment – biodiversity expenditures estimated at \$35,960,000 (low-range) - \$85,091,000 (high-range)<sup>29</sup>
- Ministry of Sustainable Resource Development - biodiversity expenditure estimated at \$44,443,100 of the total budget of \$486,363,000<sup>30</sup>
- Ministry of Tourism, Parks and Recreation - biodiversity expenditure estimated at \$79,800,000 of the total budget of \$222,414,000<sup>31</sup>

**x. Saskatchewan: \$22.08 million - \$187.3 million (FY 2009-2010)**

- Ministry of Environment:
  - Low-range estimate: Forest Services, Fish, Wildlife and Biodiversity - \$25,035
  - High-range estimate: All of above + Forest Services, Fire Management and Forest Protection, Environmental Protection, Compliance & Field Services, Corporate Policy and Planning = \$165,227,956<sup>32</sup>
- Ministry of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sports - biodiversity expenditure estimated at \$22,056,000.<sup>33</sup>

**xi. Manitoba: \$141.48 million - \$168.43 million (FY 2009-2010)**

- Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives - biodiversity expenditure (Agri-environment, Land-use) estimated at \$5,383,000<sup>34</sup>
- Ministry of Water Stewardship:
  - High-range estimate for biodiversity expenditure estimated at \$26,943,209.<sup>35</sup>
- Manitoba Conservation - \$136,099,000<sup>36</sup>

**xii. Ontario: \$ 253.16 million - \$ 358.98 million (FY 2009-2010):**

- Ministry of Natural Resources:
  - Low-range estimate: Natural Resource Management Program (Fish & Wildlife, Land & Water, Ontario Parks (net expenses, not including Parks revenues), Field Services Support) = \$196,229,773
  - High-range estimate: All of the above + Public Safety and Emergencies Program (Forest Fire service) = \$302,051,124.<sup>37</sup>
- Ministry of Environment: Water Program – Source Protection = \$47,218,314.<sup>38</sup>
- Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs<sup>39</sup>: \$9,710,835 (Agricultural Drainage Infrastructure Program \$7,270,847; Agri-Environmental Standards Research \$545,000; Environment Partnerships \$1,894,988).

<sup>28</sup> Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development - Policy and Environment. Annual Report 2009/2010, p. 59 Alberta

<sup>29</sup> Ministry of Environment. Annual Report 2009-2010. p. 77. Alberta

<sup>30</sup> Ministry of Sustainable Resource Development. Annual Report 2009-2010. p. 38 Alberta

<sup>31</sup> Ministry of Tourism, Parks and Recreation. Annual Report 2009-2010 p. 30 Alberta

<sup>32</sup> Ministry of Environment Annual Report 09-10 pp. 28-29 Saskatchewan

<sup>33</sup> Ministry of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sports. Annual Report 09-10 pp. 31-32. Saskatchewan

<sup>34</sup> Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives. Annual Report 2009-2010 pp. 136 Manitoba

<sup>35</sup> Ministry of Water Stewardship. Annual Report 2009-2010 pp. 78-79 Manitoba

<sup>36</sup> Ministry of Conservation. Annual Report 2009-2010 pp. 166-169 Manitoba

<sup>37</sup> Ontario Ministry of Finance. Public Accounts of Ontario 2009-2010. p. 2-307.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid. p. 2-165.

**xiii. Quebec: \$179.58 million - \$718.18 million (FY 2009-2010)**

- Ministry of Sustainable Development, Environment and Parks: \$ 98,380,000 (Environmental Policies, Park Management, Environmental Evaluations, Regional Analysis and Expertise)<sup>40</sup>.
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Wildlife:
  - Low-range estimate: \$81.2 million from Wildlife Program.
  - High-range estimate: Above + \$538.6 million from Forest Program = \$619.8 million<sup>41</sup>.

**xiv. New Brunswick: \$27.87 million - \$ 57.68 million (FY 2009-2010)**

- Department of Tourism and Parks:
  - Low-range estimate: \$0 – NOTE: Annual Report does not differentiate between expenses related to the development of tourism products and the operations of provincial parks.
  - High-range estimate: Tourism Development and Operations (provincial parks) = \$8,874,900.<sup>42</sup>
- Department of Environment: \$12,527,100<sup>43</sup>
- Department of Natural Resources:
  - Low-range estimate: \$11,940,700 (Fish & Wildlife Management; Land Management & Natural Areas. NOTE: does not include revenues)
  - High-range estimate: \$32,873,600 (above + Forest Management)<sup>44</sup>
- Department of Agriculture, Aquaculture and Fisheries: \$3,405,000<sup>45</sup> (Land & Environment; Sustainable Aquaculture)

**xv. Nova Scotia: \$82.75 million - \$95.18 million (FY 2009-2010)**

- Department of Environment:
  - Low-range estimate: \$4,635,200 (Environment Science & Program Management x 20% - as this Division also conducts work on air quality, water, pollution prevention).
  - High-range estimate: \$ 17,059,200 (Above + Environmental Monitoring & Compliance; Environment and Sustainable Prosperity Partnerships)<sup>46</sup>
- Department of Natural Resources: \$78,119,000<sup>47</sup> (Renewable Resources + Regional Services).

**xvi. Prince Edward Island: \$10.61 million (FY 2008-2009)**

- Department of Tourism and Culture: \$3,117,713 (Provincial Parks operations and administration).<sup>48</sup>
- Department of Environment, Energy and Forestry:
  - Forests, Fish & Wildlife: \$6,699,328
  - Water Management (x25%): \$794,015.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid. p. 2-7.

<sup>40</sup> Ministère du Développement durable, de l'environnement et des parcs, Québec. Rapport annuel de gestion 2009-2010, p.44.

<sup>41</sup> Ministry of Natural Resources and Wildlife. Annual Report 2009 - 2010 Quebec

<sup>42</sup> Department of Tourism and Parks. Annual Report. 2009-2010 Tourism and Parks. p.5 New Brunswick.

<sup>43</sup> Department of Environment. Annual Report. 2009-2010 Environment and Natural Resources. p.51 New Brunswick

<sup>44</sup> Department of Natural Resources. Annual Report. 2009-2010 p. 14. New Brunswick.

<sup>45</sup> Ministry of Finance 2009-2010 Main Estimates for Agriculture, Aquaculture and Fisheries p.24 New Brunswick

<sup>46</sup> Department of the Environment. Accountability Report 2009-2010. Nova Scotia

<sup>47</sup> Department of Natural Resources. Accountability Report 2009-2010 p. 18 Nova Scotia

<sup>48</sup> Department of Tourism and Culture – Provincial Parks. Annual Report 2008-2009 p. 33. Prince Edward Island

<sup>49</sup> Department of Environment, Energy and Forestry. Annual Report 2008-2009. Prince Edward Island

**xvii. Newfoundland and Labrador: \$51.37 million (FY 2009-2010):**

- Department of Environment and Conservation:
  - Environmental Management and Control (Water Resources Management): \$4,032,636
  - Parks and Natural Areas: \$7,646,372
  - Wildlife: \$9,136,480.<sup>50</sup>
- Department of Natural Resources:
  - Forest Management – Operations: \$12,915,012
  - Forest Management - Administration and Program Planning: \$8,261,307
  - Forest Management – Fire suppression and communications: \$3,999,025
  - Forest Management – Insect control: \$3,475,838
  - Agrifoods Development - Land Resource Stewardship: \$1,905,381.<sup>51</sup>

**xviii. Nunavut: \$15.73 million (FY 2009-2010)**

- Department of Environment: \$20,972,000 x 75% = \$15,729,000 (3 of the 4 main Programs of the Department of the Environment are directly related to the CBD's objectives).<sup>52</sup>

**xix. Northwest Territories: \$54.12 million (FY 2009-2010)**

- Department of Environment and Natural Resources:
  - Forest Management: \$25,044,000
  - Wildlife: \$14,038,000
  - Land and Water: \$2,186,000.<sup>53</sup>
- Department of Industry, Tourism and Investment:
  - Tourism and Parks: \$12,850,000.<sup>54</sup>

**xx. Yukon: \$27.50 million (FY 2009-2010)**

- Department of Energy, Mines and Resources:
  - Sustainable Resources: \$8,754,000.<sup>55</sup>
- Department of Environment:
  - Environmental Sustainability: \$18,743,000.<sup>56</sup>

**xxi. Local Governments: \$283.39 - \$3,588.21 million (2008)**

Attempting to review specific expenditure data for every municipality in Canada would not be feasible or practical for this study. As a result, it was decided to estimate the financial contributions of local governments to the objectives of the CBD using local government expenditure data available from Statistics Canada<sup>57</sup>.

---

<sup>50</sup> Department of Environment and Conservation. Annual Report 2009-2010 pp. 28-29 Newfoundland and Labrador

<sup>51</sup> Department of Natural Resources. Annual Report 2009-2010 pp. 95-98. Newfoundland and Labrador

<sup>52</sup> Department of Finance of Nunavut. Revised. 2010-2011. Main Estimates. pp. 11 – 17. Nunavut

<sup>53</sup> Department of Finance, Northwest Territories. 2011-2012 Main Estimates, Department Summary. p.13-1

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> Department of Finance, Government of Yukon. 2011-2012 Operation, Maintenance and Capital Estimates p.14 and 17 Yukon

<sup>56</sup> Department of Finance, Government of Yukon, 2011-2012 Operation, Maintenance and Capital Estimates p.14 and 17 Yukon

<sup>57</sup> Statistics Canada. Table 385-0003 - Local government revenue and expenditures for fiscal year ending closest to December 31, annual (dollars), CANSIM (database).

This information does not however enable specific determination of actual expenditures on activities that contribute to the implementation of the CBD. Firstly, it classifies some local government expenditures as “Environment” and then sub-classifies these into “Water purification and supply”, “Sewage collection and disposal”, “Garbage, waste collection and disposal”, and “Other environmental services”. While all of these elements may be important for environmental protection, they probably do not all make direct contributions to conserve biodiversity or sustainably use biological resources. Expenditures labelled as “Other environmental services” may include biodiversity-related activities.

On one hand, it could be argued that an estimate of at least 25% of all local government “Environment” expenditures contribute to the objectives of the CBD. On the other hand, given that activities related to water, sewage and waste are counted separately under their own sub-category in this data, it would be conservative to estimate that at least 50% of the sub-category “Other environmental services” expenditures are likely to contribute to the objectives of the CBD.

Secondly, Statistics Canada classifies some local government expenditures as “Resource conservation and industrial development”. Noting that some of these expenditures relate to “industrial development” rather than “resource conservation”, for our high-range estimate we assume that 25% of this category contributes to the objectives of the CBD.

As a result, according to Statistics Canada, in 2008 Canadian local governments expended the following biodiversity related expenditures<sup>58</sup>:

- Low-range estimate:
  - Other environmental services: \$261,533,000 x 50% = \$130.77 million
  - Resource conservation and industrial development: \$1,526,196,000 x 10% = \$152.62 million.
- High-range estimate:
  - “Environment” expenditures: \$12,826,647,000 x 25% = \$ 3,206.66 million
  - Resource conservation and industrial development: \$1,526,196,000 x 25% = \$381.55 million.

**(c) Private sector:**

	Millions of CAN\$ annual (FY 2009-2010)		
	Low estimate	High estimate	Average estimate
<b>Private sector</b>	<b>\$ 686.80</b>	<b>\$ 824.16</b>	<b>\$ 755.48</b>
<i>Business expenditures</i>	\$ 140.80	\$ 278.16	\$ 209.48
<i>User fees (parks fees, licenses)</i>	\$ 546.00	\$ 546.00	\$ 546.00

**i. Business expenditures:**

According to the 2008 Statistics Canada publication *Environmental Protection Expenditures in the Business Sector*, businesses operating in Canada spent \$9.1 billion in 2008 on environmental protection.<sup>59</sup> This amount is based on both capital and operating expenditures in the following areas:

- Waste management and sewerage services;
- Pollution prevention processes;
- Pollution abatement and control - end-of-pipe;
- Reclamation and decommissioning;

<sup>58</sup> Ibid

<sup>59</sup> Statistics Canada. Environmental Protection Expenditures in the Business Sector. 2008

- Environmental monitoring;
- Wildlife and habitat protection; and
- Environmental assessments and audits.

Activities in all of the above areas would make some contribution to the implementation of the CBD, in particular, the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of biological resources objectives. However, it would be difficult to justify including expenditures from the first four categories as directly related to the objectives of the CBD.

“Environmental monitoring” refers to expenditures for purchase of equipment, supplies, labour and services required to monitor pollutant emissions that would affect air, water or soil quality. As a result, at least a portion of these expenditures could be included as contributing to the objectives of the CBD. The same could be said of “Environmental assessments and audits”, defined as expenditures made to review the current compliance of operations with regulations and to evaluate the environmental impact of proposed projects. “Wildlife and habitat protection” is clearly related to the objectives of the CBD and could be included in its full amount.

- Low-range estimate: \$140.8 million (2008)
  - Wildlife and habitat protection: \$140.8 million
- High-range estimate: \$278.16 million (2008)
  - Wildlife and habitat protection: \$140.8 million
  - Environmental monitoring: \$329.1 million x 25% = \$82.28 million
  - Environmental assessments and audits: \$220.3 million x 25% = \$55.08 million

## ii. User fees:

An additional area of private sector expenditures relates to user fees, including direct fees, licenses and permits. In the case of protected areas, for example, users pay fees to use recreational facilities in parks and campsites. Resource users, such as fishers and loggers, also pay for licenses and permits, although in some cases it would be very difficult to determine if the purpose of these license fees are related to the objectives of the CBD. In many cases, however, governments have specific accounts used to collect and disburse these funds.

The following highlights the main available data for revenues from user fees (Total: \$546,009,785):

- National protected areas revenue (2010)<sup>60</sup>: \$80,752,000
  - Entrance fees: \$56,631,000
  - Recreational fees: \$24,121,000
- Provincial protected areas revenue: \$226,796,285
  - British Columbia: \$16,000,000 (FY 2009-2010)<sup>61</sup>
  - Alberta: \$8,843,000 (FY 2009-2010)<sup>62</sup>
  - Saskatchewan: \$13,880,000 (FY 2009-2010)<sup>63</sup>
  - Manitoba: \$4,720,000 (FY 2010 – 2011 estimate)<sup>64</sup>
  - Ontario: \$65,313,000 (FY 2009-2010)<sup>65</sup>

<sup>60</sup> Parks Canada 2009-2010 Departmental Performance Report. <http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/pc/rpts/rmr-dpr/03312010.aspx>

<sup>61</sup> BC Parks Annual Report 2009-2010. [www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/research/year\\_end.../year\\_end\\_rep\\_2010.pdf](http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/research/year_end.../year_end_rep_2010.pdf)

<sup>62</sup> Alberta Tourism, Parks and Recreation Business Plan 2011-2014. [www.finance.alberta.ca/publications/budget/.../tourism-parks-recreation.pdf](http://www.finance.alberta.ca/publications/budget/.../tourism-parks-recreation.pdf)

<sup>63</sup> Ministry of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sports. Annual Report 09-10. Saskatchewan

<sup>64</sup> 2011 Manitoba Estimates of Expenditure and Revenue. [www.gov.mb.ca/finance/budget11/papers/r\\_and\\_e.pdf](http://www.gov.mb.ca/finance/budget11/papers/r_and_e.pdf)

<sup>65</sup> Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. Results-based plan 2010-2011.

- Quebec: \$ 110,963,000 (FY 2009-2010)<sup>66</sup>
- New Brunswick: \$6,259,500 (FY 2009-2010)<sup>67</sup>
- Prince Edward Island: \$817,785 (2009)<sup>68</sup>
- Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nunavut, Northwest Territories, Yukon: Not available.
- Other user fees: \$ 238,461,500
  - While most Canadian provinces and territories collect fees for other biodiversity-related user fees, such as wildlife-related licenses and permits, it was only possible to collect specific data in the following cases
    - British Columbia Conservation Trust Fund: \$6 million (2011).<sup>69</sup>
    - Alberta Recreational Licensing Management System: \$111,295,000 (FY 2009-2010).<sup>70</sup>
    - Saskatchewan fishing and hunting licenses: \$14,643,000 (FY 2009-2010).<sup>71</sup>
    - Manitoba: license sales and wildlife sundry: \$ 4,156,000 (FY 2009-2010).<sup>72</sup>
    - Ontario Fish & Wildlife Special Purpose Account<sup>73</sup>: \$65,480,000 (FY 2009-2010).<sup>74</sup>
    - Quebec: wildlife licenses: \$32,800,000 (FY 2009-2010).<sup>75</sup>
    - New Brunswick Wildlife Trust Fund + Trail Management Trust Fund: \$3,087,500 (FY 2009-2010).<sup>76</sup>
    - Nova Scotia: Fishing and Gaming licenses: \$1,000,000 (estimate FY 2010-2011).<sup>77</sup>

There are numerous other innovative areas of private sector financing for biodiversity. These include biodiversity offsets, land conservation tax incentives, schemes for payment for ecosystem services (PES), and the sale of green products. However, experience (and data) related to these in Canada is limited at present. Therefore, no additional effort was made in this study to estimate financial flows from these areas.

It is worth noting that most of the estimates above largely do not include investments and expenditures made by the private sector related to many of the sustainable uses of biodiversity resources. For example, a case could be made to include private sector expenditures related to sustainable agriculture, forestry and fishing, just to name a few sectors. Unfortunately, at this point dependable, disaggregated national data for these sectors is not available. Attempting to estimate, for example, the % of total agriculture spending related to “sustainable use” of biological resources would not be prudent. But it would be important to note here that these three primary sectors of the Canadian economy represent over \$22.6 billion in annual economic activity.<sup>78</sup> If even 10% of this activity is

---

<sup>66</sup> Sépaq • Rapport annuel 2008- 2009. Québec.

<sup>67</sup> Department of Tourism and Parks. Annual Report. 2009-2010 Tourism and Parks. New Brunswick.

<sup>68</sup> Department of Tourism and Culture – Provincial Parks. Annual Report 2008-2009. Prince Edward Island

<sup>69</sup> Habitat Conservation Trust Fund. Press Release April 15, 2011. “Foundation gives back \$6 million to BC wildlife”.

<sup>70</sup> Ministry of Sustainable Resource Development. Annual Report 2009-2010. Alberta. The Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management of Alberta outsourced the sale of recreational hunting and fishing licences through the Recreational Licencing Management (RELM) system to IBM. Under the agreement, IBM has full responsibility for the service and it is responsible for all costs associated with it. IBM receives a transaction fee for each licence sold with the balance of the revenue being forwarded to the Ministry or to a Delegated Authorized Organization. The Ministry reports revenue in Premiums, Fees and Licences on the Consolidated Statements of Operations net of IBM transaction fees of \$6.3 million.

<sup>71</sup> Ministry of Environment Annual Report 09-10. Saskatchewan.

<sup>72</sup> Ministry of Conservation. Annual Report 2009-2010. Manitoba.

<sup>73</sup> This Fund was created to ensure that revenues generated from the sale of fish and wildlife licenses is re-channeled for specific sustainable fish and wildlife management initiatives.

<sup>74</sup> Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. Results-based plan 2010-2011.

<sup>75</sup> Ministry of Natural Resources and Wildlife. Annual Report 2009 - 2010 Quebec.

<sup>76</sup> Department of Natural Resources. Annual Report. 2009-2010. New Brunswick.

<sup>77</sup> Nova Scotia Department of Finance. Estimates and Supplementary Detail for the fiscal year 2011–2012

<sup>78</sup> Statistics Canada. Table 379-00231,2 - Gross domestic product (GDP) at basic price in current dollars, System of National Accounts (SNA) benchmark values, by North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), annual (data in millions)

directly related to the sustainable use of biological resources, this would more than triple the estimated biodiversity expenditures estimated above for the private sectors.

In regards to Canadian private sector expenditures for biodiversity made outside of Canada, this study did not find a reliable or practical source of information yet to estimate this figure.

**(d) Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia:**

	Millions of CAN\$ annual (FY 2009-2010)		
	Low estimate	High estimate	Average estimate
<b>Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia</b>	<b>\$ 508.46</b>	<b>\$ 614.63</b>	<b>\$ 561.55</b>
<i>Non-governmental organizations, foundations</i>	\$ 446.01	\$ 446.01	\$ 446.01
<i>Academia</i>	\$ 62.45	\$ 168.62	\$ 115.54

**i. Non-governmental organizations, foundations:**

There are several hundred, if not thousands of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and foundations in Canada dedicated to activities related to the objectives of the CBD. However, there is no one comprehensive source of data on their nature or their revenues and expenditures. As a result, information had to be gathered on a case-by-case basis, mainly by reviewing each NGO's financial statements and/or annual reports. This obviously could not be completed for each and every organization, but the following list provides the main, largest biodiversity-related NGOs in Canada.

<b>National NGOs</b>	
The Nature Conservancy of Canada	\$182,736,812 <sup>79</sup>
Ducks Unlimited Canada	\$ 75,842,000 <sup>80</sup>
Canadian Wildlife Federation	\$11,017,000 <sup>81</sup>
World Wildlife Fund Canada	\$8,713,194 <sup>82</sup>
David Suzuki Foundation	\$6,655,661 <sup>83</sup> (\$7,441,125 - \$785,464 spent on climate change)
EcoTrust	\$3,068,507 <sup>84</sup>
Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society	\$3,206,107 <sup>85</sup>
Nature Canada	\$2,483,799 <sup>86</sup>
Wildlife Habitat Canada	\$2,089,388 <sup>87</sup>
Wildlife Preservation Canada	\$635,596 <sup>88</sup>
Forest Stewardship Council Canada	\$334,793 <sup>89</sup>
<b>British Columbia</b>	
Habitat Conservation Trust Foundation	\$6,015,311 <sup>90</sup>
Pacific Salmon Foundation	\$8,350,353 (\$9,949,792 – \$1,599,409 public

<sup>79</sup> The Nature Conservancy of Canada Financial Statements, ending June 30 2010

<sup>80</sup> Ducks Unlimited Canada Annual Report 2010

<sup>81</sup> Canadian Wildlife Federation Financial Statements, ending February 28, 2010

<sup>82</sup> World Wildlife Fund Canada Combined Financial Statements, ending June 30, 2010

<sup>83</sup> David Suzuki Foundation Statement of Revenue and Expenses, ending August 31, 2010

<sup>84</sup> EcoTrust Canada 2009 Annual Report

<sup>85</sup> Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society Financial Statements, ending March 31, 2010

<sup>86</sup> Nature Canada Annual Report 2009-10, ending March 31, 2010

<sup>87</sup> Wildlife Habitat Canada Financial Statement ending March 31, 2010

<sup>88</sup> Wildlife Preservation Canada Annual Report 2009-10, ending December 31 2009

<sup>89</sup> Forest Stewardship Council Canada Annual Report 2009-2010

<sup>90</sup> Habitat Conservation Trust Foundation Financial Statements, ending March 31, 2010

	funds) <sup>91</sup>
The Land Conservancy of British Columbia	\$5,135,782 <sup>92</sup>
<b>Alberta</b>	
Alberta Conservation Association	\$12,527,367 <sup>93</sup>
<b>Saskatchewan</b>	
Wascana Centre Authority	\$2,088,840 <sup>94</sup>
<b>Ontario</b>	
Nature Ontario	\$2,492,094 <sup>95</sup>
<b>Conservation Authorities</b>	<b>Expenditures less public funding<sup>96</sup></b>
Ausable Bayfield	\$4,766,175 <sup>97</sup>
Central Lake Ontario	\$2,547,348 <sup>98</sup> (\$5,660,774 * 0.45)
Cataraqui	\$1,070,704 <sup>99</sup>
Essex Region	\$4,455,000 <sup>100</sup> (\$8,100,000 * 0.55)
Grey Sauble	\$1,251,934 <sup>101</sup> (\$2,298,259 - \$1,046,325)
Lower Trent	\$292,526 <sup>102</sup> (\$3,656,577 * 0.08)
Saugeen Valley	\$1,634,865 <sup>103</sup> (\$3,336,461 * 0.49)
St. Clair	\$3,319,302 <sup>104</sup> (\$5,029,246 * 0.66)
Credit Valley	\$1,739,152 <sup>105</sup>
Ganaraksa Region	\$1,478,462 <sup>106</sup> (\$2,789,551 * 0.53)
Halton	\$11,754,049 <sup>107</sup> (\$20,265,602 * 0.58)
Kettle Creek	\$1,110,564 <sup>108</sup> (\$1,735,257 * 0.64)
Long Point Region	\$2,267,970 <sup>109</sup> (\$3,385,031 * 0.67)
Niagara Peninsula	\$2,050,012 <sup>110</sup> (\$11,027,263 * 0.19)
Nottawasaga Valley	\$752,336 <sup>111</sup> (\$2,786,433 * 0.27)
Toronto and Region	\$39,854,894 <sup>112</sup> (\$ 92,685,800.00 * 0.43)
Grand River	\$15,792,000 <sup>113</sup> (\$33,600,000 * 0.47)
Lake Simcoe Region	\$2,294,169 <sup>114</sup> (\$15,294,466 * 0.15)

<sup>91</sup> Pacific Salmon Foundation 2009 Annual Report

<sup>92</sup> The Land Conservancy of British Columbia Consolidated Financial Statements, ending April 30, 2010

<sup>93</sup> Alberta Conservation Association Annual Report 2009/2010, p. 61 Alberta

<sup>94</sup> Wascana Centre Authority Financial Statements, ending March 31, 2010

<sup>95</sup> Nature Ontario Annual Report 2009-10

<sup>96</sup> The total expenditures of Conservation Authorities were multiplied by the % of their funds estimated to not originate from public sector sources according to each entity's annual report. This was done to avoid double-counting with data reported under "Domestic public sector".

<sup>97</sup> Ausable Bayfield conservation authority annual report 2010

<sup>98</sup> Central lake Ontario Conservation Authority Year in Review 2009

<sup>99</sup> Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority Financial Statements

<sup>100</sup> Essex Region Conservation Authorities Annual Report 2010

<sup>101</sup> Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Financial Statements, ended December 31, 2008

<sup>102</sup> Lower Trent Conservation Authority Annual Report 2010

<sup>103</sup> Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority Annual Report 2010

<sup>104</sup> St Clair Conservation Authority Annual Report 2010

<sup>105</sup> Credit Valley Conservation Authority Annual Report 2006

<sup>106</sup> Ganaraksa Region Conservation Authority Annual Report 2010

<sup>107</sup> Conservation Halton Public Accountability Report 2010

<sup>108</sup> Kettle Creek Conservation Authority Annual Report 2009

<sup>109</sup> Long Point Region Conservation Authority Annual Report 2010

<sup>110</sup> Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority Annual Report 2008

<sup>111</sup> Nottawasaga Valley conservation Authority Annual Report 2005

<sup>112</sup> Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Annual Report 2009

<sup>113</sup> Grand River Conservation Authority Budget Overview

<sup>114</sup> Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority Annual Report 2010

Lower Thames Valley	\$550,632 <sup>115</sup> (\$2,039,379 * 0.27)
Mattagami Region	\$191,000 <sup>116</sup>
Nickel District	\$1,049,562 <sup>117</sup>
Rideau Valley	\$2,152,860 <sup>118</sup>
South Nation	\$2,829,304 <sup>119</sup>
Upper Thames River	\$6,215,599 <sup>120</sup> (\$12,949,166 * 0.48)
<i>Sub-Total Ontario Conservation Authorities</i>	<i>\$111,420,419</i>
<b>Québec</b>	
Nature Québec (Citoyens pour la nature)	\$818,807 <sup>121</sup>
<b>Nova Scotia</b>	
Ecology Action Centre	\$374,276 <sup>122</sup>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$446,006,106</b>

**ii. Academia:**

Canada's universities and colleges also provide valuable resources that support the objectives of the CBD, both through research and through undergraduate and graduate education. Unfortunately, in regards to research limited data exists on amounts of expenditures specific to biodiversity and related sectors. As a result, no data has been included in this study for this area.

In regards to expenditures on biodiversity-related undergraduate and graduate education, Statistics Canada provides data for enrolment numbers in Canadian universities disaggregated by instructional programs. Two categories were identified that directly relate to the objectives of the CBD: "Agriculture, natural resources and conservation" and "Physical and life sciences and technologies". The number of students enrolled in each category was multiplied by the average tuition paid by Canadian students<sup>123</sup>. Of note, this tuition does not include public funds provided by governments to support these programs, but come directly from private contributions of students and their families.

The category of "Physical and life sciences and technologies" would seem to encompass much more than biodiversity-related fields. As a result, only 25% of its value has been included and only in the high-end estimate.

The category of "Agriculture, natural resources and conservation" would seem to mostly include biodiversity-related fields, with the exception of training in conventional agriculture. As a result, 90% of its value has been included in the low-end estimate.

*Agriculture, natural resources and conservation (2008/2009)*

<b>Program level</b>	<b>Number of students enrolled</b>	<b>Average tuition</b>	<b>Total expenditures</b>
----------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------

<sup>115</sup> Lower Thames Valley Conservation Authority Annual Report 2010

<sup>116</sup> Mattagami Region Conservation Authority Annual Report 2010

<sup>117</sup> Nickel District Conservation Authority Financial Statements, ending December 31, 2010

<sup>118</sup> Rideau Valley Conservation Authority Annual Report 2009

<sup>119</sup> South Nation Conservation Authority Annual Report 2008

<sup>120</sup> Upper Thames River Conservation Authority Approved Budget 2011

<sup>121</sup> Nature Québec Annual Report 2009-10, ending August 31, 2010

<sup>122</sup> Ecology Action Centre Annual Report 2009-10

<sup>123</sup> Statscan, Undergraduate tuition fees for full-time Canadian students, by discipline, by province

Undergraduate	11,586 <sup>124</sup>	\$4,366 <sup>125</sup>	\$50,584,476
Graduate	4,740 <sup>126</sup>	\$3,967 <sup>127</sup>	\$18,803,580
Low-end estimate			\$69,388,056 x 90% = \$62,449,250

*Physical and life sciences and technologies (2008/2009)*

Program level	Number of students enrolled	Average tuition	Total expenditures
Undergraduate	73,842 <sup>128</sup>	\$4,682 <sup>129</sup>	\$345,728,244
Graduate	18,582 <sup>130</sup>	\$4,249 <sup>131</sup>	\$78,954,918
Sub-total			\$424,683,162 x 25% = \$106,170,791
High-end estimate			\$168,620,041

**(e) International financial institutions:**

All relevant Canadian contributions to international financial institutions have been included under (a) Official Development Assistance.

**(f) United Nations organizations, funds and programmes:**

All relevant Canadian contributions to United Nations organizations, funds and programmes have been included under (a) Official Development Assistance.

**(g) Non-ODA public funding:**

N/A

**(h) South-South cooperation initiatives:**

N/A

**(i) Technical cooperation.**

All relevant Canadian contributions to technical cooperation have either been included under (a) Official Development Assistance or (b) Domestic Budgets.

**Consolidated annual Canadian financial flows for achieving  
the CBD's three objectives**

<sup>124</sup> Statscan (477-0013), University enrolments by program level and instructional program

<sup>125</sup> Statscan, Undergraduate tuition fees for full-time Canadian students, by discipline, by province

<sup>126</sup> Statscan (477-0013), University enrolments by program level and instructional program

<sup>127</sup> Statscan, Average graduate tuition fees for Canadian full-time students by faculty

<sup>128</sup> Statscan (477-0013), University enrolments by program level and instructional program

<sup>129</sup> Statscan, Undergraduate tuition fees for full-time Canadian students, by discipline, by province

<sup>130</sup> Statscan (477-0013), University enrolments by program level and instructional program

<sup>131</sup> Statscan, Average graduate tuition fees for Canadian full-time students by faculty

	Millions of CAN\$ annual (FY 2009-2010)		
	Low estimate	High estimate	Average estimate
<b>Official Development Assistance (ODA)</b>	<b>\$ 38.25</b>	<b>\$ 233.29</b>	<b>\$ 135.77</b>
<b>Government of Canada</b>	<b>\$ 14.34</b>	<b>\$ 148.61</b>	<b>\$ 81.48</b>
<i>CIDA</i>	\$ 10.80	\$ 103.46	\$ 57.13
<i>Finance Canada</i>	\$ 0.92	\$ 20.74	\$ 10.83
<i>IDRC</i>	\$ 1.45	\$ 23.24	\$ 12.35
<i>Environment Canada</i>	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.70
<i>Parks Canada</i>	\$ 0.47	\$ 0.47	\$ 0.47
<b>International financial institutions and United Nations</b>	<b>\$ 23.91</b>	<b>\$ 84.68</b>	<b>\$ 54.30</b>
<i>Global Environment Facility</i>	\$ 16.63	\$ 22.05	\$ 19.34
<i>CGIAR</i>	\$ 2.85	\$ 48.32	\$ 25.59
<i>FAO</i>	\$ 3.92	\$ 10.53	\$ 7.23
<i>UNDP</i>	\$ -	\$ 3.01	\$ 1.51
<i>UNESCO</i>	\$ 0.51	\$ 0.77	\$ 0.64
<b>Domestic public budgets at all levels</b>	<b>\$ 4,189.62</b>	<b>\$ 9,421.86</b>	<b>\$ 6,805.74</b>
<b>Federal</b>	<b>\$ 2,442.81</b>	<b>\$ 2,998.51</b>	<b>\$ 2,720.66</b>
<i>Agriculture and Agri-food Canada</i>	\$ 177.90	\$ 177.90	\$ 177.90
<i>Environment Canada</i>	\$ 178.90	\$ 372.10	\$ 275.50
<i>Parks Canada</i>	\$ 716.07	\$ 716.07	\$ 716.07
<i>Natural Resources Canada</i>	\$ 10.90	\$ 280.90	\$ 145.90
<i>Fisheries and Oceans Canada</i>	\$ 1,270.10	\$ 1,270.10	\$ 1,270.10
<i>Indian and Northern Affairs</i>	\$ 55.50	\$ 148.00	\$ 101.75
<i>Canadian Museum of Nature</i>	\$ 33.44	\$ 33.44	\$ 33.44
<b>Provincial</b>	<b>\$ 1,463.42</b>	<b>\$ 2,835.14</b>	<b>\$ 2,149.28</b>
<i>British Columbia</i>	\$ 415.08	\$ 858.84	\$ 636.96
<i>Alberta</i>	\$ 182.09	\$ 231.22	\$ 206.66
<i>Saskatchewan</i>	\$ 22.08	\$ 187.30	\$ 104.69
<i>Manitoba</i>	\$ 141.48	\$ 168.43	\$ 154.96
<i>Ontario</i>	\$ 253.16	\$ 358.98	\$ 306.07
<i>Quebec</i>	\$ 179.58	\$ 718.18	\$ 448.88
<i>New Brunswick</i>	\$ 27.87	\$ 57.68	\$ 42.78
<i>Prince Edward Island</i>	\$ 10.61	\$ 10.61	\$ 10.61
<i>Nova Scotia</i>	\$ 82.75	\$ 95.18	\$ 88.97
<i>Newfoundland &amp; Labrador</i>	\$ 51.37	\$ 51.37	\$ 51.37
<i>Yukon</i>	\$ 27.50	\$ 27.50	\$ 27.50
<i>Northwest Territories</i>	\$ 54.12	\$ 54.12	\$ 54.12
<i>Nunavut</i>	\$ 15.73	\$ 15.73	\$ 15.73
<b>Local governments</b>	<b>\$ 283.39</b>	<b>\$ 3,588.21</b>	<b>\$ 1,935.80</b>
<b>Private sector</b>	<b>\$ 686.80</b>	<b>\$ 824.16</b>	<b>\$ 755.48</b>
<i>Business expenditures</i>	\$ 140.80	\$ 278.16	\$ 209.48
<i>User fees (parks fees, licenses)</i>	\$ 546.00	\$ 546.00	\$ 546.00
<b>Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia</b>	<b>\$ 508.46</b>	<b>\$ 614.63</b>	<b>\$ 561.55</b>
<i>Non-governmental organizations, foundations</i>	\$ 446.01	\$ 446.01	\$ 446.01
<i>Academia</i>	\$ 62.45	\$ 168.62	\$ 115.54
International financial institutions (non-ODA)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
United Nations organizations, funds and programmes (non-ODA)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-ODA public funding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
South-South cooperation initiatives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Technical cooperation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 5,423.13</b>	<b>\$ 11,093.94</b>	<b>\$ 8,258.54</b>

- 2. Number of countries that have: (a) Assessed values of biodiversity, in accordance with the Convention; (b) Identified and reported funding needs, gaps and priorities; (c) Developed national financial plans for biodiversity; (d) Been provided with the necessary funding and capacity-building to undertake the above activities:**  
Not applicable – indicator intended for developing countries.
- 3. Aggregated estimate of annual Canadian biodiversity-related financial flows:**  
It is estimated that annual Canadian financial flows related to the objectives of the CBD are from \$5,423.13 million to \$11,093.94 million, with an average of \$8,258.54 million.
- 4. Amount of domestic financial support, per annum, in respect of those domestic activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of this Convention:**  
It is estimated that Canada provides between \$5,384.88 million and \$10,860.65 million annually in domestic resources to achieve the objectives of the CBD in Canada.
- 5. Amount of funding provided through the Global Environment Facility and allocated to biodiversity focal area:**  
As indicated above, Canada provides annually an estimated \$16.63 to the GEF's biodiversity focal area, and up to \$22.05 to the GEF for all biodiversity-related activities.
- 6. Level of CBD and Parties' support to other financial institutions that promote replication and scaling-up of relevant successful financial mechanisms and instruments:**  
Not applicable
- 7. Number of international financing institutions, United Nations organizations, funds and programmes, and the development agencies that report to the Development Assistance Committee of Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/DAC), with biodiversity and associated ecosystem services as a cross-cutting policy:**  
Not applicable
- 8. Number of Parties that integrate considerations on biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services in development plans, strategies and budgets:**  
It is believed that this question is intended for developing country Parties. Not applicable. However, Canada can highlight that its recent Federal Sustainable Development Strategy has the objective of integrating government wide actions and results, linking sustainable development planning and reporting to the Government's core expenditure planning reporting system, and providing effective measurement, monitoring and reporting tools to track and report on progress.
- 9. Number of South-South cooperation initiatives conducted by developing country Parties and those that may be supported by other Parties and relevant partners, as a complement to necessary North-South cooperation:**  
Not applicable
- 10. Amount and number of South-South and North-South technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives that support biodiversity:**  
Specific information was not available on the amount and number of North-South technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives supported by Canada. However, a portion of Canada's contribution to the GEF is used for these types of activities.

**11. Number of global initiatives that heighten awareness on the need for resource mobilization for biodiversity:**

Not applicable

**12. Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries to contribute to achieving the Convention's objectives:**

As indicated above, it can be estimated that Canada provides at least between \$38.25 million to \$233.29 million annually to developing countries to achieve the Convention's objectives.

In addition to these estimates, which are directly applied to meeting the Convention's objectives, there are additional sources of financing that positively contribute to the Convention on Biological Diversity. These additional sources may have been allocated to an alternative primary initiative, such as climate change or health, and have biodiversity as a secondary or even tertiary goal. In an effort to avoid counting the same flows towards more than one initiative, we have not accounted for funds that do not have the objectives of the Convention as a primary objective. In effect, we have not accounted for co-benefits from other financial flows in reporting given the methodology supported within this document. While this approach helps to limit the risk of double counting, it also prevents a more accurate assessment of total funds contributed towards meeting the Convention's objectives from being realized.

**13. Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020:**

Not applicable – as Strategic Plan has just recently been negotiated.

**14. Resources mobilized from the removal, reform or phase-out of incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity, which could be used for the promotion of positive incentives, including but not limited to innovative financial mechanisms, that are consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations, taking into account national social and economic conditions:**

Canada does not currently monitor the amount of resources mobilized from the removal, reform or phase-out of incentives harmful to biodiversity.

**15. Number of initiatives, and respective amounts, supplementary to the financial mechanism established under Article 21, that engage Parties and relevant organizations in new and innovative financial mechanisms, which consider intrinsic values and all other values of biodiversity, in accordance with the objectives of the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization:**

Not known at present.

**16. Number of access and benefit-sharing initiatives and mechanisms, consistent with the Convention and, when in effect, with the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization, including awareness-raising, that enhance resource mobilization:**

Not applicable to Canada at present.

**INDIA, RECEIVED ON 21 OCTOBER 2011**

**India's comments on CBD's draft documents on"  
UNEP/CBD/SRM/Indicators/1; and (ii) UNEP/SRM/Indicators/2**

**General comments**

Effective implementation of the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity 2011-20 and achievement of Aichi targets hinge upon provision of adequate financial resources to the developing country Parties for this purpose, and the extent to which developing countries are able to meet their commitments is related to provision of financial resources and transfer of technology (Decision X/2, para 10). In decision X/3, CoP-10 while adopting the 15 indicators for monitoring the implementation of strategy for resource mobilisation, has come out with a process for increasing resources against an established baseline (para 8(a) to (i), leading to adoption of targets at CoP-11. This process or roadmap is not only somewhat convoluted and complex, but its culmination in adoption of targets at CoP-11 hinges on two things: identification and endorsement of robust baselines; and adoption of effective reporting framework. The first operational steps in this process [para 8(d)] are for the Secretariat to come out with methodological guidance to the 15 indicators and guidelines for implementation of this methodology. Accordingly, the Secretariat has come out with these two documents currently being posted for peer review. This itself has taken exactly one year since adoption of the decisions by CoP-10. Following completion of the peer review process, the Parties are required to apply this methodology to measure gaps and needs in mobilisation of resources against the indicators set and communicate this information to the Secretariat, which will then present it before CoP-11. The compilation of the required information is not an easy task and is beset with several complexities, some of which have been reflected in the detailed comments that follow. Thus, it is an extremely tight schedule to meet before CoP-11, more so for the already capacity and resource-constrained developing countries. Moreover, considering that many indicators and methodologies will take time to sink in, understood and absorbed, achieving the tasks in a time-bound manner seems to be a tall order.

In this background, some specific comments on the two documents are given below.

**Specific comments**

**I. Document UNEP/CBD/SRM/Indicators/1**

On the use of indicators, difficulties are foreseen especially for three indicators: 3, 13 and 14. In the case of indicator 3 on domestic financial support, there could be constraints on two fronts: (i) At present there is no mechanism to monitor government expenditures on biodiversity incurred by different departments. (ii) Second, of the total expenditures incurred by a concerned ministry dealing with a particular ecosystem

activity, only a subset may deal with the one or more objectives of the CBD. The real economic problem is the ubiquitous nature of joint and common costs in programmes related to biodiversity conservation and difficulty of measuring costs attributable to biodiversity activities.

Regarding indicator 13 on subsidies, para 1.13.5 states that no definition for the phrase “incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity” is provided in the Methodological Guidance on Indicators. The Methodological Guidance on Indicators focuses on the government’s intention rather than on the effect of any subsidy, and there is no clear limit on the activities and purposes that might be used to define harmful subsidies. In addition, for implicit harmful subsidies, there is no actual transaction or monetary flow between entities of biodiversity financing, and hence the flow cannot be recorded appropriately. (1.13.6) says that a subsidy should be considered to be for biodiversity objectives when the intent or purpose of the government is that subsidy be used for support to any activities of the Classification of Biodiversity Activities contained in annex 2.2.

There are many practical difficulties in identifying and measuring harmful subsidies. First, one commonly accepted definition of subsidy for product or service, based on Pareto criterion of economic efficiency, is the difference between the social cost and the price. The government cost data is based on accounting and not social costs. Second, many countries do provide subsidies for provision of merit goods at affordable prices and the intention is to achieve the social goal of sustainable development. Thus there is trade off between efficiency and equity. Third, it is true subsidized underground and surface irrigation water, under pricing of chemical fertilizers and pesticides and policies encouraging unsustainable uses of natural resources have perverse incentives and such subsidies should be phased out over time or at least be targeted to the poor. The Survey may seek information from the members about their road for phasing out the perverse subsidies, political and other obstacles they face and methods of overcoming them.

Regarding indicator 14, para 1.14.4 says innovative financial mechanisms aim at improving financial performance by generating new and additional financial resources, by increasing cost efficiencies or by improving capacity to innovate. But all innovative financial mechanisms are associated with uncertainty over their outcome, because not all the results of the innovative financial mechanisms are known beforehand. (1.14.5) says for purposes of this indicator, new and innovative financial mechanisms as identified by the Conference of the Parties include payment for ecosystem services, biodiversity offset mechanisms, markets for green products, biodiversity-business partnerships, new forms of charity, environmental fiscal reforms, new and innovative sources of international development financing, and consideration of biodiversity in climate change funding schemes. These neoliberal measures need to be assessed in terms of their long-term sustainability, operational efficiency, transaction structures, and above all contribution to poverty alleviation.

Some of the suggested mechanisms exist only in a few countries and they are in different stages of development. PES can work only if the rights over the resources are

well defined and enforced, institutional mechanisms available for sharing costs and benefits and pricing, and if the stakeholders are also made better off after PES.

Biodiversity contribution is a package of private goods, merit goods, local public goods and global public goods. Given the right structures of incentives almost every individual can help in achieving the three goals of CBD. But para 2.2.4 states that the Classification of Biodiversity Activities are limited to formal biodiversity activities that are institutionalized, intentional, and planned through public organizations and recognized private bodies, which, in their totality, make up the formal biodiversity system of a country. Informal biodiversity activities can be intentional or deliberate, but not institutionalized, and thus do not fall within the scope of the Classification of Biodiversity Activities. Para 2.2.3 gives opinions on counting certain activities.

Two criteria are used to screen for biodiversity activities: entities of biodiversity financing, and purposes of activities. As a general rule, all activities of identified entities of biodiversity financing can be considered as biodiversity activities, and all activities with the purposes of achieving biodiversity objectives are counted as biodiversity activities. Some same activities need to be treated differently, if undertaken by those that are not entities of biodiversity financing. It mentions when forest fire fighting and wastewater treatment and other activities of this nature can be considered as biodiversity activities. It says the Secretariat of the Convention should gather the cases of activities that require further examination for classification, and publish its opinions on how such activities should be treated. Appropriate consultation and consensus should be undertaken before such an opinion is formalised.

The Survey may document the existence of innovative biodiversity activities initiated by households and communities voluntarily and find out whether such initiatives are driven by their livelihood concerns, nature preservation and altruism or all of them.

Some specific suggestions on the language of the text in this document are given below.

#### **1. Para 1.1.3 on page 11**

There is need for the document to explain 'how' and 'why' the statistical quality of the aggregated financial indicator is not affected. In other words, it is important to explain how the aggregated indicator needs to exist vis-a-viz indicators 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

#### **2. Para 1.1.4 on page 11**

A footnote may be provided on what is meant by " a fixed 10 percent rate of discount". Is it discount in relation of the grant component or discount in relation to present worth of ODA flows?

### **3. Para 1.1.5 on page 11-12**

The utility of confining ODA to bilateral sources of funding is not clear. A footnote may be added clarifying why this restricted meaning is adopted. Further, it needs to be pointed out that it is practical to seek information on bilateral lending from the OECD DAC or from the donors registers, than expect 'capacity constrained' developing countries to work out these figures,.

### **4. Para 1.1.7 on page 12**

The words 'can be' may replace 'may be'. The latter conveys a prescriptive tone. Channelizing ODA is not a matter for donors to decide. It falls within the policy domain of recipient countries.

### **5. In Para 1.1.8 on page 12**

There is reference to operational NGOs and campaigning NGOs. The words 'action based' and 'advocacy based' may replace 'operational' and 'campaigning'. It is also important to assess the quantum and sources of funds flowing to these NGOs in the interest of avoiding double counting.

### **6. Para 1.1.19 on page 13**

The para may be reformulated as 'For international purposes, this indicator should be first calculated on a pilot basis for a few countries for the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 2012, and subsequently included in the fifth and sixth national reports under the Convention.'

This formulation is suggested since it may not be possible for all COP countries to come up with figures before COP 11.

### **7. Para 1.1.22 on page 13**

The alternative formulation suggested is " National reports and surveys required from the Conference of the Parties may confirm the figures sourced from Rio markers and the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development as well as the Government Finance Statistics of the International Monetary Fund."

### **8. Para 1.2.4 on page 14**

The para may be re-formulated as follows: ' , a country that has assessed values that hold for at least one third of all its biodiversity and ecosystem services is counted as part of the number of countries that have assessed values of biodiversity in accordance with the Convention'.

This reformulation is proposed since the existing para conveys that only a country that has 'enumerated' 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of its biodiversity /ecosystem. The reformulation is realistic since it conveys that a country that has assessed representative ecosystem services or biodiversity that is relevant to at least 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of its total biodiversity / ecosystem services can be considered to have fulfilled the Convention requirements.

**9. Para 1.5.5 on page 20**

The words 'innovative debt based financing systems' may be added after the words 'environmental fiscal reforms' in para 1.5.5.

**10. Para 1.9.8 on page 29**

The words 'for a few countries on a pilot basis; may be inserted after the words 'first calculated'.

**11. Para 1.12.9 on page 33**

The following sentence may be inserted after the sentence starting from 'Effective use-----domestic resources.' 'The latter can be achieved through well chosen case studies'

**12. Para 1.12.11 on page 34**

The alternative formulation proposed is " National reports and surveys required by the Conference of the Parties may confirm figures sourced from Rio markers and the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development."

**13. Para 1.13.6 on page 35**

This para may be re-formulated as: 'Subsidies redirected to biodiversity objectives also include those subsidies received by non-governmental entities of biodiversity financing, as defined by the Implementation Guidelines on Indicators.'

The re-formulation is suggested since all redirected subsidies do not go to NGOs. There could be situations where such subsidies are redirected to local public utilities and other related entities. Moreover, in our country very often the subsidies are for livelihood of the local people.

**14. Para 1.13.9 on page 36**

The words 'for a select group of countries' may be introduced after the word 'calculated'

**15. Para 1.14.8 on page 38**

It is inconceivable that new and innovative financial mechanisms will be introduced every year or every two years. Hence the reformulation can be as follows: 'For national planning and monitoring purposes, this indicator may be calculated periodically and operated upon depending on national policy cycles.'

**16. Para 1.15.11 on page 40**

The words 'and mechanisms' may be removed from B15.

**17. Para 4.2.2 in Annexure on page 88**

The proposal is loaded with suggestions that involve structural policy changes in biodiversity providing countries, and would lead to ruffling sensitivities. The paragraph therefore needs reformulation.

**II. Document UNEP/CBD/SRM/Indicators/2**

For this indicator-based questionnaire survey, there is a need to have some normalization in terms of for example, area of the country, GDP, population etc. Otherwise, the results emanating from the survey would not be comparable, for example how would you compare size of this effort and the need for this effort.

Some specific suggestions for improving the language of the text in this document are given below. The comments given on indicators in document UNEP/CBD/SRM/Indicators/1 are also relevant here.

**1. Para 1 on page 6**

The timelines for responding to the questionnaires need to be adjusted to reflect the fact that the prerequisite for successfully responding to the 2012 questionnaire is the requirement of dedicated staff at both national and global levels.

Further the words 'politically and financially' may be removed in view of their redundancy and sensitivity.

**2. Para 25 on page 10**

This last sentence in para 25 may be re-formulated as: 'Subsidies redirected to biodiversity objectives also include those subsidies received by non-governmental entities of biodiversity financing, as defined by the Implementation Guidelines on Indicators'.

The re-formulation is suggested since all redirected subsidies do not go to NGOs. There could be situations where such subsidies are re-directed to local public

utilities and other related entities to enable them execute biodiversity conservation activities.

CHINA, RECEIVED ON 21 NOVEMBER 2011

**Subject: Submissions by China on the Draft Documents on Indicators for the Strategy for Resource Mobilization**

**I. General Comments to the Resource Mobilization for the Implementation of the Convention**

We hold the position that the text on the financial resources, in particularly the Paragraph 4 of Article 20, of the Convention shall be highlighted, and serve as the guidance to all discussions on the critical issue of resource mobilization under the Convention. As agreed by COP 10, the extent to which developing country Parties will effectively implement the Strategic Plan of 2011-2020 will depend on effective implementation by developed country Parties of their commitments under this Convention related to financial resources and transfer of technology. Therefore, the obligations and commitments of developed countries should be reiterated in this document.

**II. Proposals to the Methodological and Implementation Guidance for the "Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Convention's Strategy for Resource Mobilization"**

1. We would like to suggest the Secretariat to develop Guidelines on Data Collection and Accounting, and assist Parties in this regards, especially on resources from the private sector, NGOs and the public.
2. As to the deadline of submission, it is suggested to change the deadline of submission from the proposed January 15, 2012 to February 29, 2012 given such heavy workload and limited time available.
3. As to the time scale of baseline data, it was proposed in the document that Parties submit data for the year of 2010 or years before and after that. China supports to collect data for the period from 2006 to 2010 given that one year data may not accurately reflect the trend of inputs into biodiversity related sector at both national and global levels.
4. As to the "*Figure 1: Types of International Financial Flows*" in para31-33, Page 7-8, it is proposed to further divide **other public funds** into that from developed countries and that from developing countries, including through South-South Cooperation.

### **III. Specific Proposals for the Preliminary Reporting Framework**

1. For “*Information (both qualitative and quantitative, including in monetary terms) on the role of specific initiatives including those relating to technical cooperation, and innovative financing mechanism*” in the Para II (4) in Page 14, we would like to propose to add a footnote stating that data described in II (4) may duplicate that described in II (1) and (2).

And the Parties have the right to determine and clarify the scale and amount of the initiatives counted.

2. We would like to seek clarification on “*Category C: sustainable use and management*” and “*Category D: sustainable production and consumption*”. The explicit meanings of these terms under the framework of CBD need to be included in.

3. As for “*Access and Benefit Sharing*” mentioned in the column of Category B and Activities considered, clarification should be made if it is referred to *Access and Benefit Sharing* of genetic resources.

**JAPAN, RECEIVED ON 6 DECEMBER 2011**

Suggestions and comments on the Methodological and Implementation Guidance for the “indicators for monitoring the implementation of the Convention’s strategy for resource mobilization”

Government of Japan

With regard to the Notification 2011-190 which requests Parties to review the above mentioned draft guidance, the Government of Japan provides following suggestions and comments.

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) secretariat has prepared Methodological and Implementation Guidance, which provides effective means in capturing the status of resource mobilization by categorizing necessary information and biodiversity-related activities. Japan expects further elaboration of the Guidance and Preliminary Reporting Framework, because this type of guidance could be useful in figuring out the global trend of the strategy for resource mobilization.

It should be noted that the present Framework has many points which are difficult for the Parties to describe. Japan concerns that, if the present Framework were utilized before adequate review and discussion, Parties would not be able to achieve required results in spite of enormous administrative efforts. Japan, through the process of preparing recent submissions of its view on indicators of resource mobilization and innovative financial mechanisms, has found that collecting information on resource mobilization is a challenging task, for which an effective reporting framework must be fully elaborated. Japan believes that, the reporting framework needs to be refined in order for all Parties to submit complete data based on the present framework and objectives of strategy of resource mobilization (to substantially enhance international financial flows and domestic funding for biological diversity in order to achieve a substantial reduction of the current funding gaps in support of the effective implementation of the Convention's three objectives and the 2010 target).

The section “review of the indicators adopted in decision X/3 (II)” points out that there are many overlaps among indicators. In this respect, the Preliminary Reporting Framework (Annex I) of the Guideline may contribute to avoiding overlaps and providing calculation methods for some indicators. To improve the framework for actual use, it is desirable that some ambiguous points, like how to avoid or accommodate overlapping, are to be made clearer before information submission by Parties.

Grasping OOF on biodiversity, private and market financial flows accurately is a difficult task. There are also uncertainties on what kind of information Parties should provide, for indicators 14 and 15 related to the Nagoya Protocol. Consequently, further consideration and elaboration are needed for filling out items of the present Framework, and information gathering should be initiated after its further revision. Specific examples should also be presented as much as possible on the information to be provided for each indicator.

The section on “information needed for the indicators and rational for the reporting framework (III)” suggests the idea of dividing the Preliminary Reporting Framework into several sections. Although this method as a whole is considered useful for Parties, further improvement is necessary because Parties may not be able to effectively fill out all the sections of the Framework. As for the item 4.2.1, it is difficult to define subsidies harmful to biodiversity as “removed, reformed or phased out”. Although the tool has been prepared by OECD for the purpose of identifying harmful subsidies, this is not ready for an immediate use to smoothly submit information on strategy for resource mobilization. Thus, an additional study should be conducted for incorporating existing tools into the Reporting Framework. It should be also noted that there is a dialogue on fishery subsidies in the WTO regime.

Taking such an ongoing dialogue into account, fishery subsidies need to be excluded. It seems that there are some other issues, for which coordination with other conventions and frameworks is needed. As to the item 4.2. and 4.4., additional information is needed, together with specific examples, in order to judge what information is required.

On the section of “categorization of biodiversity activities to identify funding (IV)”, reporting framework is divided into the categories from A to D. If this newly introduced classification becomes a part of the Framework, there are some points for Parties to discuss and decide what kinds of categories are needed, and how to utilize categorized information. “5. Activity Classification” in the reporting framework mixes up the actor-based information with the activity-based information. Japan considers that whether actors are “environmental agencies” or not in “Default Description” of the categories A to D has little to do with identifying activities of CBD and the Strategic Plan. More acceptable definitions of categories need to be formulated through discussion among Parties. There are also overlaps between Category D and A or C, and these overlaps need to be solved before utilizing the Framework.

On the section of “implementation guidance (V)”, there are many ambiguous points in the “institutional mapping” on its structure and who is to prepare it. In addition, to make the “implementation guidance” an effective tool to avoid overlapping in counting, specific examples of other treaties need to be provided. On the section of “consideration of baseline (VI)”, Japan is of the opinion that it is desirable to set the “baseline period” rather than “baseline year” in order to “avoid the results being overly influenced by conditions that may exist in any one year”. If Parties are required to gather multi-year information, the process will become more complicated and burdensome, for the process of collecting data imposes an enormous burden on Parties.

There is a trade-off between accuracy of data and its collecting cost. Therefore, it is advisable to have sufficient discussion on deciding whether baseline years have satisfaction ground and whether employing “baseline years” is appropriate or not. Enough consideration should also be given to the adequacy of the Reporting Framework and categorization.

On the section of “next steps and related initiatives (VII)”, Japan considers that it will be a heavy administrative burden to submit information by using the present Preliminary Reporting Framework. Considering that works on the strategic resource mobilization are at its initial step, current framework needs several annotations indicating that, for some items, Parties can submit report with blank cells in the reporting framework, if they think that the definition of item is obscure. To avoid insufficient consequence, Parties and CBD secretariat have to work on the refinement toward an ideal Reporting Framework in an appropriate forum including the WGRI-4 and COP11.

NORWAY, RECEIVED ON 22 DECEMBER 2011

## **Submission from Norway on Notification 2011-019: Indicators for the Strategy for Resource Mobilization**

We acknowledge the work undertaken by the Secretariat to develop methodological guidance and guidelines for the application of the indicators for resource mobilization. The preliminary reporting framework is a useful tool for Parties, however there is still room for improvements. Those 15 adopted indicators have inherent strengths and weaknesses. Several of the indicators are overlapping. We therefore recommend reassessing the justification of these indicators, and in case of direct overlap, we prefer the removal of one of the indicators from the list. Special attention should be directed to availability of data with the aim to reduce reporting burdens as limited technical and institutional capacity is often ranked as one of the main constraints for reporting on adopted indicators.

**Indicator 1 Aggregated financial flows in a manner that avoids double counting:** This indicator is several aggregated numbers. To avoid double counting, we would recommend it to be limited to the first three categories; a) Official development Assistance (ODA) , b) Domestic budgets and c) Private sector, where Norad can deliver the Norwegian data on ODA funds. ODA funding is channeled through d) NGOs foundations and academia, e) International financing institutions, f) UN organizations, funds and programs and i) technical cooperation. It can be difficult to extract the ODA part from the private sector part (c) of the funding through NGOs foundations and academia (d). An alternative solution might be to develop sub categories of the ODA contribution.

**Indicator 2**

- i) Assessed the values of biodiversity in accordance with the Convention**
- ii) Identified and reported funding needs, gaps and priorities**
- iii) Developed national financial plans for biodiversity**
- iv) Been provided with the necessary funding and capacity building to undertake the above activities**

“Yes” or “no” approach would be sufficient to report on this indicator, however, additional descriptive information would be preferable in order to allow Parties to report on outcomes, achievement and challenges. The additional information will also contribute to give a more nuanced picture as some countries may have not undertaken some these activities yet, but are in a process of doing so.

**Indicator 3 Amount of domestic financial support, per annum, in respect of those domestic activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of the Convention:** This indicator is overlapping with 1b, 1c and 1d, except the funds provided as ODA. To avoid overlap, we recommend merging some of these indicators.

**Indicator 7 Number of Parties that integrate considerations on biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services in development plans, strategies and budgets.**

Using a simple “yes” or “no” would be sufficient however we see the added value of additional information, such as description of to which extent considerations on biological diversity is integrated in development plans.

**Indicator 9 Amount and number of South-South and North South technical cooperation and capacity building initiatives:** Norad cannot easily retrieve these data. Technical cooperation is classified in two forms of assistance; donor country personnel or other technical assistance, but it is limited to projects that include capacity building only. The technical cooperation that is included as a part of a program is not included in these statistics. The number would thus not be reflecting the true amount of expenditure in this area.

**Indicator 11 Amount of resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries to contribute to achieving the Conventions objectives:** This indicator is overlapping with indicator 1 and 12.

**Indicator 12 Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed to developing countries towards implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020:**

This indicator is overlapping with indicator 1 and 11. It is important that the indicators are easy to interpret, that the information is easily available and that they are not overlapping. We would thus recommend that the ODA relevant part of indicator 1, 11 and 12 is formulated as one single indicator.

**Indicator 13 Resources mobilized from the removal or phase out of incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity, which could be used for the promotion or positive incentives, including but not limited to innovative financial mechanism:**

We do not have existing data sets or monitoring systems to provide data for these indicators.

**Indicator 14 Number of initiatives, and respective amounts, supplementary to the financial mechanism established under Article 21, that engage Parties and relevant organizations in new and innovative financial mechanisms, which consider intrinsic values and other values of biodiversity, in accordance with the objectives of the Convention :** This information is not available in the Norad database.

**Indicator 15 Number of access and benefit sharing initiatives and mechanisms, consistent with the Convention and when in effect, with the Nagoya protocol, including awareness-raising, that enhances resource mobilization:** Information about private access and benefit sharing initiatives and mechanisms is lacking.

**MYANMAR, RECEIVED ON JUNE 22, 2012**

3.1 - National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) has been prepared with the GEF financing US\$ 103,000 in collaboration with UNEP.

- In 2010, the projects on Biodiversity Conservation and Promoting Protected Area Management were implemented in Inlay Lake Wildlife Sanctuary, Indawgui Lake Wildlife Sanctuary, Lampi Marine National Park and Alaungdaw Kathapa National Park with US\$ 43,600 contribution from ASEAN CENTER For BIODIVERSITY (ACB).

- From 2007 to 2010 Inventory Project on Myanmar amphibians and reptiles was completed in collaboration with the California Academy of Sciences (CAS) of the United States of America with the financial assistance of US\$ 71922.27.

- The USA based Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) of country programme spent some US\$ 397928 for biodiversity conservation from 2007 to 2010 in Myanmar.

- Italy based INSTITUTO OIKS spent some £ or EUR 50820 in Lampi Marine National Park for biodiversity conservation.

3.7 Myanmar spent average of US\$ (0.858) million every year for biodiversity conservation from 2007-2010.

**ETHIOPIA, RECEIVED ON 29 JUNE 2012**

**PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK (Microsoft word 2007)**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

**Ethiopian Institute of Biodiversity Conservation has filed the** Preliminary Reporting Framework sent by the CBD Secretariat intended to be used by Parties in the period 2011-2012 for Providing data on resource mobilization according to the indicators adopted in decision X/3. IBC Ethiopia has provided resource mobilization data for the period of 2006 to 2010 years and showed an average on 2010.

The average data for the year 2010 for regions and municipals financial data is not available and we here with provide you with the best estimate.

Ethiopia's financial year is July to June. But we reported this report in Gregorian calendar. The currency used for this report is US Dollars. Because of the data limitation most of the figures are based on best estimates.

***Identification of respondent***

Country: Ethiopia	Name of respondent: <b>Tesfaye Bidika</b>
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed: <b>IBC Director General, Dr. Gemedo Dale.</b>	National Focal Point o Focal point for resource mobilization o Other. Please specify: <b>Planning and programming Department Directorate Director.</b>
Title and Department of respondent :	
<b>Planning and programming Department Directorate Director</b>	
Organization of respondent: <b>IBC, Ethiopia</b>	
Email address: <b>teseba@yahoo.co.uk</b>	
Telephone contact: 251 0922836772	
Date of completion and submission of completed framework: <b>June 29, 2012</b>	

***1. Information on International Flows of Financial Resources***

This section of the Framework relates to the flows of financial resources from ODA sources to Ethiopia. The amount of resources provided in support of biodiversity in Ethiopia through ODA, other public funds, private/market mechanisms **are estimated** as below.

Data provided are for multiple years 2006-2010, **but** the average is used.

Year: 2010 Currency: USD

Year (2010) average (2006-2010)		Currency USD (in thousands)0										
Type of financial flows		Activity categories										Total
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management.		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption				
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	
1.1 Official Development Assistance	1.1.1 Bilateral	460000	medium	300000	medium	457680	medium	250000	medium	1467680	medium	
	1.1.2 Multilateral	800000	medium	400000	medium	603800	medium	300000	medium	2103800	medium	
1.2 Other public funds		20000	low	10000	low	5000	low	5000	low	40000	low	
1.3 Private/Market		No data		No data		No data		No data		No data		
1.4 Not for profit organizations		25000	low	20000	low	10000	low	12000	low	67000	low	
<b>Total:</b>		<b>1305000</b>		<b>730000</b>		<b>1076480</b>		<b>567000</b>		<b>3,678,480</b>		
<b>Comments:</b>		<b>Getting data in these category is limited/or none existence. Therefore, it is the combination of existing data and estimates used to produce these data</b>										

**2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in Ethiopia.**

Financial resources that were available to implement the Convention and its Strategic Plan in Ethiopia from local sources during the 2006- 2010 period ,but an estimated average for 2010 is as follows.

Year: 2010 Average	Currency USD					
Source	Activity categories4					Total/year 2010 average/
	Category A: Biodiversity	Category B: Policy	Category C: Sustainable	Category D: Sustainable		

		protection		development and administration		use and management.		production and consumption			
		Amount in thousand	Confidence	Amount in thousand	Confidence	Amount in thousand	Confidence	Amount in thousand	Confidence	Amount in thousand	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	1500.	high	1000.	high	1750.	high	1500.	high	5750	high
	2.1.2 State/Provincial (estimate)	500	low	200.	low	550.	low	340.	low	1590	low
	2.2.3 local/Municipal	160	low	140	low	200	low	102	low	602	low
2.2 Private/ Market		20	low	15	low	25	low	30	low	90	low
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)		140	low	160	low	120	low	180	low	600	low
<b>Total:</b>		<b>2320</b>		<b>1515</b>		<b>2645</b>		<b>2152</b>		<b>8632</b>	
<p><b>Comments: the regions and municipal financial resource used for biodiversity conservation is estimated. There is no record for the amount used for any of the categories.</b></p>											

### 3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization

This section of the Framework addresses initiatives which are important in enabling access to financial resources for biodiversity activities.

Our country has implemented some of the activities, but no recorded data found.

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)	
3.1 Assessments of the values of biodiversity	No data	No data		No data	
3.2	No data	No data		No data	

Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities					
<b>3.3</b> Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	No data	No data		No data	
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	No data	No data		No data	
<b>3.5</b> Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	No data	No data		No data	
Comments: even though some activities are undertaken there is no data which shows the activities implemented.					

**4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability**

This section of the Framework contains questions related to several specific issues including: technical cooperation; South-South cooperation; innovative financial mechanisms; and access and benefit sharing.

**4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation/Developed countries/  
There is no data to fill the table. /or not applicable/**

**Year: 2006-2010/ 2010 estimated average**

**Currency: USD**

Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
<b>4.1.1</b> North-South technical cooperation and capacity building				

provided				
<b>4.1.2</b> Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity-building through triangular cooperation				
<b>Comments:</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>			

**In order to indicate the number of technical cooperation and capacity building initiatives that support biodiversity from which we have received resources and the numbers of initiatives that have been financed by our country. There is no data to fill the table, but we put estimates.**

**Year:**

**Currency:**

<b>Type of initiative</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Confidence</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>4.1.3</b> North-South technical cooperation and capacity building received	4/ <b>Estimated/</b>	1000,000	<b>low</b>	Capacity building ; Experience exchange
<b>4.1.4</b> South-South technical cooperation & capacity building received from other developing countries	6/ <b>Estimated/</b>	750,000	<b>low</b>	Capacity building ; Experience exchange
<b>4.1.5</b> South-South technical cooperation and capacity building - Provided 17	8/ <b>Estimated/</b>	1200,000	<b>low</b>	Capacity building ; Experience exchange
<b>Comments: this is estimate</b>				

**4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies: There is no data to fill the table.**

**Year: 2006- 2010 Average**

**Currency:**

<b>Incentives</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>4.2.1</b> Removed, reformed or phased-out	<b>No data</b>	<b>No data</b>
<b>4.2.2</b> Positive incentives 24 introduced	<b>No data</b>	<b>No data</b>
<b>Comments : No data</b>		

*4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism;*

Year: 2010 estimated average

Currency: USD

<b>Type of Initiative</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Biodiversity Planning</b>	<b>350,000</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o NBASP development</li> <li>o CHM related activities</li> </ul>
<b>Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources</b>	<b>300,000</b>		ABS frameworks
<b>Safeguarding biodiversity</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o in situ/ex situ conservation</li> <li>o Protected areas</li> <li>o Maintaining genetic diversity</li> <li>o Addressing threats from invasive alien species</li> <li>o Addressing threats to specific ecosystems and/or species</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainable management of ecosystems</b>	<b>850,000</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Sectoral measures to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries, etc)</li> <li>o Sectoral measures to conserve water and prevent pollution</li> </ul>
<b>Measures in the wider economy and</b>	<b>500,000</b>		o Planning, fiscal and regularity

society			measures to promote sustainable consumption and production o Broad scale public awareness and education measures
<b>Total</b>	<b>4000000</b>		

**4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention**

**Please indicate the number of access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and Mechanisms your country has undertaken that enhance resource mobilization:**

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
<b>Comments:</b>	<b>Data shortage</b>

**5. Activity Classification**

**For the resource classification mentioned in sections 1 and 2 above please indicate which types of initiatives you have considered under each category.** A brief description of each of the categories as well as an indicative list of the actions that could be considered under each category is provided below. Please select all that apply. Please also list any additional activities considered under each category.

	Activity classification				
	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	
<b>Default Description</b>	Activities where biodiversity protection is the main purpose, such as activities funded by environmental agencies that directly and intentionally impact biodiversity.	Activities related to policy development and administration carried out in part or entirely by environmental agencies Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the	Activities related to sustainable use and sustainable management that have co-benefits for biodiversity. Activities under this category would generally be lead by	Activities related to sustainable production and consumption where the responsibility lies with multiple government entities, the private sector and the general public.	

	Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	agencies outside of the environmental sector Activities related to Articles 8, 10 and 11 of the Convention as well Targets 5-8, 10, 14 and 15 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to Articles 11 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 1-4 of the Strategic Plan	
<b>Activities considered</b> <i>(Please check those that apply)</i> <b>Safeguarding biodiversity</b>	<b>Safeguarding biodiversity</b> in situ/ex situ conservation o Protected areas o Maintaining genetic diversity o Addressing threats from invasive alien species o Addressing threats to specific ecosystems and/or species	<b>Biodiversity Planning</b> o NBASP development o CHM related activities <b>Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources</b> o ABS frameworks  <b>Biosafety</b> o Biosafety frameworks	<b>Sustainable management of ecosystems</b> o Sectoral measures to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries, etc) o Sectoral measures to conserve water and prevent pollution <b>Land use and climate related activities</b> o Managing land use to protect biodiversity, mitigate climate	<b>Measures in the wider economy and society</b> o Planning, fiscal and regularity measures to promote sustainable consumption and production o Broad scale public awareness and education measures	

			change and increase resilience		
<b>Additional activities</b> <i>(Please add additional activities not already included in the row above)</i>					

**Appendix HOW THE INDICATORS CONTAINED IN DECISION X/3 ARE COVERED BY THE DATA FIELDS IN THE PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK**

Indicators from decision X/3		Relevant data field in the reporting framework	Explanation and further notes
1. Aggregated financial flows, in the amount and where relevant percentage, of biodiversity-related funding, per annum, for achieving the Convention's three objectives, in a manner that avoids double counting, both in total and in, <i>inter</i>	(a) Official Development Assistance (ODA);	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b> Includes bilateral ( <b>1.1.1</b> ) and multilateral ( <b>1.1.2</b> )
	(b) Domestic budgets at all levels	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.1</b> Includes government agencies and other publically funded entities at three levels of government: central/national/federal ( <b>2.1.1</b> ), state/provincial ( <b>2.1.2</b> ) and local/municipal ( <b>2.1.3</b> ).
	(c) Private sector;	<b>2.2 and 1.3</b>	<b>2.2</b> indicates total available from private/market sources; <b>1.3</b> indicates international flows of private/market resources
	(d) Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia	<b>2.3 and 1.4</b>	<b>2.3</b> indicates total available from non profit organizations not already included above; <b>1.4</b> indicates international flows of such resources
	(e) International financial institutions;	<b>1.1.1</b>	<b>1.1.1</b> Included within multilateral ODA. This date from countries will be supplemented by information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat from the organizations concerned and made available to Parties for their review

Indicators from decision X/3		Relevant data field in the reporting framework	Explanation and further notes
<i>alia</i> , the following categories:	f) United Nations organizations, funds and programmes	<b>1.1.1</b>	
	(g) Non-ODA public funding; <b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	
	(h) South-South cooperation initiatives	<b>4.1</b>	
	(i) Technical cooperation;	<b>4.1</b>	
2. Number of countries that have:	(a) Assessed values of biodiversity, in accordance with the Convention;	<b>3.1</b>	
	(b) Identified and reported funding needs, gaps and priorities	<b>3.2</b>	
	(c) Developed national financial plans for biodiversity;	<b>3.3</b>	
	(d) Been provided with the necessary funding and capacity building to undertake the above activities	<b>3</b>	
	<b>2(less 1)</b>	Includes all domestic sources ( <b>2.1 + 2.2 +2.3</b> ) less, for developing countries, that received from other countries ( <b>1</b> )	
3. Amount of domestic financial			

Indicators from decision X/3	Relevant data field in the reporting framework	Explanation and further notes
support, per annum, in respect of those domestic activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of this Convention;		
4. Amount of funding provided through the Global Environment Facility and allocated to biodiversity focal area;	None	Global indicator – Information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat from GEF Secretariat and made available to Parties for their review
5. Level of CBD and Parties' support to other financial institutions that promote replication and scaling-up of relevant successful financial mechanisms and instruments;	None	Global indicator – Information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat and made available to Parties for their review
6. Number of international financing institutions, United Nations organizations, funds and programmes, and the development agencies that report to the Development Assistance Committee of Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD/DAC), with biodiversity and associated ecosystem services as a cross-cutting policy	None	Global indicator – Information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat from the institutions concerned and made available to Parties for their review
7. Number of Parties that integrate considerations on biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services in development plans, strategies and budgets;	<b>3.4 and 3.5</b>	
8. Number of South-South cooperation initiatives conducted by developing country Parties and those that may be supported by other Parties and relevant partners, as a complement to necessary North-South cooperation;	<b>4.1</b>	
9. Amount and number of South-South and North-South technical	<b>4.1</b>	

Indicators from decision X/3	Relevant data field in the reporting framework	Explanation and further notes
cooperation and capacity-building initiatives that support biodiversity;		
10. Number of global initiatives that heighten awareness on the need for resource mobilization for biodiversity;	None	Global indicator – Information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat and made available to Parties for their review
11. Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries to contribute to achieving the Convention's objectives;	1	These two indicators are regarded as equivalent for the period of Strategic Plan 2011—2020.
12. Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;	1	
13. Resources mobilized from the removal, reform or phase-out of incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity, which could be used for the promotion of positive incentives, including but not limited to innovative financial mechanisms, that are consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations, taking into account national social and economic conditions;	4.2	
14. Number of initiatives, and respective amounts, supplementary to the financial mechanism established under Article 21, that engage Parties and relevant organizations in new and innovative financial mechanisms, which consider intrinsic values and all other values of biodiversity, in accordance with the	4.3	

Indicators from decision X/3	Relevant data field in the reporting framework	Explanation and further notes
<p>objectives of the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization;</p> <p>15. Number of access and benefit-sharing initiatives and mechanisms, consistent with the Convention and, when in effect, with the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable 4.4Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization, including awareness-raising, that enhance resource mobilization;</p>		

**NORWAY, RECEIVED ON 29 JUNE 2012**

As a general comment we would like to underline that this was a challenging task, one main concern, having the strategic plan in mind is; “what is resources for biodiversity”. Direct biodiversity, indirect biodiversity etc. We realize that it will be difficult to compare the numbers given, but we do hope that the submissions will help in providing the overview needed.

**Content**

1. Background	2
2. General notes on methodology and scope	2
3. Environmental budgets	4
4. National budget - Ministry of Environment	5
5. Regional budgets	7
5.1 County governor	7
5.2 County councils	8
6. National budget - Ministry of Agriculture and Food	9
7. National budget - Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs	10
8. National budget - Ministry of Transport and Communications	10
9. National budget - Ministry of Defence	11
10. Official Development Assistance (ODA)	12
11. The Norwegian Government's International Climate and Forest Initiative	14
12. EEA Grants and Norway Grants	15

## 1. Background

Summarizing biodiversity related funding has historically been a part of Norwegian politics. In the 1980s and 1990s, the Ministry of Environment annually published a Green booklet on environmental measures in the budget proposition. The last publication was in 1997. The Green booklet presented an overview of environmental initiatives in all government departments, including references to specific issues. From 1999 the Green booklet was replaced by a white paper, the Report on the State of the Realm, which was published every second year until 2007. However, in contrast to the Green booklet, the white paper did not present budgetary figures.

A brief overview of environmental measures in each of the government departments was originally a part of the Green booklet. This was pursued in the white paper and is presently a part of the Ministry of Environment's budget proposition. However, today's overview is a less comprehensive version of the earlier Green booklet. The following report is a more detailed review of Norwegian biodiversity funding.

## 2. General notes on methodology and scope

- Official budgets and input from relevant sectors have been used when compiling this information. With this procedure we are able to get comparable information from year to year, but the degree of CBD-relevance is more difficult to assess.
- The report is based on existing information from recent budgets, national accounts, as well as national reporting systems (KOSTRA) and reporting according to the OECD DAC system.
- The year of reference is in most cases set to 2010. Figures from the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and County councils are presented from 2006 to 2010.
- Numbers are presented in NOK, except for EEA grants and Norway grants (chapter 12).

### Thematic scope

- The study presents activities that both directly and indirectly contribute to biodiversity conservation. Activities that indirectly enhance biodiversity conservation (e.g. pollution control, waste management, climate mitigation, compensation for loss of pastoral stocks to large carnivores) are included in the figures as these would often be hard to separate from more direct biodiversity measures.
  - Likewise, biodiversity protection on the one hand, and policy development and administration on the other hand, are not separated in the figures as budget figures very often cover both.
- 
- Outdoor recreation is a common activity in Norway and contributes to increased knowledge and understanding of biodiversity values. Management of outdoor recreational areas is important to stimulate such activities and is therefore considered to contribute to CBD's objectives. Expenditures related to outdoor recreation are included in both national and regional figures.
  - In Norway, management of cultural heritage is part of the Ministry of Environment's budget. Since this issue is not covered by the CBD objectives, these expenditures are not included in the report, except for personnel and administrative resources which are difficult to separate from aggregated budget figures.
  - The Norwegian Government's Climate and Forest Initiative is the single most significant Norwegian contribution to improve conditions for biodiversity. However, as the initiative works on several levels, and with focus on the broad aspect of reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation, it is hard to estimate how much of the total that benefits biodiversity. The budget is therefore treated separately in the study.

### Administrative levels

- Data from sector budgets are included from the following government departments:
  - Ministry of Agriculture and Food
  - Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs
  - Ministry of Transport and Communications
  - Ministry of Defence
  - Ministry of Foreign Affairs
  - Data from the Ministry of Petroleum and Energy is not available due to lack of reporting.
  - Data from the Ministry of Education and Research has not been included. However, the Ministry covers relevant expenditures on the Biodiversity Information Centre and different nature museums.
- Financial resources on biodiversity and the sustainable use of natural resources in sector budgets are often aggregated together with other expenditures. In some of these cases detailed expenditure information on biodiversity related issues were not available. Since government departments have reported quite differently, comparison between sectors is not feasible. Each department budget is therefore presented separately.
- Funding within the environmental sector, on national and regional level, is summarized in chapter 3 and split by national and regional figures in chapter 4 and 5.

- Biodiversity related expenditures at County governor level are integrated in national budget figures, but personnel resources are estimated separately (chapter 5.1).
- Municipal budgets are not included in the report as financing is allocated as general block grants and biodiversity expenditures may vary greatly between municipalities.
- Financial resources from private business, organizations, foundations and academia are not included in the report as data sampling would have been very time-consuming.

### 3. Environmental budgets

The table summarizes biodiversity related funding within the environmental sector. This comprises budget figures from the Ministry of Environment (chapter 4), the County governor (chapter 5.1) and the County councils (chapter 5.2). Numbers are not accurate as personnel resources are estimates, based on man-year converted to expenditures, and as figures from County councils are extracted from a national reporting system in which reporting may vary to some extent.

Ministry of Environment, County governor, County councils	NOK (2006)	NOK (2007)	NOK (2008)	NOK (2009)	NOK (2010)	Average NOK (2006-2010)
Nature management measures*	1 443 425 681	1 763 801 312	2 067 483 640	2 567 273 000	2 589 615 000	2 086 319 727
Pollution control measures**	732 060 778	594 356 418	641 216 525	680 237 500	751 155 000	679 805 244
Environmental tasks in County councils	23 248 000	38 359 000	42 453 000	57 792 000	73 507 000	47 071 800
Environmental measures in the polar regions	178 207 000	198 248 000	217 859 000	263 163 000	284 615 000	228 418 400
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 376 941 460</b>	<b>2 594 764 730</b>	<b>2 969 012 165</b>	<b>3 568 465 500</b>	<b>3 698 892 000</b>	<b>3 041 615 171</b>

\*Total amount of measures related to nature management at national level, from the Ministry of Environment and County governor (FAD, chapter 1510)

\*\* Total amount of measures related to pollution control at national level, from the Ministry of Environment and County governor (FAD, chapter 1510 and fee-financed personnel)

### 4. National budget - Ministry of Environment

The table presents national accounts for nature management, pollution control and environmental measures in the polar region in Norway from 2006 to 2010. Figures include salaries and administration costs.

In Norway, cultural heritage conservation is part of the Ministry of Environment's budget. Since this issue is not covered by the CBD's objectives, these project expenditures are not included, i.e. Directorate for Cultural Heritage (chap 1429) and Svalbard's Cultural Heritage fund (chap 1432). However, personnel and administrative costs related to cultural heritage conservation are included. Likewise, the Norwegian Mapping Authority and the process of registering rights to real properties (chap 1465 and 2465) are not included in the figures.

Environmental activities	NOK (2006)	NOK (2007)	NOK (2008)	NOK (2009)	NOK (2010)
1. Nature management measures	1 327 231 000	1 646 751 000	1 945 543 000	2 442 143 000	2 457 540 000
2. Pollution control measures	661 680 000	534 120 000	568 532 000	600 940 000	663 405 000
3. Environmental measures in the polar regions	178 207 000	198 248 000	217 859 000	263 163 000	284 615 000
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 167 118 000</b>	<b>2 379 119 000</b>	<b>2 731 934 000</b>	<b>3 306 246 000</b>	<b>3 405 560 000</b>

Below are examples of activities for each category is presented:

#### 1. Nature management measures (Chap 1400, 1410, 1425, 1426, 1427)

- Protected areas and management of protected areas
- Forest conservation
- Management of cultural landscapes
- Management of large carnivores\*
- Management of wild salmon
- Harvest management of game population and inland fish stocks
- Watercourse management
- Management of marine and coastal ecosystems
- Outdoor recreation
- Knowledgebase, Nature Diversity Index
- Municipal, county and regional planning
- International agreements

- Environmental research and monitoring
- Nature Inspectorate (SNO)

\*72 859 000 NOK - compensation for loss of sheep to large carnivores in 2010

71 533 000 NOK - compensation for loss of reindeer to large carnivores in the herding season 2010/2011

In total: 144 392 000 NOK compensation for loss of pastoral stocks to large carnivores (Rovbase)

Budget expenditures on preventive measures and conflict mitigation are approximately 68 000 000 NOK.

#### 2. Pollution control measures (Chap 1441, 1445, 1447, 1448)

- Air pollution
- Hazardous substances
- Contamination of seabed sediments
- Radioactive pollution
- Waste management
- Public purchasing regulations
- Shipping
- Climate mitigation measures
- Climate adaptation measures
- Knowledgebase
- Municipal, county and regional planning
- International agreements
- Environmental research and monitoring

#### 3. Environmental measures in the polar regions (Chap 1471, 1472, 1473, 1474)

- Norwegian Polar Institute
- Svalbard's Environmental Protection Fund
- Radioactive pollution
- High North Research Centre for Climate and the Environment (Fram Centre)

## 5. Regional budgets

### 5.1 County governor

Biodiversity related expenditures at County governor level are integrated in national budget figures as grants from the Ministry of Government Administration, Reform and Church Affairs. The table presents the County governor's expenditures on nature management and pollution control from 2006 to 2010 for personnel resources. Figures on personnel resources are estimates, based on man-year converted to expenditures. One man-year including all costs, is estimated to be 750 000 NOK in 2010. There are totally 18 County governors in Norway.

County governor	NOK (2006)	NOK (2007)	NOK (2008)	NOK (2009)	NOK (2010)
Nature management, man-years (FAD, 1510*)	175	171	173	172	176
Nature management, man-years, other funding**	16	19	22	42	50
Nature management man-years NOK (FAD 1510*)	116 194 681	117 050 312	121 940 640	125 130 000	132 075 000
Nature management, man-years NOK, other funding**	11 449 027	14 456 142	25 730 468	68 585 215	86 434 936
<b>Total nature management measures</b>	<b>127 643 708</b>	<b>131 506 454</b>	<b>147 671 108</b>	<b>193 715 215</b>	<b>218 509 936</b>
Pollution control man-years, (FAD, 1510*)	106	85	87	87	86
Pollution control man-years, other funding**	5	5	5	5	3
Pollution control man-years, fee-financed***		3	16	22	31
Pollution control man-years NOK, (FAD, 1510*)	70 380 778	58 182 904	61 393 725	63 292 500	64 500 000
Pollution control man-years in NOK, other funding**	3 319 848	3 422 524	3 528 375	3 637 500	2 250 000
Pollution control man-years in NOK, fee-financed***	Not available	2 053 514	11 290 800	16 005 000	23 250 000
<b>Total pollution control measures</b>	<b>73 700 626</b>	<b>63 658 942</b>	<b>76 212 900</b>	<b>82 935 000</b>	<b>90 000 000</b>
<b>Total nature management and pollution control measures, County governor</b>	<b>201 344 335</b>	<b>195 165 396</b>	<b>223 884 008</b>	<b>276 650 215</b>	<b>308 509 936</b>

\*Ministry of Government Administration, Reform and Church Affairs (FAD), budget chapter 1510

\*\* Funding through the Ministry of Environment

\*\*\*Personnel financed by fees related to pollution control of companies

### 5.2 County councils

According to a recent management reform, the Norwegian County councils are now responsible for water management, harvest management of game population and inland fish stocks and outdoor recreation. These tasks were allocated to the 19 County councils on January 1<sup>st</sup> 2010.

The figures are based on KOSTRA-data and include salaries, administration and measures related to biodiversity conservation work. For some of the County councils data is not available due to lack of reporting. In addition to the numbers below, some County councils have added own funding, but these figures are not available in the national reporting database (KOSTRA).

County council	NOK (2006)	NOK (2007)	NOK (2008)	NOK (2009)	NOK (2010)
0100 Østfold fylkeskommune	3 149 000	3 530 000	3 406 000	3 876 000	5 813 000
0200 Akershus fylkeskommune	3 890 000	6 056 000	8 531 000	16 469 000	8 637 000
0300 Oslo	Not reported				
0400 Hedmark fylkeskommune	Not reported	3 777 000	3 378 000	5 597 000	Not reported
0500 Oppland fylkeskommune	237 000	938 000	558 000	584 000	1 285 000
0600 Buskerud fylkeskommune	2 861 000	3 487 000	4 430 000	4 704 000	10 749 000
0700 Vestfold fylkeskommune	597 000	625 000	772 000	750 000	3 549 000
0800 Telemark fylkeskommune	686 000	495 000	1 152 000	1 110 000	2 210 000
0900 Aust-Agder fylkeskommune	550 000	548 000	715 000	819 000	3 767 000
1000 Vest-Agder fylkeskommune	495 000	663 000	1 091 000	1 785 000	1 586 000
1100 Rogaland fylkeskommune	6 294 000	7 271 000	6 912 000	6 159 000	10 914 000
1200 Hordaland fylkeskommune	2 949 000	3 054 000	3 466 000	6 125 000	10 707 000
1400 Sogn og Fjordane fylkeskommune	Not reported				
1500 Møre og Romsdal fylkeskommune	Not reported				
1600 Sør-Trøndelag fylkeskommune	560 000	753 000	1 233 000	1 600 000	905 000
1700 Nord-Trøndelag fylkeskommune	284 000	300 000	275 000	325 000	622 000
1800 Nordland fylkeskommune	Not reported	5 757 000	5 156 000	6 358 000	9 099 000
1900 Troms fylkeskommune	696 000	1 105 000	1 378 000	1 531 000	2 830 000
2000 Finnmark fylkeskommune	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	834 000
<b>Total</b>	<b>23 248 000</b>	<b>38 359 000</b>	<b>42 453 000</b>	<b>57 792 000</b>	<b>73 507 000</b>

## 6. National budget - Ministry of Agriculture and Food

The Ministry of Agriculture and Food has the main responsibility for agricultural policy in Norway and budget expenditures are mainly targeted towards management of these resources. Sustainable use and management of forest and agricultural resources are therefore primarily established to promote business activity within the sector, but may also contribute to enhance biodiversity conservation. Expenditures that directly contribute to biodiversity conservation within the sector are very hard to extract from budget figures. Measures given below are to some degree related to biodiversity conservation, but are primarily targeted towards resource management.

Environmental activities	NOK (2010)
Environmental research and innovation (includes climate, biodiversity, organic farming and marine resources, chap 1137)	115 000 000
Conservation and use of genetic resources, environmental mapping and resource registration (chap 1139)	36 000 000
Knowledge transfer and development: agri-environment and rural development (chap 1141)	68 000 000
Management of agri-environmental activities (chap 1143)	16 000 000
Annual agricultural subsidy agreement, relevant budget posts (chap 1150, see table below)	3 475 900 000
Reindeer agreement: environmental management (chap 1151)	1 000 000
Norwegian state-owned land and forest enterprise: accessibility and amenity management for public access (chap 1161)	10 000 000
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 721 900 000</b>

The figure below presents more detailed information from the annual agricultural subsidy agreement between the government and farmer's unions. Only measures that are related to biodiversity conservation are included.

Annual agricultural subsidy agreement, chapter 1150	NOK (2010)
Special agri-environmental projects: restoration of biological diversity, "SMIL" (Post 50.11)	*72 000 000
Information and development measures for environment and water quality project in Morsa (Post 50.11)	11 000 000
Selected agricultural landscapes (Post 50.11)	8 000 000
UNESCO World Heritage Areas (Post 50.11)	3 000 000
Grazing areas for geese (internationally important migratory species) (Post 50.11)	2 500 000
Organic farming subsidies (Post 74.20)	116 000 000
Agri-environmental measures (management and maintenance), "RMP" (Post 74.19)	**369 000 000
Agri-environmental base-payment (Farm environmental mapping and requirements) (Post 74.17)	3 106 900 000
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 475 900 000</b>

\*60 % of the total amount

\*\*90% of the total amount

## 7. National budget - Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs

Sustainable use and management of marine resources is mainly motivated for business purposes, but may also contribute to enhance biodiversity conservation. Funding to promote biodiversity conservation within the sectors is therefore very difficult to define. The figure is restricted to display expenditures with main focus on environmental considerations. Research related to climate and hazardous substances are reported separately as they are indirectly linked to biodiversity conservation.

Biodiversity related activities cover i.a.:

- Resource-research to promote sustainable harvesting of fish stocks (e.g. population monitoring programmes as a basis for sustainable quotas)
- Measures to prevent escapes of farmed fish and to combat infection of wild salmon from sea lice
- Mapping of marine biodiversity through different programmes
- Follow up of the Water Framework Directive
- Measures against acute pollution

Environmental activities	NOK (2010)
Biodiversity related activities	1 841 400 000
Research and monitoring of hazardous substances	76 100 000
Climate research	42 000 000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 959 500 000</b>

## 8. National budget - Ministry of Transport and Communications

Biodiversity financing from the Ministry of Transport and Communications include funding of national biodiversity mapping and monitoring programmes, measures to control and combat invasive alien species, and biodiversity related research and development programmes.

In addition, several measures against invasive alien species are a part of specific development and maintenance projects throughout the country. Expenditures related to these projects are not available, but are roughly estimated to be between 0,5 mill and 1 mill NOK nationally (numbers from the Norwegian Public Roads Administration). Lastly, biodiversity measures are also incorporated in individual development projects, but quantifying these would not be feasible.

<b>Environmental activities</b>	<b>NOK (2012)</b>
Mapping and monitoring of biodiversity	3 000 000
Measures against invasive alien species	500 000
Research and development	1 150 000
<b>Total</b>	<b>4 650 000*</b>

\*3,00 mill NOK and 1,65 mill NOK from the Norwegian Public Roads Administration ("Statens Vegvesen") and the Norwegian Railway Network Administration ("Jernbaneverket") respectively.

#### 9. National budget - Ministry of Defence

The Ministry of Defence has many operations in natural areas which might be harmful to biodiversity. Activities listed below are mostly mitigation measures to prevent further damage on biodiversity. In the figure activities that both directly and indirectly (mitigation), promote biodiversity conservation are included.

Below examples of activities for each category is presented:

##### Biodiversity conservation and outdoor recreation

- Mapping and monitoring of biodiversity
- Management and environmental measures in military training fields
- Measures to prevent ground and vegetation damage from military vehicles.
- Measures related to the establishment of a large military training field in Eastern Norway ("Regionfelt Østlandet")

##### Clean oceans and freshwater, non-toxic environment

- Environmental measures related to run-off from airports
- Cleanup in harbours and naval bases of contaminated seabed sediments with substances that are hazardous to health or the environment
- Management and environmental measures in military training fields
- Restoration of disused military training fields and other properties that will be realized for civil purposes

##### Research and development

- Environmental effects of the use of ammunition
- Restoration of disused military training fields in peatlands
- Low frequency sonar and effect on marine environment
- Development of leadless ammunition

<b>Environmental activities</b>	<b>NOK (2010)</b>
Biodiversity conservation and outdoor recreation	24 800 000
Clean oceans and freshwater, non-toxic environment	131 804 000
Research and development	17 242 000
<b>Total</b>	<b>173 846 000</b>

#### 10. Official Development Assistance (ODA)

Reporting on Norwegian development assistance follows the OECD-DAC system. With the DAC-marker biodiversity some figures can be provided. Referring to the template, Norway provides figures for 1.1 ODA, category A and B. With regard to category C and D, figures are not presented as the OECD-DAC system is not providing this type of information. Figures for 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 are not available (not ODA).

The Norwegian reporting on ODA is focusing on expenditure in which biodiversity is the main or significant objective (as compared to the other sectors in which other indirect expenditures are included as well).

Norad, the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, has developed a system, "Norwegian Aid Statistics", which gives easy access to all official statistics about Norwegian development assistance from 1960 until today. Biodiversity is however not a specific search criteria in this system. <http://www.norad.no/en/tools-and-publications/norwegian-aid-statistics>

For the Norwegian Government's Forest and Climate Initiative, see chapter 11.

The table presents Norwegian official development assistance in support of biodiversity from 2006 to 2010 (NOK 1000).

		1000 NOK 2006	1000 NOK 2007	1000 NOK 2008	1000 NOK 2009	1000 NOK 2010	1000 NOK Average 2006-2010
<b>Bilateral<sup>1</sup></b>	Biodiversity protection <sup>3</sup>	63 020	98 594	95 630	81 017	98 882	87 429
	Policy development and administration <sup>4</sup>	128 516	209 441	262 905	316 975	300 868	243 741
<b>Multilateral<sup>2</sup></b>	Biodiversity protection <sup>3</sup>	18 262	41 179	48 547	58 141	78 151	48 856
	Policy development and administration <sup>4</sup>	192 452	141 187	184 936	250 663	110 671	175 982
<b>Total</b>		<b>402 250</b>	<b>490 402</b>	<b>592 017</b>	<b>706 797</b>	<b>588 572</b>	<b>556 008</b>
Other bilateral ODA to biodiversity not included above <sup>5</sup>	Policy marker biodiversity Main objective	61 480	101 231	99 098	83 258	70 709	83 155
	Policy marker biodiversity Significant objective	78 735	65 940	88 216	213 222	141 189	117 461
Other multilateral ODA to biodiversity not included above <sup>5</sup>	Policy marker biodiversity Main objective	2 000	4 000	7 500	10 538	10 860	6 980
	Policy marker biodiversity Significant objective	22 825	53 097	93 224	101 879	118 192	77 844
<b>Total other ODA to biodiversity</b>		<b>165 041</b>	<b>224 269</b>	<b>288 038</b>	<b>408 896</b>	<b>340 950</b>	<b>285 439</b>
<b>Total ODA in support of biodiversity</b>		<b>567 291</b>	<b>714 671</b>	<b>880 056</b>	<b>1 115 693</b>	<b>929 523</b>	<b>841 447</b>

\*)Excluding chapter post 166.73 - climate and forest initiative

1) All bilateral ODA, including where agreement partners are governments/public, NGOs or private

2) ODA through multilateral organisations, does not include core support to such organizations

3) Includes DAC sectors 410.20, 410.30 and 410.40

4) DAC sector 410.10

5) Based on the Policy-marker bio-diversity, but excluding DAC sectors 410.10, 410.20, 410.30 and 410.40

## 11. The Norwegian Government's International Climate and Forest Initiative

The International Climate and Forest Initiative's budget for 2010 totaled **2 714 597 808 NOK** (approximately 452 million USD). The aim of the funding is to support reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (REDD+). The funds support efforts to improve conditions for the world's biodiversity both directly and indirectly.

The objectives of the initiative are to:

1. Contribute to the inclusion of "REDD+" – reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from forests in developing countries – under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).
2. To contribute to early actions for measurable emission reductions from deforestation and forest degradation.
3. To promote the conservation of primary forests, due to their particular importance as carbon stores, and for their biological diversity.

As an overarching goal, all these efforts should promote sustainable development and the reduction of poverty.

As tropical forests are among the most biodiversity rich ecosystems on the planet, and because carbon stocks and biodiversity often correlate in these ecosystems, the 452 million USD budget (in 2010) of the Climate and Forest Initiative is the single most significant Norwegian contribution for biodiversity conservation. However, as the initiative works on several levels, and with focus on the broad aspect of reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation, it is hard to estimate how much of the total that benefits biodiversity.

Below is a list of examples demonstrating *some* of the ways the Norwegian Government's International Climate and Forest Initiative contributes to preserving biodiversity.

- The secretariat of CBD has received financing to explore relationships between REDD+ and biodiversity, develop indicators, newsletter etc.
- Norway is the largest donor to the UN-REDD Programme. One of the 6 work areas of the UN-REDD Program, led by UNEP, is ensuring multiple benefits from REDD+. The UN-REDD program has received support to develop tools for how biodiversity considerations can be integrated into national plans for REDD+, for workshops and reports on multiple benefits (and specifically on biodiversity benefits) from REDD+.
- Norway has also been one of the most outspoken supporters of a robust regime for both social and environmental safeguards, such as the preservation of natural forests, in the discussions under the UNFCCC.

- Norway supports the UN-REDD program and the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), where both environmental and social issues are important parts of national plans being developed, such as designing an information system for multiple benefits, other impacts, governance, and safeguards
- Biodiversity is emphasized in Norway's bilateral agreements with several countries in the tropics. Examples of this include:
  - Guyana: In the Joint Concept Note (JCN) between Guyana and Norway, Guyana agrees to several biodiversity relevant elements including, but not limited to, establishing a system for identifying priority areas for biodiversity within its forests, and to develop policies for best practices to be used by concession holders etc.
  - Brazil: Biodiversity is highlighted as a main goal of the Brazilian-Norwegian cooperation. For a project to be eligible for support from the Amazon Fund, it must fall in one of seven categories – one of these is "Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity".

## **12. EEA Grants and Norway Grants**

The EEA Grants and Norway Grants were established in connection with the historic enlargement of the European Union and European Economic Area in 2004. Norway provides funding for social and economic development projects in Central and Southern Europe both through the EEA Grants and the Norway Grants. Environment, including biodiversity, is one main topic in this system.

The grant system is split into 5 year periods. For the period 2009-2014, the EEA Grants amounts to €1.79 billion. Norway contributes around 97% of the total funding. 36% of total grants is allocated to environmental and climate change programmes. Programmes with biodiversity as a main component is about € 70 million, about half of the environmental programmes (marine and inland water management, biodiversity, monitoring and planning/control, reduction of hazardous substances). In addition, biodiversity relevant activities are covered by NGO-funds, research funds and adaptation to climate change.

**EUROPEAN UNION AND MEMBER STATES, RECEIVED ON 6 JULY 2012**

**EU submission to the CBD notification 2012-023 on Methodological and Implementation Guidance for the 'Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Convention's Strategy for resources Mobilization'.  
6 July 2012**

*The submission for this Notification has a mixed format. The common EU chapeau contains the EU views and general statements, followed by individual inputs from Member States.*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The EU and its Member States are committed to providing robust information on mobilisation of resources within the EU to the extent that is possible. We believe this is important information for all Parties to provide to support the discussion on resource mobilisation in Hyderabad.

This submission addresses both contributions from the EU budget and from individual EU Member States. Information on the national budgets of several Member States is included in annex. EU Member States have their own internal methodology for accounting resources. In addition, using the 2006-2010 yearly average has not always been possible at national level, and the years or periods of years chosen for reporting differ across countries depending on data availability. This makes it difficult to compile and compare the data. As many details as possible are provided on each methodology for the sake of transparency and to account for possible differences. These issues might be addressed through further iterations of this process. The EU stresses that continued efforts will be made to further refine accounting methods, using the guidance of the CBD decisions as well as the on-going work on the utilisation of OECD-DAC indicators and Rio-markers.

The Rio marker, including the marker on biodiversity, are qualitative and intended to help the monitoring the aid targeting the objectives of the CBD. Given that the common guidelines for the methodology to account for the quantitative amounts for biodiversity support is are still to be developed, the data provided might still be difficult to be compared. The development of methodological guidance, in accordance with the invitation made to the OECD/DAC by paragraph 12 of Decision X/3 of the CBD, would be needed in order to ensure solid and robust information on biodiversity-related ODA.

Quality and guidelines for reporting biodiversity-related ODA have improved since 2006.

## **2. EU BUDGET**

This part of the submission focuses on resources within the EU budget. Identifying biodiversity-related expenses is only possible to a limited extent in the current financing framework (2007-2013), and the figures provided below have therefore a low level of confidence. This should be seen as a first attempt to apply the Preliminary Reporting Framework, to be improved in future exercises. The European Commission is planning to develop a methodology to track biodiversity-related expenses in the next EU budget (2014-2020), which will help improve estimates and provide more consistency.

## 1. International Flows of Financial resources

International Flows of Financial resources at EU level mainly related to ODA, which is the focus of this section.

### ODA from the EU budget

It was not possible to distinguish between categories A, B, C and D at this stage, nor to differentiate between bilateral and multilateral ODA as there is no marker for this in the EU or OECD database. The table below therefore reports a single figure for ODA per year.

The European Commission tags systematically its contribution to biodiversity with the OECD DAC Rio markers in all its external financial instruments since 2008. To avoid overestimation of the financial support for meeting the obligations of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the European Commission applies a fixed adjustment factor to account for activities that are only partially relevant to the objectives of the CBD. Only 40% of the allocated budget is accounted if biodiversity conservation is only a significant objective (i.e. Rio Marker 1) whereas 100% is accounted if biodiversity is a principal objective (i.e. Rio Marker 2). This method also applies for climate finance. The figures below have been calculated following this methodology.

EU institutions	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Average 2007-2010
1	-	61	64	187	162	
2	-	72	95	59	98	
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>134</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>199</b>

**EU's institutions biodiversity-related Official Development Assistance, 2006-2010 adjusted deflators (Commitments, EUR million at constant 2010 prices) Source: OECD DAC/CRS.**

## 2. Information on the availability of financial resources in each country

The submissions of each EU Member State are included in annex. They follow the structure of the preliminary reporting framework (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add.1).

The information used in this table is mostly taken from the commitments made in the 2007-2013 EU budget, averaged over one year. This is taken as a reasonable approximation of yearly average expenditure over the period 2006-2010. Most of the EU funds do not finance the total envelope of projects and EU Member States also provide co-financing. While the table presented here only covers spending at EU level and excludes national level biodiversity spending, it is important to note that when aggregating funding from the EU budget and from EU Member States, there is therefore a risk of double counting. Reporting in the annexes has to the extent possible concentrated on national co-financing to limit this risk.

Year: average 2006-2010		Currency: Euro (unit: million EUR)											
Source: EU budget commitments		Activity categories		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable prod. and consumption		Total	
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1 Government budgets	Central	597.4	low	29.3	low	6371.1	low	14880.2	low	21878.0	low		
	State/Provincial												
	Local/Municipal												
2.2 Private/Markets													
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, academia)													
<b>Total:</b>		<b>597.4</b>		<b>29.3</b>		<b>6371.1</b>		<b>14880.2</b>		<b>21878.0</b>			
<p>Comments: yearly average of commitments 2007-2013 taken as an estimate of average for 2006-2010.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Category A includes EAFRD Natura 2000 payments (84.3); EFF payments for 'protection of aquatic flora and fauna'; Category 51 'Promotion of biodiversity and Nature protection' from ERDF and CF (384); LIFE+ Nature and Biodiversity (119.5). This is likely to be a strong underestimate of total expenses directly related to biodiversity, but these are currently difficult to track in the EU budget.</li> <li>- Category B includes FP6 and FP7 spending on biodiversity-related research projects (yearly average 2006-2010). Other funds provide funding for developing biodiversity management plans (e.g. EARDF, axis3), which are not included here.</li> <li>- Category C includes EARDF agri-environment (3200) and forest-environment payments (2800) - EAFRD non productive investments also have some biodiversity impacts but the proportion is difficult to estimate and therefore not included; CF and ERDF category 55 "Promotion of natural assets" (162) and 56 "Protection and development of natural heritage" (201); EFF aqua-environmental measures (8.1) - EFF is contributing more widely to mainstreaming biodiversity in fisheries management, but quantitative data are only available at MS level.</li> <li>- Category D includes CF and ERDF for direct (water treatment, etc.: 5900) and indirect (e.g. developing green transport, sustainable energy and urban rehabilitation: 8571.4) environmental investments; LIFE+ environment projects other than biodiversity and nature (408.8); The Common Agricultural Policy also contributes through pillar 1 (not included here) through compulsory cross compliance, including good agricultural and environment condition (GAEC) on avoiding the deterioration of habitats. Some EARDF measures on training, advisory services are also related to biodiversity. The ESF also contributes through promoting employment and better prepared workforce for biodiversity protection. The EFF also supports schemes for diversification of activities, which could include biodiversity protection.</li> </ul> <p>EARDF: European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development; EFF: European Fisheries Fund; CF: Cohesion Fund; ERDF: European Regional Development Fund; ESF: European Social Fund; FP6 and FP7: 6th and 7th Research Framework Programme</p>													

Table 2: Resources for financing domestic biodiversity within the EU budget

For many EU financing instruments, and national Member States budgets, it is difficult to distinguish within budget lines what is specifically targeting biodiversity protection. Therefore only the budget lines which are clearly targeted to biodiversity protection (e.g. Natura 2000) have been included in category A. As other budget lines also contribute to biodiversity protection, but not in totality, the amounts in category A in particular are likely to be significantly underestimated.

The outcome of this exercise and the reporting from Member States in annex shows that the reporting framework needs to be further developed based on the experience of the first round.

### 3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	Yes	2008 - 2010	EC contribution to TEEB	TEEB Reports
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps, and funding priorities	Yes	Ongoing		Preliminary estimations in EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020; further assessment ongoing.
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	Yes	2009-2011		Resource mobilisation sections of EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 adopted on 11 May 2011; biodiversity considerations integrated in European Commission Proposals for 2014-2020 budget
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies				
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	Yes	2010-2011		Biodiversity considerations integrated in European Commission Proposals for 2014-2020 budget
<b>Comments: see</b> <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/comm2006/pdf/2020/1_EN_ACT_part1_v7%5B1%5D.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/comm2006/pdf/2020/1_EN_ACT_part1_v7%5B1%5D.pdf</a>				

### 4. Information on specific issues related to Resource availability.

#### 4.1 Technical cooperation, capacity building and south-south cooperation

These figures have been included in section 1.

#### 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies

Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out		
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced		

**Comments:** The last reform of the Common Agricultural Policy, and the current reforms of the Common Agricultural Policy and the Common Fisheries Policy aim at reducing support which has a negative environmental impact, whilst rewarding practices that deliver public goods, including biodiversity. It is however very difficult to estimate values associated with these reforms. Important efforts are being made as well at national level by EU Member States and are reported in the annexes attached to this submission.

#### 4.3 New and innovative financing mechanisms

Year:	Currency:		
Type of Initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
<p>Comments: Innovative financing mechanisms are being explored at EU level. The next financial budget will include financial instruments which may apply to biodiversity, and innovative financing mechanisms such as payments for ecosystem services and biodiversity offsets are being explored in the context of policy initiatives such as a Green Infrastructure strategy and a No Net Loss initiative. Important efforts are being made as well at national level by EU Member States and are reported in the annexes attached to this submission.</p>			

#### 4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
<p>Comments: Under development</p>	

#### Identification of respondent:

Country: European Union	Name of respondent: Laure Ledoux
Please indicate of whose behalf this is being completed:	Focal point for resource mobilization
Title and department of respondent:	Policy Officer, Unit B2 - Biodiversity, DG Environment, European Commission
Organization of respondent:	European Commission
Email address:	<a href="mailto:Laure.Ledoux@ec.europa.eu">Laure.Ledoux@ec.europa.eu</a>
Telephone contact:	+32 229 57384
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	01/07/2012

### 3. NATIONAL SUBMISSIONS BY EU MEMBER STATES

See individual submissions in annex.



BELGIUM IN THE EU SUBMISSION

## **SUBMISSION BY BELGIUM TO THE CBD NOTIFICATION 2012-23 ON THE METHODOLOGICAL AND IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE FOR THE “INDICATORS FOR MONITORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION’S STRATEGY FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION”**

### **Identification of respondent**

<b>Country: Belgium</b>	<b>Name of respondent: Els Van de Velde</b>
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focal point for resource mobilization <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify
Title and Department of respondent:	Advisor International Environmental Policy Environment, Nature and Energy Department
Organization of respondent:	Flemish government
Email address:	Els.vandavelde@lne.vlaanderen.be
Telephone contact:	+32 2 553 81 76 +32 499 86 52 91
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	

### **Introduction**

**Belgium provided data for the year 2010, where possible. In some cases we provided data for the period 2006-2010. We provided the figures in EURO. Belgium did not use the categorization of biodiversity activities.**

The implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity is carried out by the federal government, the regions and communities (Flemish, Brussels-Capital and Walloon) and the local authorities (provinces and municipalities).

The regions are in charge of territorial matters. They have therefore the greatest amount of responsibilities on biodiversity-related issues: nature conservation, forest management, agriculture, exploitation of natural resources, land use and spatial planning, hunting, fisheries, etc. They are also in charge of tourism, which is a competence that has been delegated to them by the communities.

The Federal government is more specifically involved in the international dimension, the external relations and in matters related to the North Sea. It is the Federal government that undertakes the follow-up of trade in threatened species and that takes measures relating to the trade of exotic species.

The Communities take care of issues linked to culture, research, education and public awareness. The Regions and the Federal government can also raise public awareness in their own fields of competence.

The provinces and the municipalities play an important role at the local level, in accordance with regional policy.

<b>Information on international flows for biodiversity</b>	
ODA Bilateral	<p><b>17.520.219€in 2010</b></p> <p>Information is available on ODA-dBase (public). Calculation has been done on the basis of the CRS-system (Credit Reporting System, OECD/DAC), where weighing factors per sub-sector are applied. The sum of the weighing factors for climate change, biodiversity and desertification never exceeds the 100%. Thereafter a manual control has been imposed and corrections done. Bilateral includes the indirect sector (NGO's, universities, institutes...), not the private sector.</p>
ODA Multilateral	<p><b>28.267.882€in 2010</b></p> <p>Information is available on ODA-dBase (public). Calculation has been done on the basis of the CRS-system (Credit Reporting System, OECD/DAC), where weighing factors per sub-sector are applied. The sum of the weighing factors for climate change, biodiversity and desertification never exceeds the 100%. Thereafter a manual control has been imposed and corrections done (eg. for GEF and other multilateral agencies). Multilateral does not include the transfers to the EU (European Union).</p>
Other public funds	This information is not automatically available on our ODA-dBase. BE is working on this to include these figures in the general dBase.
Private/Market	Notavailable.
Notforprofitorganizations	Part of this is included in ODA Bilateral. Other information is not available.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>45.788.101 € in 2010</b>
<b>Comments</b>	<p><b>Division by sector/type :</b></p> <p>The main sectors where biodiversity is a major concern are: agriculture (30%), water (14%), forestry(10%), environment (31%)and multisectoralprogrammes(14%).</p> <p>The bilateral part is divided in governmental activities (16%) and activities from non-governmental actors (NGA'S) (22%). The multilateral activities comprise 62% of the Belgian efforts for biodiversity.</p>

<b>Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country</b>	
<b>Government budgets</b>	
Central level	<p><b>Directorate General for Development (DGD)</b> is a part of the Federal Public Service (FPS) Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation. <b>428.882 € in 2010</b></p> <p>This amount includes: overhead costs (missions and evaluations) and rough salary estimates.</p>
Central level	<p><b>The Federal Public Service Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment</b> <b>4.325.750 € in 2010</b></p> <p>This amount reflects the contribution of the FPS to the implementation of</p>

	<p>CITES, the Cartagena Protocol and the CBD, in particular for the marine environment. It covers mainly rough salary estimates, subsidies, studies and working expenses. Mission costs were not included.</p>
Central level	<p><b>Belgian Federal Science Policy Office (BELSPO)</b> is a government institution responsible for coordinating science policy at a federal level. <b>32.270.000 € for the period 2006-2010</b></p> <p>This amount includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- amounts of money (rough estimates) allocated to 9 projects carried out within the framework of the STEREOII programme "support to exploitation and research in Earth Observation data (using remote sensing techniques)" during the period 2006-2010. Projects mainly deal with Ecosystem Services (ES) and habitats monitoring and classification or aim at providing scientific support tools to Ecosystem Services management.</li> <li>- amount of money allocated to 11 research projects in the framework of the programme "a Science for sustainable management" during the period 2006-2010. The projects aim at providing scientific support to BD management policies.</li> <li>- BCCM : Belgian coordinated collection of microorganisms (2006-2010)</li> <li>- Belgian Biodiversity platform (2006-2010)</li> </ul>
Central level	<p><b>The Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences (RBINS):4.335.815 € in 2010.</b></p> <p>The RBINS is one of the 10 scientific institutions of the federal government. It hosts the national Museum of natural history and is National Focal Point to the CBD. The amount provided for 2010 corresponds to 'research' and 'scientific service' projects related to biodiversity and ecosystems.</p> <p>What is included in the total:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- salaries, equipment and functioning of research and expertise projects for which, as far as we know, have not been taken into account elsewhere.</li> <li>- functioning of the National Focal Point to the CBD (except for the capacity building aspects sponsored by the Belgian Development Cooperation, which are included in amounts mentioned by DGD).</li> </ul> <p>What is not included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- subsidies coming from federal and regional administrations in Belgium and coming from European and international sources for which we are sure they have been taken into account elsewhere (e.g. projects sponsored by the Belgian Development Cooperation, by BELSPO or by the regional administrations and covered by the programmes mentioned above or below).</li> <li>- activities of the Museum, educational and public awareness activities.</li> </ul>
Regional level	<p><b>Flemish region:132.858.164€ in 2010</b></p> <p>At this point in time data is only available from the Environment, Nature and Energy Policy Area. This includes data from the Environment, Nature and Energy Department (LNE) and the 3 agencies: the Agency for Nature and Forests (ANB), Institute for Nature and Forest Research (INBO) and the Flemish Land Company (VLM).</p>
Regional level	<p><b>Walloon region:60.244.834,47 € in 2010</b></p> <p>This includes budgets related to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in the different activities of the Directorate General for Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment (D GARNE) and the Walloon Air and Climate Agency (AWAC), including the staff. This includes, in addition to the nature budget, part of the budget dedicated to the management of forest, watercourses, hunting, fisheries, waste..., but also part of the budget for policy</p>

	areas such as air, climate and agriculture.
Regional level	<b>Brussels region: 1.088.000 € in 2012</b> (could serve as estimate for 2010) This includes budgets related to biodiversity conservation, forest and nature reserves management, staff not included.
Local level: Provinces and municipalities	Not available
<b>Private/market</b>	Not available
<b>NGO</b>	Not available
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>209 745 445,47 in 2010</b>
<b>Comments</b>	To calculate the total amount for 2010 only 1/5th of the BELSPO budget was taken into account.

<b>Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization</b>	
Assessment of values of biodiversity	<p><b>Belgian Federal Science Policy Office (BELSPO)</b> BEES project : Belgium Ecosystem Services - A new vision for society-nature interactions (2010-2012). (100.000 €) <i>Objectives:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bring together key scientists, policy makers and organizations that are either already involved with Ecosystem Services (ES) research or who might catalyze the ES research.</li> <li>- Make an inventory of the ES expertise</li> <li>- Obtain an overview of ES related research in Belgium and bring forward a methodology that could be used as a basis for an ecosystem assessment of Belgium.</li> <li>- Evaluate the opportunity to establish a “virtual” research institute on ES research in Belgium, covering the necessary expertise to contribute to large international research initiatives.</li> <li>- Formulate recommendations for scientific programs and policy objectives.</li> </ul> <p>Support of several research projects aimed at providing tools for assessing the values of biodiversity and ecosystems services (2010-2012)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BIOSERF (800.000 €) <a href="http://www.belspo.be/belspo/SSD/science/projects/BIOSERF_EN.pdf">http://www.belspo.be/belspo/SSD/science/projects/BIOSERF_EN.pdf</a></li> <li>- ECOFRESH (350.000 €) <a href="http://www.belspo.be/belspo/SSD/science/projects/ECOFRESH.E.pdf">http://www.belspo.be/belspo/SSD/science/projects/ECOFRESH.E.pdf</a></li> <li>- VOTES (350.000 €) <a href="http://www.belspo.be/belspo/fedra/proj.asp?l=en&amp;COD=SD/TE/05A">http://www.belspo.be/belspo/fedra/proj.asp?l=en&amp;COD=SD/TE/05A</a></li> <li>- INVALUABLE ( EU biodivERsA project) (100.000 €) <a href="http://www.biodiversa.org/118">http://www.biodiversa.org/118</a></li> <li>- smallFOREST ( EU biodivERsA project) (100.000 €) <a href="http://www.biodiversa.org/119">http://www.biodiversa.org/119</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Studies on assessments Flanders:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Ecosysteemdiensten in Vlaanderen: Een verkennende inventarisatie van ecosysteemdiensten en potentiële ecosysteemwinsten”. The study describes the main ecosystems and their services in Flanders and gives a first mapping and inventory of the potential benefits and of 5 site specific pilot projects.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- De handleiding “Economischewaardering van ecosysteemdiensten”: a guideline for economic valuation of ecosystem services – a social cost-benefits analysis of development projects.</li> <li>- On-line system for assessing nature values: an instrument to quantify and value the main ecosystem services for the assessment of projects with an impact on nature.</li> <li>- feasibility study for the development of a TEEB report for Flanders (ongoing).</li> </ul>
Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	/
Development of national financial plans for biodiversity( refer to financial plans developed as part of national biodiversity strategies and action plans)	/
Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	The Federal Public Services Public Health, Security of the Food Chain and Environment, the Belgian Development Cooperation and the Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences undertake since 2010 activities for the mainstreaming of biodiversity into policies and programmes of the federal government. These activities include the training of civil servants on understanding the critical role played by biodiversity and ecosystem services in their fields of activities.
Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services innational budgets	/

**4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability**

<b>4.1 Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation</b>	
North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided	<p>See ODA. Most of the ODA-activities contain components of capacity building (CB) and/or technology transfer (TT). <b>For the moment it's not possible to calculate the total part on CB and TT.</b></p> <p>The Belgian Development Cooperation sponsors a programme by the Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences to build capacities in the field of biodiversity and ecosystem services. This includes support to research institutions as well as to National Focal Points (CBD, CHM, GTI) in developing countries. <b>855.089 € in 2010</b></p>
Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity building through triangular cooperation	This kind of cooperation is not well developed in the Belgian Development Cooperation. Planning in the future could be considered.

<b>4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies</b>	
Removed, reformed or phased-out	Not available.
Positive incentives introduced	Not available.
<p><b>Flanders</b> – positive incentives and subsidies: with the view to enhance and support participation by NGO's and private land owners in the conservation and management of Natura 2000, a review of the existing financial instruments was carried out. The goal is to adapt mechanisms and develop new instruments. As this process is ongoing, values are not yet defined.</p>	

<b>New and innovative financial mechanism</b>
<p>In the future the new service of <b>Directorate General for Development</b> (inclusive growth) will provide the necessary follow-up. Until now the only kind of activities in this field consisted in the participation in workshops and conferences.</p>

<b>Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention</b>
Not available.

BULGARIA IN THE EU SUBMISSION

**PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK**

**Identification of respondent**

**Please complete the following table:**

Country: Bulgaria	Name of respondent: Ministry of Environment and Water (MOEW)
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed: Stoyan Vergiev	<input type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input type="checkbox"/> Focal point for resource mobilization <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify: Public servant
Title and Department of respondent:	National Nature Protection Service – Directorate (NNPS)
Organization of respondent:	MOEW
Email address:	<a href="mailto:stojan_ver@moew.government.bg">stojan_ver@moew.government.bg</a>
Telephone contact:	+3592 940 61 09
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	20.06.2012

**1. Information on International Flows of Financial Resources**

This section of the Framework relates to the flows of financial resources from all sources to developing countries.

For **developed countries** (members of OECD-DAC): **Please indicate the amount of resources provided in support of biodiversity in developing countries through ODA, other public funds, private/market mechanisms and through not-for profit organizations.** For **developing countries** (countries, not members of OECD -DAC): **Please indicate the amount of resources received from external sources through ODA, other public funds, private/market mechanisms and through not-for profit organizations.**

For each of the expenditure sources listed please indicate the total amount of financial resources spent as well as an assessment of your confidence in the estimated amount (high, medium low; alternatively provide a range of estimates). ***Please take care to avoid double counting; expenditure included in one row of the table should not also be included in another.*** You may indicate expenditures according to the four categories, or provide an estimate of the total without categorization. A list of indicative activities for each of the four categories is provided in section 5. Please provide data for multiple years if possible (duplicate the table as necessary).

Year: 2011		Currency: USD											
Type of financial flows		Activity categories <sup>1</sup>								Total			
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management.		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption					
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence		
1.1 Official Development Assistance <sup>2</sup>	1.1.1 Bilateral <sup>3</sup>			50136	medium								
	1.1.2 Multilateral <sup>4</sup>												
1.2 Other public funds <sup>5</sup>													
1.3 Private/ Market <sup>6</sup>													
1.4 Not for profit organizations													
Total:												50136	low

Comments: The financial support is provided d by programme Short term financing of European Commission for realization of Project Bulgarian contribution to Short term financing 2011-2012: Assistance for capacity building in former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for realization of monitoring, reporting and verification of emissions of hothouse gasses.

**2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country**

This section of the Framework relates to the financial resources available to implement the Convention and its Strategic Plan in your country. It relates specifically to the end use of financial resources regardless of whether the source of the funds is domestic or external.

**Please indicate the financial support to domestic activities intended to achieve the objectives of this Convention from all sources.** For each of the expenditure sources listed please indicate the total amount of financial resources spent as well as an assessment of your confidence in the estimated amount (high, medium low; alternatively provide a range of estimates). You may indicate expenditures according to the four categories, or provide an estimate of the total without

<sup>1</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>2</sup> **Official Development Assistance (ODA)** refers to flows of official financing administered with the purpose of promoting economic development and welfare of developing countries as the main objective, and which are concessional in character with a grant element of at least 25 per cent (using a fixed 10 per cent rate of discount). ODA can be bilateral or multilateral. Where resources are provided or received for general budget support rather than for specific activities, an estimate of resources provided/received for biodiversity may be calculated from the proportion of the recipient country's budget devoted to such activities.

<sup>3</sup> **Bilateral ODA** refers to contributions of donor government agencies, at all levels, to developing countries

<sup>4</sup> **Multilateral ODA** refers to funds provided through international financial institutions such as the Global Environment Facility, the World Bank and United Nations funds and programmes.

<sup>5</sup> This category includes **non-ODA public funding**, also called "other official flows" (OOFs), which refers to transactions by the official sector with countries on the List of Aid Recipients which do not meet the conditions for eligibility as Official Development Assistance. The category also includes resources provided from other "non-donor" countries i.e. through "South-South Cooperation".

<sup>6</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transaction mediated through a market.

categorization. A list of indicative activities for each of the four categories is provided in section 5. Please provide data for multiple years if possible (duplicate the table as necessary).

*Please take care to avoid double counting; expenditure included in one row of the table should not also be included in another. As this question specifically relates to domestic expenditures if you are representing a developed country (members of OECD-DAC) please do not include any funding provided to other countries. However, if you are representing a developing country (not a members of OECD -DAC) please include the money received from other countries.*

Year: 2006		Currency: USD									
Source		Activity categories <sup>7</sup>								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets <sup>8</sup>	2.1.1 Central	207449	low			13862501	low	59698	low	14129648	low
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal										
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>9</sup>											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>10</sup>											
<b>Total:</b>										14129648	low
<b>Comments:</b>											

<sup>7</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>8</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for “central” and for “local/municipal”. When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>9</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>10</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.

Year: 2007		Currency: USD									
Source		Activity categories <sup>11</sup>								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets <sup>12</sup>	2.1.1 Central	646529	medium	3726491	medium	15343708	medium	414791	medium	20131519	medium
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal										
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>13</sup>											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>14</sup>											
<b>Total:</b>										20131519	low
<b>Comments: В следващите табл. - също</b>											

<sup>11</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>12</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for “central” and for “local/municipal”. When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>13</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>14</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.

Year: 2008		Currency: USD									
Source		Activity categories <sup>15</sup>								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets <sup>16</sup>	2.1.1 Central	716096	medium	9086217	medium	21275527	medium	575197	medium	31653037	medium
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal										
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>17</sup>											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>18</sup>											
<b>Total:</b>										31653037	low
<b>Comments:</b>											

<sup>15</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>16</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for “central” and for “local/municipal”. When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>17</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>18</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.

Year: 2009		Currency: USD									
Source		Activity categories <sup>19</sup>								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets <sup>20</sup>	2.1.1 Central	784455	medium	2948401	medium	162906412	medium	548249	medium	20571746	medium
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal										
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>21</sup>											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>22</sup>											
<b>Total:</b>										20571746	low
<b>Comments:</b>											

<sup>19</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>20</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for “central” and for “local/municipal”. When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>21</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>22</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.

Year: 2010		Currency: USD									
Source		Activity categories <sup>23</sup>								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets <sup>24</sup>	2.1.1 Central	506577	medium	3239389	medium	10632796	medium	398365	medium	14777127	medium
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal										
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>25</sup>											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>26</sup>											
<b>Total:</b>										14777127	low
<b>Comments:</b>											

<sup>23</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>24</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for “central” and for “local/municipal”. When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>25</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>26</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.

Year: 2011		Currency: USD									
Source		Activity categories <sup>27</sup>								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets <sup>28</sup>	2.1.1 Central	606371	medium	3019612	medium	4852094	medium	460548	medium	8938625	medium
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal										
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>29</sup>											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>30</sup>											
<b>Total:</b>										8938625	low
<b>Comments:</b>											

<sup>27</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>28</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for “central” and for “local/municipal”. When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>29</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>30</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.

**3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization**

This section of the Framework addresses initiatives which are important in enabling access to financial resources for biodiversity activities. The information sought in this section does not require response in monetary units.

**Please indicate whether your country has undertaken any of the following steps to enable implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization and provide additional information as appropriate.**

If your country has undertaken any of the activities below please indicate the results which have been achieved if possible. If you are representing a developing country (not a member of the OECD -DAC) please also indicate whether external funding and/or capacity building support was received by your country to undertake the initiatives (if applicable). Please also indicate the results and year initiated and completed (where applicable).

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity <sup>31</sup>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities <sup>32</sup>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity <sup>33</sup>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies <sup>34</sup>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets <sup>35</sup>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
<b>Comments:</b>				

**4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability**

This section of the Framework contains questions related to several specific issues including: technical cooperation; South-South cooperation; innovative financial mechanisms; and access and benefit sharing.

<sup>31</sup> Assessments of the values of biodiversity and ecosystem services comprise assessments at the national, local and/or project levels, which may be undertaken by national or international experts, to estimate the value of biodiversity.

<sup>32</sup> Funding needs, gaps and priorities are identified and reported at the national level, on the basis of the Convention and is often part of a national biodiversity strategy and action plan process.

<sup>33</sup> National financial plans for biodiversity refer to financial plans developed as part of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

<sup>34</sup> Development plans and strategies may take various forms in different countries, such as national poverty reduction strategies or national sustainability strategies.

<sup>35</sup> A **national budget** which integrates biodiversity considerations would normally contain a section or paragraph dealing with biodiversity.

**4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation**

For ***developed countries*** (members of OECD -DAC): **Please indicate the number and value of technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives in support of biodiversity that are financed by your country as well as support to South-South cooperation through triangular cooperation.** As far as is possible, please include the amount of resources provided through ODA, other public funds, private/market mechanisms and through non-for profit organizations.<sup>36</sup> You may also provide a description of the types of initiatives supported.

Year:

Currency:

Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided <sup>37</sup>				
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity-building through triangular cooperation <sup>38</sup>				
<b>Comments:</b>				

For ***developing countries*** (countries, not members of OECD -DAC): **please indicate the number of technical cooperation and capacity building initiatives that support biodiversity from which you have received resources and the numbers of initiatives that have been financed by your country.** Please indicate the number of initiatives and the amount of resources made available. Please also provide a description of the types of initiatives supported.

Year:

Currency:

Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.3 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building received <sup>15</sup>				
4.1.4 South-South technical cooperation & capacity building received from other developing countries <sup>39</sup>				
4.1.5 South-South technical cooperation and capacity building - Provided <sup>17</sup>				
<b>Comments:</b>				

**4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies**

<sup>36</sup> Note that your response to section 2 would already include such resources within the totals provided; this question is intended to elucidate specific information for indicators (8) and (9) of decision X/3.

<sup>37</sup> **North-south technical cooperation** and capacity-building initiatives are those in which resources and/or expertise are provided by a developed country to a developing country.

<sup>38</sup> While **South-South cooperation** and capacity building is by definition between developing countries, in some instances developed countries may provide resources and expertise which play a catalytic role in such initiatives. This type of support is commonly referred to as “triangular cooperation” and should be noted.

<sup>39</sup> **South-South Cooperation** describes the exchange of resources, technology, and knowledge between developing countries. Developing countries participating in these types of initiatives can be recipients and/or providers of resources. In this field developing countries are asked to indicate separately the **resources they have provided and received** through such initiatives.

Please indicate the value of incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity<sup>40</sup> that have been removed, phased out or reformed and the value of positive incentives introduced.

Year: Currency:

Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out		
4.2.2 Positive incentives <sup>41</sup> introduced		
Comments :		

#### *4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism*

Please identify the new and innovative financial mechanisms that have been implemented by your country or in which your country has participated.

Please indicate the type of initiative and the amount of financial resources generated (where known; order of magnitude estimates are better than none). Please also indicate whether and how the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity were considered and provide a brief description of the initiative, including the year of its establishment and operation.

Year: Currency:

Type of Initiative <sup>42</sup>	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
Comments:			

#### *4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention*

Please indicate the number of access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms your country has undertaken that enhance resource mobilization:

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
Meetings and discussions between affected administrations regarding Nagoya Protocol.	Assignment of the problem and necessity of applying of new approaches for mobilization of resources for achieving Protocol goals.
<p>There is lack of understanding regarding financial aspects and recourses mobilizations. In this relation national measures for capacity building are planned.</p> <p>We are on the position that this matter is high priority and it is necessary to be planned and implemented measures/programmes for capacity building, share of experience, applying of same approaches and equalization between member states in the frames of European Union. Together with this is important the stakeholders to be included in mobilization of resources processes.</p>	

### 5. Activity Classification

<sup>40</sup> Incentives harmful to biodiversity emanate from policies or programmes that induce unsustainable behaviour harmful to biodiversity, often as unanticipated and unintended side effects of policies or programmes designed to achieve other objectives. Types of possibly harmful incentives include production subsidies and consumer subsidies while policies and laws governing resource use, such as land tenure systems and environmental resource management, can also have harmful effects.

<sup>41</sup> Positive incentive measures are economic, legal or institutional measures designed to encourage beneficial activities.

<sup>42</sup> Types of initiatives might include: payment for ecosystem services; biodiversity offset mechanisms; environmental fiscal reforms; markets for green products; business-biodiversity partnerships; new forms of charity; integrating biodiversity and ecosystem services in the development of new and innovative sources of international development finance and funding mechanisms for climate change which consider biodiversity and ecosystem services.

**For the resource classification mentioned in sections 1 and 2 above please indicate which types of initiatives you have considered under each category.** A brief description of each of the categories as well as an indicative list of the actions that could be considered under each category is provided below. Please select all that apply. Please also list any additional activities considered under each category.

	Activity classification			
	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D
<b>Default Description</b>	Activities where biodiversity protection is the main purpose, such as activities funded by environmental agencies that directly and intentionally impact biodiversity. Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to policy development and administration carried out in part or entirely by environmental agencies  Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to sustainable use and sustainable management that have co-benefits for biodiversity. Activities under this category would generally be lead by agencies outside of the environmental sector Activities related to Articles 8, 10 and 11 of the Convention as well Targets 5-8, 10, 14 and 15 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to sustainable production and consumption where the responsibility lies with multiple government entities, the private sector and the general public. Activities related to Articles 11 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 1-4 of the Strategic Plan
<b>Activities considered</b> <i>(Please check those that apply)</i>	<b>Safeguarding biodiversity</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in situ/ex situ conservation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protected areas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maintaining genetic diversity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats from invasive alien species <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats to specific ecosystems and/or species	<b>Biodiversity Planning</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NBASP development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CHM related activities  <b>Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ABS frameworks  <b>Biosafety</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biosafety frameworks	<b>Sustainable management of ecosystems</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries, etc) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to conserve water and prevent pollution  <b>Land use and climate related activities</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Managing land use to protect biodiversity, mitigate climate change and increase resilience	<b>Measures in the wider economy and society</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning, fiscal and regularity measures to promote sustainable consumption and production <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Broad scale public awareness and education measures.
<b>Additional activities</b> <i>(Please add additional activities not already included in the row above)</i>				

Appendix

**HOW THE INDICATORS CONTAINED IN DECISION X/3 ARE COVERED BY THE DATA FIELDS IN THE PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK**

Indicators from decision X/3		Relevant data field in the reporting framework	Explanation and further notes
1. Aggregated financial flows, in the amount and where relevant percentage, of biodiversity-related funding, per annum, for achieving the Convention's three objectives, in a manner that avoids double counting, both in total and in, <i>inter alia</i> , the following categories:	(a) Official Development Assistance (ODA);	1.1	Includes bilateral (1.1.1) and multilateral (1.1.2)
	(b) Domestic budgets at all levels;	2.1	Includes government agencies and other publically funded entities at three levels of government: central/national/federal (2.1.1), state/provincial (2.1.2) and local/municipal (2.1.3).
	(c) Private sector;	2.2 and 1.3	2.2 indicates total available from private/market sources; 1.3 indicates international flows of private/market resources
	(d) Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia;	2.3 and 1.4	2.3 indicates total available from non profit organizations not already included above; 1.4 indicates international flows of such resources
	(e) International financial institutions;	1.1.1	Included within multilateral ODA. This date from countries will be supplemented by information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat from the organizations concerned and made available to Parties for their review
	(f) United Nations organizations, funds and programmes	1.1.1	
	(g) Non-ODA public funding;	1.2	
	(h) South-South cooperation initiatives;	4.1	
	(i) Technical cooperation;	4.1	
2. Number of countries that have:	(a) Assessed values of biodiversity, in accordance with the Convention;	3.1	
	(b) Identified and reported funding needs, gaps and priorities;	3.2	
	(c) Developed national financial plans for biodiversity;	3.3	
	(d) Been provided with the necessary funding and capacity building to undertake the above activities	3	
3. Amount of domestic financial support, per annum, in respect of those domestic activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of this Convention;	2 (less 1)		Includes all domestic sources (2.1 + 2.2 + 2.3) less, for developing countries, that received from other countries (1)

Indicators from decision X/3	Relevant data field in the reporting framework	Explanation and further notes
4. Amount of funding provided through the Global Environment Facility and allocated to biodiversity focal area;	None	Global indicator – Information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat from GEF Secretariat and made available to Parties for their review
5. Level of CBD and Parties' support to other financial institutions that promote replication and scaling-up of relevant successful financial mechanisms and instruments;	None	Global indicator – Information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat and made available to Parties for their review
6. Number of international financing institutions, United Nations organizations, funds and programmes, and the development agencies that report to the Development Assistance Committee of Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/DAC), with biodiversity and associated ecosystem services as a cross-cutting policy;	None	Global indicator – Information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat from the institutions concerned and made available to Parties for their review
7. Number of Parties that integrate considerations on biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services in development plans, strategies and budgets;	3.4 and 3.5	
8. Number of South-South cooperation initiatives conducted by developing country Parties and those that may be supported by other Parties and relevant partners, as a complement to necessary North-South cooperation;	4.1	Specifically 4.1.4, 4.1.5 and 4.1.2
9. Amount and number of South-South and North-South technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives that support biodiversity;	4.1	
10. Number of global initiatives that heighten awareness on the need for resource mobilization for biodiversity;	None	Global indicator – Information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat and made available to Parties for their review
11. Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries to contribute to achieving the Convention's objectives;	1	These two indicators are regarded as equivalent for the period of Strategic Plan 2011–2020.
12. Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;	1	
13. Resources mobilized from the removal, reform or phase-out of incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity, which could be used for the promotion of positive incentives, including but not limited to innovative financial mechanisms, that are consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations, taking into account national social and economic conditions;	4.2	

14. Number of initiatives, and respective amounts, supplementary to the financial mechanism established under Article 21, that engage Parties and relevant organizations in new and innovative financial mechanisms, which consider intrinsic values and all other values of biodiversity, in accordance with the objectives of the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization;	4.3	
15. Number of access and benefit-sharing initiatives and mechanisms, consistent with the Convention and, when in effect, with the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization, including awareness-raising, that enhance resource mobilization;	4.4	

**DENMARK IN THE EU SUBMISSION**

**Submission to the CBD notification (2012-023) on Methodological and Implementation Guidance for the “Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Convention’s Strategy for Resources Mobilization”**

Country: Denmark	Name of respondent: Jesper Tranberg
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<input type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input type="checkbox"/> Focal point for resource mobilization <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify: National CBD team
Title and Department of respondent:	Head of Section, Nature Planning and Biodiversity / Nature Agency
Organization of respondent:	Danish Ministry of the Environment
Email address:	<a href="mailto:npb@nst.dk">npb@nst.dk</a>
Telephone contact:	+45 7254 3000
Date of completion and submission of preliminary framework:	July 2012

## Introduction

In response to the call from the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and with offset in its Strategy for Resource Mobilization, this preliminary assessment focuses on Denmark’s financial contributions in support of the objectives of the CBD.

This submission is not meant to represent a final or comprehensive assessment of Denmark’s contributions towards the CBD’s three objectives. Instead Denmark has undertaken the data collection and preliminary assessment and reporting with the following three objectives;

- first of all it will contribute to building on the knowledge base needed for a robust baseline;
- secondly it is a step in the process to further develop and improve the reporting framework in order to move from the current preliminary framework to a effective one; and
- thirdly it will provide Denmark and other parties who engage in the reporting, with a better understanding of the challenges associated with collecting data and future needs for the reporting.

As this is a preliminary assessment the process has included limited involvement of NGO’s and private stakeholders in the compilation of data. Also, there has not been a comprehensive review process of the assessments within Denmark. The assessment should therefore be sited as preliminary and not be used for purposes which fall outside of its objective.

## Key findings

Based on the data sources used this assessment suggests that Denmark on average for the years 2006-2010 used 3.6 billion DKK annually on activities related to the CBD objectives.

The assessment indicates that Denmark, at national level uses between 1.1 and 1.5 billion DKK per year from 2006 to 2010.

On average Denmark provided an estimated 2.3 billion DKK annually in support of developing countries' efforts related directly to the objectives of the CBD. Multilateral aid was most significant in the five years except for 2010 where the bilateral aid exceeded the multilateral aid.

The approach to the national assessment focus on actual expenditure, directs effects on biodiversity and only to a certain extend includes indirect benefits and co-benefits. It must therefore be assumed that the result of the assessment is conservative and the estimates presented for the national flows should be seen as a low range estimate.

**Table 1. Summary of ODA and public resources from section 1 and 2**

Year: 2006-2010		Currency: million DKK					
		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Average
1.1 Official Development Assistance	1.1.1 Bilateral	812	560	856	621	1,796	929
	1.1.2 Multilateral	1,153	1,286	1,532	1,253	1,490	1,343
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	863	965	1,315	1,179	841	1,033
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	267*	-	-	-	-	261
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal	83	180	232	267	278	
2.3: Other (NGOs, foundation)		7	9	7	5	21	10
<b>Total:</b>		<b>3,185</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>3,942</b>	<b>3,325</b>	<b>4,426</b>	<b>3,576</b>

\* Provinces were abolished in 2006, resources spend on biodiversity were moved to the municipal or central level (the 267 million in 2006 has been included in the average of 2.1.3).

## General on Methodology

The assessment is based on publicly available and previously published sources data from 2006 to 2010. To ensure reliability, official reports such as government reports, annual reports and audited financial statements were used as a basis. The assessment of the international flows builds on the national reporting to OECD-DAC and Danida Annual Reports 2006 to 2010. For the national flows the reporting use actual spending for reporting on public resources. Due to the approach the level of confidence in the provided estimates are classified as "high".

Note that the activities included in the national assessment concentrate on the resources used directly for biodiversity. Resources used for activities that have indirect benefits or co-benefits for biodiversity is not included or only included to a very limited extend. Consideration regarding opportunity costs has not been part of the assessment as information in most cases are not readily available. The approach of focusing on actual expenditure, directs effects on biodiversity and to a great extend excluding indirect benefits and co-benefits, ensure a very conservative estimate.

Detailed information on expenditure from NGO's and private sector is not readily available and a comprehensive consultation procedure has not been made. However, an inquiry was made to the largest NGOs and private foundations in regards to their use of resources at national level. At international level the resources used by Danish NGO's has to a large extend been included under the assessment of bilateral aid. The reason being, that a large part of the funding to national NGOs comes from DANIDA and therefore is included in the DAC reporting.

Further detail regarding the methodological approach is provided under each table. All figures in this document are in Danish Crowns and displayed in millions.

## 1. International Flows of Financial Resources

Table 2:

Year: 2006 – 2010		Currency: million DKK					
Type of financial flows		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Confidence (all years)
		1.1 Official Development Assistance <sup>43</sup>	1.1.1 Bilateral <sup>44</sup>	812	560	856	
	1.1.2 Multilateral <sup>45</sup>	1,153	1,286	1,532	1,253	1,490	High
1.2 Other public funds <sup>46</sup>		-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3 Private/ Market <sup>47</sup>		-	-	-	-	-	-
1.4 Not for profit organizations		-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:		1,965	1,846	2,388	1,874	3,286	High
<p>Comments:</p> <p>1.1 Source of information are the MFA CRS-forms 2001-2010, the Danida Annual Reports 2001-2010, Danida's Programme and Project Database as well as information published in the Foreign Ministry's annual Programme and Project Orientation (PPO) and other official reports from the Foreign Ministry. The statistical summaries are compiled in report "The Danish assistance in relation to the Rio Conventions 2001 – 2010". The report is available at <a href="http://www.cbd.int/financial/doc/eu-resource-mobilization-strategy-dk-en.pdf">http://www.cbd.int/financial/doc/eu-resource-mobilization-strategy-dk-en.pdf</a>.</p> <p>Biodiversity related aid is defined as activities that promote at least one of the three objectives of the CBD: the conservation of biodiversity, the sustainable use of its components (ecosystems, species or genetic resources), or the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits of the utilisation of genetic resources.</p> <p>All funding of bilateral projects within the water, energy, agriculture, forestry and environment sectors has been examined. Both aid activities reported to OECD-DAC as targeting the Conventions as a "principal objective" and as "significant objective" have been fully included in the assessment.</p>							

<sup>43</sup> **Official Development Assistance** (ODA) refers to flows of official financing administered with the purpose of promoting economic development and welfare of developing countries as the main objective, and which are concessional in character with a grant element of at least 25 per cent (using a fixed 10 per cent rate of discount). ODA can be bilateral or multilateral. Where resources are provided or received for general budget support rather than for specific activities, an estimate of resources provided/received for biodiversity may be calculated from the proportion of the recipient country's budget devoted to such activities.

<sup>44</sup> **Bilateral ODA** refers to contributions of donor government agencies, at all levels, to developing countries

<sup>45</sup> **Multilateral ODA** refers to funds provided through international financial institutions such as the Global Environment Facility, the World Bank and United Nations funds and programmes.

<sup>46</sup> This category includes **non-ODA public funding**, also called "other official flows" (OOFs), which refers to transactions by the official sector with countries on the List of Aid Recipients which do not meet the conditions for eligibility as Official Development Assistance. The category also includes resources provided from other "non-donor" countries i.e. through "South-South Cooperation".

<sup>47</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transaction mediated through a market.

1.1.2 Total Danish multilateral contributions of relevance to the CBD objectives. Include contributions to World Bank, AfDB, AsDB, IDB, UNDP, UNEP, UNEP/DHI, GEF. Not included is biodiversity related support to IUCN, IIED, WWF, IISD, IWGIA, WRI with a total average of 48 million DKK pr. year for the years 2006-2010.

1.3 Denmark has the following instruments for providing aid to developing countries through the private sector: Mixed Credits and the Business-to-Business (B2B) Programme and Partnership Facility Programme. With the launch of Danida's new policy on "Growth and Employment", the B2B and IPD Programmes will be replaced by Danida Business Partnerships (mid-2011).

1.4 Assistance through Danish NGOs working on development issues has also been examined and analyzed using the definitions of the OECD/DAC markers on aid targeting the objectives of the CBD. Resources used by NGO's are therefore included in 1.1.2 and not in 1.4 and does only include the contribution from Danida.

## 2. Availability of Financial Resources in each country

Table 3:

Year: 2006		Currency: million DKK								
Source		Activity categories <sup>48</sup>								Total
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption		
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts
2.1: Government budgets <sup>49</sup>	2.1.1 Central	503	High	104	High	256	High			863
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	90	High	177	High					267
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal	83	High							83
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>50</sup>										
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>51</sup>		7	Medium							7
<b>Total:</b>		<b>682</b>		<b>281</b>		<b>256</b>				<b>1,219</b>

<sup>48</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>49</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for "central" and for "local/municipal". When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>50</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>51</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.

**Comments:**

2.1 All estimates are compiled from accounts of actual spending or estimates thereof and mainly based on the central administrative system (SKS) and governmental accounts. Additionally estimates from Statistics Denmark have also been used. All expenditures are calculated as gross cost.

2.1.1 The compilation of the national resources in relation to biodiversity 2006-2010 included funds used in the Nature Agency, the Environmental Protection Agency, Ministry of Defence and Minister for Food, Agriculture and Fisheries. For government activities supported under the European Rural Development Program is included. The resource use reported for administration (category B) has been estimated by using 7-10% (8,5 % used in the assessment) of project costs from category A. The rationale for this assessment is that the average administration fee when analyzing general restoration and biodiversity projects. Biodiversity expenditure in relation to the area under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Defence has been estimated to a total of 9.5 million for the years 2007-2010 and does not include positive indirect effects on biodiversity. Policy development at the central level has been included based on an estimate that 25 % of the centrally placed administrative staff participates in development of new policies, an estimated 40 million per year.

2.1.2 Provinces were abolished in 2006, resources spend on biodiversity were moved to the municipal or central level.

2.1.3 A minor part of the resources included at the municipal level includes activities that have indirect effects on biodiversity (sustainable forest management, promotion of recreational activities). Provinces were abolished in 2006, resources spend on biodiversity were moved to the municipal or central level.

2.3 Only a limited number of NGOs and foundations were requested to give input. Included in the assessment are; The Danish Society for Nature Conservation; 15. Juni Fonden. Please note that administration is included in section A.

**Table 4:**

Year: 2007		Currency: million DKK								
Source		Activity categories								Total
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption		
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	452	High	113	High	401	High			
	2.1.2 State/Provincial									
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal	125	High	55	High					180
2.2 Private/ Market										
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)			Medium							9
<b>Total:</b>		585		167						1,153
<b>Comments:</b> Please see comments to table 3.										

Table 5:

Year: 2008		Currency: million DKK								
Source		Activity categories								Total
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption		
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	818	High	140	High	357	High			
	2.1.2 State/Provincial									
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal	159	High	73						232
2.2 Private/ Market										
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)		7	Medium							7
<b>Total:</b>		984		212		357				1,554
Comments: Please see comments to table 3.										

Table 6:

Year: 2009		Currency: million DKK								
Source		Activity categories								Total
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption		
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	702	High	129	High	347	High			
	2.1.2 State/Provincial									
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal	170	High	97	High					267
2.2 Private/ Market										
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)		5	Medium							
<b>Total:</b>		878		226		347				1,451
Comments: Please see comments to table 3.										

Table 7:

Year: 2010		Currency: million DKK								
Source		Activity categories								Total Amounts
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption		
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	487	High	101	High	233	High			841
	2.1.2 State/Provincial									
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal	165	High	113	High					278
2.2 Private/ Market										
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)		21	Medium							21
<b>Total:</b>		673		214		233				1,120
Comments: Please see comments to table 3.										

### 3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization

Table 8:

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities <sup>52</sup>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2009/2020		
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity <sup>53</sup>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/	However the plan for green growth 2010-2015 does include a financial plan	
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies <sup>54</sup>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1996/2020		
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets <sup>55</sup>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2009/2015		

<sup>52</sup> Funding needs, gaps and priorities are identified and reported at the national level, on the basis of the Convention and is often part of a national biodiversity strategy and action plan process.

<sup>53</sup> National financial plans for biodiversity refer to financial plans developed as part of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

<sup>54</sup> Development plans and strategies may take various forms in different countries, such as national poverty reduction strategies or national sustainability strategies.

<sup>55</sup> A **national budget** which integrates biodiversity considerations would normally contain a section or paragraph dealing with biodiversity.

**Comments:**

3.1 To date no national assessment has been made of the value of biodiversity. However, with a 2012 assessment of the funding needs the focus on a national assessment of the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) would be a logical next step.

3.2 Denmark has adopted the target decided in Nagoya, Japan, in 2010, of halting the loss of biodiversity before 2020. The cost of halting the loss of biodiversity in Denmark is assessed in the 2012 report Economics and Environment 2012 (<http://www.dors.dk/sw9038.asp>). The analysis indicates that management measures are required on 126,000 hectares of existing nature to secure the protection of all analysed species. Although many other species living in the same habitats will be covered by the management measures, not all 32,000 species will be covered. Thus the result of the analysis is a lower bound estimation of the extent of necessary management measures required to protect the habitats of all species. The analysis identifies a network of areas and finds that the social costs of protecting the habitats of all included species will be about DKK 0.8 billion per year. Some of the management measures are already carried out which indicates that the extra costs of the required management measures can be less than indicated in the report. On the other hand, far from all species are included in the analysis, and the costs of protecting all species are therefore likely to be higher. Altogether, it is assessed that the DKK 0.8 billion per year is a lower bound estimate of the socio-economic costs of protecting all Danish species. The funding priorities that includes biodiversity is set out in the former government plan for Green Growth (2010-2015).

3.4 The first Danish Biodiversity strategy "Biological Diversity in Denmark – status and strategy" was presented in 1996 and was followed up in 2004 with a new strategy for 2004-2009. In addition the Wilhjelm Committee in 2001 issued in unanimity the report "Danish nature- status trends and recommendations for future biodiversity policies" as a basis for a government action plan on biodiversity and nature conservation.

Environment and Nature Plan, Denmark 2010-2020 has been developed and included in the 2009 plan for Green Growth. The aim of Environment and Nature Plan Denmark 2010-2020 is to secure not only a better environment and climate, but also more areas of nature of a high quality that are accessible to everyone. The plan not only enables Denmark to meet its obligations under the EU Water Framework Directive and the Natura 2000 Directives but also facilitates follow-up of the Aquatic Environment Plan III and the Pesticide Plan 2004-2009. These investments are conditional on approval by the European Commission.

3.5 The funding priorities, including biodiversity funding is set out in the former government's plan for Green Growth (2010-2015).

## 4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability

### 4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation

Table 9:

Year: 2006 - 2010		Currency: DKK		
Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided <sup>56</sup>	More than 60 projects	-	-	See annex I.
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity-building through triangular cooperation <sup>57</sup>	-	-	-	-
<b>Comments:</b> 4.1.2 Please see annex I. 4.1.2 Projects exist but it has not been possible to assess number of projects and amount for this report.				

### 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies

Table 10:

Year: 2006 - 2010		Currency: million DKK
Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out	-	Negative incentives such as subsidies for drainage and watering have been removed. Grants and subsidies for thinning, drainage and road construction in the forest has ceased to exist. All management in state forests has been converted to close to nature management which provides far better conditions of forest biodiversity.
4.2.2 Positive incentives <sup>58</sup> introduced	1,178	Total amount from selected subsidies in 2006 – 2010 (see comments)
<b>Comments :</b> 4.2.2 Includes subsidies for nature and water efforts, subsidies for forestry, subsidies for organic farming and production and subsidies for hedgerows and planting for improvement of biotopes.		

<sup>56</sup> **North-south technical cooperation** and capacity-building initiatives are those in which resources and/or expertise are provided by a developed country to a developing country.

<sup>57</sup> While **South-South cooperation** and capacity building is by definition between developing countries, in some instances developed countries may provide resources and expertise which play a catalytic role in such initiatives. This type of support is commonly referred to as “triangular cooperation” and should be noted.

<sup>58</sup> **Positive incentive** measures are economic, legal or institutional measures designed to encourage beneficial activities.

4.3 *New and innovative financial mechanism*

Table 11:

Year: 2006 - 2010		Currency: million DKK	
Type of Initiative <sup>59</sup>	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
Fiscal policies	-	-	In recent years the Danish government has worked to integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into a number of major fiscal policy decisions, including most recently in the decisions on investment in infrastructure and tax reforms.
Afforestation initiatives	-	-	The Nature Agency together with local municipalities purchase farmland for afforestation purposes on a voluntary basis or the voluntary land consolidation programme, where support from the Rural Development Programme can be provided to establish wetlands, forests, or protect drinking water in Denmark
Agri-environmental measures	-	-	Creation of wetlands; maintenance of grass and nature areas; set-aside of riparian zones at open streams and lakes; ecological farming; plantations improving the countryside and biotopes. See annex II for further description
Subsidies/ Positive incentives introduced	1,178	-	Subset of above mentioned agri-environmental measures that includes subsidies for nature and water efforts, subsidies for forestry, subsidies for organic farming and production and subsidies for hedgerows and planting for improvement of biotopes.
Comments: Since 2010 innovative financing mechanisms have received more attention and currently Denmark is engaging in a number of initiatives at the international level to promote and use such mechanisms.			

4.4 *Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention*

Table 12:

Initiatives 2006-2010	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
African – European Environment Ministers Conference on ABS (Access and Benefit Sharing)	March 2010, Windhoek, Namibia. The international ministerial conference helped prepare for the negotiations later that year in Japan.
ABS Capacity Building Initiative:	DANIDA support this project which aim to support early entry into force and implementation of the new ABS Protocol ("Nagoya Protocol) and which has a particular focus on African countries
Comments:	

<sup>59</sup> **Types of initiatives** might include: payment for ecosystem services; biodiversity offset mechanisms; environmental fiscal reforms; markets for green products; business-biodiversity partnerships; new forms of charity; integrating biodiversity and ecosystem services in the development of new and innovative sources of international development finance and funding mechanisms for climate change which consider biodiversity and ecosystem services.

**5. Activity Classification**

Table 13:

	Activity classification			
	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D
<b>Default Description</b>	Activities where biodiversity protection is the main purpose, such as activities funded by environmental agencies that directly and intentionally impact biodiversity. Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to policy development and administration carried out in part or entirely by environmental agencies  Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to sustainable use and sustainable management that have co-benefits for biodiversity. Activities under this category would generally be lead by agencies outside of the environmental sector Activities related to Articles 8, 10 and 11 of the Convention as well Targets 5-8, 10, 14 and 15 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to sustainable production and consumption where the responsibility lies with multiple government entities, the private sector and the general public. Activities related to Articles 11 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 1-4 of the Strategic Plan
<b>Activities considered (Please check those that apply)</b>	<b>Safeguarding biodiversity</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in situ/ex situ conservation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protected areas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maintaining genetic diversity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats from invasive alien species <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats to specific ecosystems and/or species	<b>Biodiversity Planning</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NBASP development <input type="checkbox"/> CHM related activities <b>Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ABS frameworks <b>Biosafety</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety frameworks	<b>Sustainable management of ecosystems</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries, etc) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to conserve water and prevent pollution <b>Land use and climate related activities</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Managing land use to protect biodiversity, mitigate climate change and increase resilience	<b>Measures in the wider economy and society</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning, fiscal and regularity measures to promote sustainable consumption and production <input type="checkbox"/> Broad scale public awareness and education measures.
<b>Additional activities (Please add additional activities not already included in the row above)</b>		- only policy development and administration directly linked to biodiversity has been included	- mainly activities with a direct or very close influence on biodiversity has been included  - activities with the aim to mitigate or adapt to climate change has not been included	- research and education has not been included

## Annex I

Article 6-20 of the Convention outline key commitments. The table and below text links Danish development assistance to the articles of the Convention (source: Fourth Country Report to CBD, Denmark, January, 2010)

Key Commitments	CBD articles	Examples of Danish Environmental support
Developing national biodiversity strategies, plans or programmes. Establish policies which act as incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of Biodiversity.	6, 10 and 11	Bhutan, Bolivia, Cambodia, Indonesia, Kenya, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Malaysia and Laos (support to greening of PRSP and mainstreaming of biodiversity into national policies and plans).
Identifying and monitoring biodiversity in accordance with Annex 1 of the CBD including monitoring of: - Ecosystems and habitats, - Species and communities, - Described genomes and genes	7	- Malaysia (university collaboration, mapping of biodiversity) - Nicaragua (protected areas, research agreements, national environmental information system) - Vietnam (environmental information system, marine protected areas network)
Supporting <i>in situ</i> conservation measures encompassing the: - Establishment of protected areas, rehabilitation and restoration of degraded ecosystems and promoting the recovery of threatened species - Protection of indigenous peoples and their knowledge systems - Mitigation of potentially hazardous exotic species and biotechnology Products	8	- Bhutan, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Tanzania, Thailand and Vietnam (PA management) - Bolivia (PA establishment, national PA systems, natural resources management in indigenous peoples territories, support to demarcation and collective land rights) - Cambodia community based natural resources management, integrated coastal areas management) - Central America (local level natural resources management) - Mozambique (community based natural resources management)
Complementing the protection of natural habitats through ex-situ conservation measures	9	- Regional forest seed sector programmes (Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam) - Malaysia (captive breeding) - Nicaragua (tree seed centre)
In accordance with the special needs of developing countries, establish programmes for: - Scientific and technical education - Exchange of information, technical and scientific cooperation to support implementation of the CBD.	12,17 and 18	- Bolivia, Malaysia, South Africa, Tanzania and Thailand (University collaboration on forest management) - Central America (research collaboration) Indochina (University collaboration with Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam)
Promote and encourage understanding of the importance of, and the measures required for, the conservation of biological diversity, as well as its propagation through media and in educational programmes.	13	Bolivia, Cambodia, Nicaragua, South Africa, Thailand and Vietnam (environmental education in schools, public awareness)
Introduction of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	14	- Bolivia (EIA support as part of decentralised environmental management, SEA on mining sector) - Ghana (SEA on water and sanitation) - Indochina (EIA and SEA training and capacity development in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam) - Mozambique (SEA on coastal zone) - Nicaragua (EIA support to environment ministry, support to municipalities, transport sector support)

### *General measures for conservation and sustainable use (CBD article 6)*

The contracting parties are committed to developing national strategies, plans or programmes that reflect the CBD commitments. The conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity must therefore also be included as a cross-cutting issue within the planning process.

Denmark has contributed with analyses of the best ways to include and develop environmental considerations in the PRSP's (greening of PRSP), both as a cross-cutting issue and in the individual sectors. These analyses have also examined how this development can be supported through institutional and organizational capacity building of the authorities in the countries concerned. This process has been supported in Bhutan, Bolivia, Cambodia, Indonesia, Kenya, Mozambique and Nicaragua. Other countries have been supported in the process to develop and implement a national biodiversity strategy, i.e. the Lao PDR National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan.

There has also been given support to developing the national framework for biodiversity conservation. In Nicaragua, support included capacity building and a strengthening of the regulatory and policy framework by developing environmental standards and a national environment plan. Malaysia is supported in order to enhance opportunities for introducing biodiversity conservation and management safeguards into sectoral policy, programme and planning processes.

*Identifying and monitoring biodiversity (CBD article 7)*

Identification and monitoring of biodiversity is especially important in terms of supporting the establishment and appropriate management of protected areas. Danish support to the GEF is important in this regard since GEF finances the consolidation of many national protected area systems. Moreover, many GEF financed projects are site-based and include identification and assessment of biodiversity as well as the design and establishment of biodiversity monitoring schemes.

Some environment programmes, supported by Denmark, have also contributed have also contributed to identifying areas containing biodiversity of high conservation importance. This has often happened in collaboration with universities and NGOs, as in the Eastern Arc Mountains of Tanzania where support was provided to identify important areas for biodiversity. The identification of important marine areas has also been supported, as in the Marine Protected Areas Network component in Vietnam, which undertook an inventory and assessment of potential marine protected areas.

The development and establishment of different types of biodiversity monitoring schemes has been supported both inside and outside protected areas. These have ranged from a community based biodiversity and natural resource use monitoring system in Tanzania to forest cover monitoring using remote sensing and Geographical Information System (GIS) in Nicaragua.

*In-situ conservation (article 8)*

The CBD emphasizes the importance of supporting in-situ conservation. This line of support includes establishing protected areas and developing guidelines in this regard; biodiversity management inside and outside protected areas, including many types of sustainable Natural resource Management; the promotion of broader habitat and ecosystem protection and rehabilitation; sustainable development | buffer zones around protected areas; preventing the spread of genetically modified organisms (GMOs); resolving conflict over use and conservation; respect for indigenous peoples' territories, culture and intellectual property rights; and legislation on threatened species. The majority of Danish bilateral assistance of relevance to the CBD is, in some way, supporting in-situ conservation. The following is a selection of Danish supported activities in this area:

*Protected areas establishment and management*

Danish support to activities that explicitly promote the objectives of the CBD are often related to the identification, establishment, monitoring and management of protected areas. Among the examples are Nicaragua, where continued support is being provided to the National Protected areas system and to the largest protected area in the country: the Bosawas Biosphere Reserve and the Indio-Maíz Biological Reserve. In Tanzania, support has been provided for the establishment and management of the 3.250,00 ha Malagarasi-Muyovozi wetland as a Ramsar site. In Vietnam, the focus has been on both terrestrial (Pu Houng PA and U Minh Thuong PA) and marine protected areas (Hon Mun Marine Protected Area, Con Dao and Cu Lao Cham). Together with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, World Wildlife Fund (WWF)-Denmark and WWF Indochina have developed a longterm management strategy for the terrestrial PA system.

Protected areas management has been supported in both peninsular Malaysia (Krau Wildlife Reserve, Endau Rompin National Park) and Sabah (conservation area along the Kinabatangan River). In Bhutan there was support to the management of the Bumdeling Wildlife Sanctuary. Comanagement of PAs is supported in several places.

*Invasive species*

The introduction of non-native, harmful invasive species can cause severe damage to native biodiversity. Support has been provided – among other examples – to the International Water Hyacinth Programme and its work in Africa to develop an environmentally friendly fungal pesticide that will help bring the water hyacinth under control.

*Indigenous peoples*

To conserve biodiversity it is vital to work with indigenous cultures and the traditional knowledge they possess. Many of the world's biodiversity hotspots and high biodiversity wilderness areas are inhabited by indigenous peoples, and their territories cover a large amount of biologically important land areas in many regions of the world. A long term support to indigenous peoples organizations and territories in Bolivia has succeeded in demarcation and titling of numerous territories. Technical assistance is provided to sustainable natural resources management including conservation of biodiversity. In Nicaragua, support has been provided for more than a decade to indigenous communities in the Bosawas Biosphere Reserve to protect their territory and promote a sustainable use of natural resources.

Denmark has furthermore supported two phases of the Consolidation of the Amazon Region (COAMA) programme in the Colombian Amazon. The programme supports the training and capacity building of indigenous organizations with the aim of ensuring their ability to develop their own policies and fulfil the legal and technical- administrative requirements for management of their territories. The International Work group for Indigenous affairs (IWGIA) is supported through a multi-annual framework agreement. The organization supports indigenous peoples in Latin America, Africa and Asia in their political struggle for recognition and their rights of self-determination. The work of IWGIA includes intellectual property rights, natural resources management, and the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

#### Ex-situ conservation (CBD article 9)

Ex-situ conservation, whereby plants, animals or genetic material are removed from their original habitat and conserved in special facilities, is in most cases a last resort and the most resource intensive solution for the conservation of critically endangered biodiversity. Examples of ex-situ conservation activities supported by Denmark include support to forest tree seed banks (south 74 eastern Asia and Nicaragua) and to a gaur breeding facility in Malaysia (component of the Krau National Park Project).

#### *Sustainable use of natural resources (CBD Article 10)*

According to the CBD conservation and sustainable use of biological resources is to be integrated into national decision-making. Traditional cultural practices related to the use of biodiversity is encouraged and protected. Support should be given to local activities improving degraded areas. Governmental and private sectors are encouraged to collaborate on developing methods for sustainable use of biological resources. Sustainable use of natural resources is vital to long-term improvement of living conditions for disadvantaged population groups and to assure the basis of future production. Sustainable management of biological diversity is vital for securing food supplies as well as for preserving unspoiled habitats, health, the environment and a stable climate. Among the natural resources, the forests and the wetlands play a crucial role. While representing in themselves a multifunctional ecosystem characteristic of rural countryside, they not only make a vital contribution to the preservation of the climate, to the protection against natural hazards, to tourism etc, but also – in their function as elements of the rural production system – play a huge role in the reduction of poverty.

Sustainable natural resources management is a main priority in Denmark's development cooperation. Activities include the integrated water resources management, integrated coastal zone management, sustainable land management and protection and sustainable use of wetlands and forests. Sustainable water resources management is supported through global, regional and country programmes. Sustainable forestry is supported in several countries among those Cambodia, Honduras, Nepal, Nicaragua and Thailand. Support includes community forestry and certification. In Tanzania, Denmark has through more than 10 projects provides a substantial support to establishment and consolidation of participatory forest management.

#### *Research and training*

Scientific and technical education and training programmes for the identification, conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity are much needed in developing countries. Likewise with research that contributes to conservation and sustainable use. An example of Danish support in this area is the development of an environmental education and research programme at Can Tho University in Vietnam. The objective of this project is to assist the University to develop its capacity to provide environmentally oriented teaching and research to serve the special needs of the Mekong Delta Provinces for natural resources management. Activities like these will often also contribute to the obligations under CBD articles 16-18 "Access and transfer of technology", "Exchange of information" and "Technical and scientific cooperation".

The major modalities of research and training in relation to the CBD are ENRECA40, the Danish Council for Development Assistance, research centers and support to research through the

environment programmes. One example is an on-going long-term ENRECA programme between Danish Universities and Uganda and Tanzania, which seeks to strengthen local capacity in biodiversity research.

Another long-term collaboration on biodiversity research took place in the period 1999-2003 between the University of Sabah (UMS), Malaysia and Danish universities. Denmark has supported the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT) since 1994. This programme includes research and training in areas such as integrated watershed management and integrated pest management. University collaboration between South Africa and Denmark on sustainable NRM and PFM in Southern Africa took place over the period 2000-2005.

Denmark is host to the global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) and a major donor to the institution. The main task for this centre of knowledge is to register all available biodiversity information in the world. The knowledge is made available to all participating parties.

#### *Education and Awareness (Article 13)*

General environmental awareness and understanding of the importance of biodiversity for human well-being is important, as is a general understanding and appreciation of principles on sustainable use. The CBD recommends to the parties to support activities promoting environmental education in schools and general public awareness raising.

Denmark has supported many initiatives in the field of environmental education and awareness raising. Two examples can be highlighted: Support has been provided for a decade to the Danish NGO Nepenthes, who in partnership with the Nicaraguan Fundacion del Rio develops environmental education for children and young people in the buffer zone of the Indi-Maíz Biological Reserve. Activities include curriculum development, education materials, a nature centre, natural trails, a radio station, agroecological training and school gardens.

The Outdoor Council, a Danish Umbrella organisation for 93 associations related to outdoor life, nature and the environment, is involved in an environmental education programme in Kenya alongside Kenyan organisation for Environmental Education. The project aims to implement the green School concept in 300 schools and to strengthen environmental education in another 1200.

#### *Impact Assessment (CBD Article 14)*

Any proposed projects that are likely to have significant adverse effects on biological diversity should undergo an environmental impact assessment with a view to minimising or avoiding such effects. Denmark is supporting developing countries to ensure that Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) become a natural part of planning and that capacity is built in terms of implementing EIAs.

The environmental support provided by Denmark includes capacity building in EIA methodologies. One example of this practice is the long-term development of Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales Nicaragua (MARENA), Nicaragua. Another example is the regional collaboration on environmental planning and management, the USEPAM programme. This programme has organised a number of EIA courses for local university staff and government officials in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam.

Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) have been supported in Bolivia (mining sector), Ghana (SEA on Water sanitation), Mozambique (SEA on coastal zone), and Vietnam (SEA on Fisheries sector).

Denmark is also providing training and capacity building in EIA in other types of support such as the transportation sector programmes in Bangladesh, Benin, Ghana, Nicaragua, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia.

## Annex II

Agri-environmental measures in Denmark (based on M. Zandersen et al. 2009, *Payment for and management of Ecosystem Services, Issues and Options in the Nordic Context*, Nordic Council, download [http://www.norden.org/is/utgafa/utgefid-efni/2009-571/at\\_download/publicationfile](http://www.norden.org/is/utgafa/utgefid-efni/2009-571/at_download/publicationfile))

Agri-environmental measures in Denmark are based on a number of independent projects that can receive full or part support from the state and the EU.

- Support to pilot projects and demonstration use of *technology* that reduces environmental impacts, improve working environment and reduce negative impacts on nature;
- Support to the *creation of wetlands* covers up to 100% of expenditure eligible for public funding and maximum 15,000dkr per ha with possibility of dispensation. All landowners can apply regardless of their status. Eligibility conditions include that the area must be within Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) and will contribute i.a. to a reduction of phosphor leakage and enhance fauna and flora. During 2009, three rounds of applications are open.
- *Maintenance of grass and nature areas* covers a per hectare support for grazing (1400dkr/ha) and grazing and/or hay cutting (800dkr/ha) in areas classified as ESAs. Agreements have a duration of five years;
- Support to *reduce the use of nitrogen and stop use of pesticides*, targeting all farmers in Denmark, including ecological farmers, regardless of location and type of farm. The application for this support was open during 3 months in 2009;
- Support to *set-aside of riparian zones at open streams and lakes* larger than 100m<sup>2</sup> targets all farmers and intends to function as an incentive for farmers to locate their obligatory set-aside area along lakes and streams. The objective is to reduce the leakage of nitrogen, phosphor and pesticides to the water environment;
- Support to *ecological farming* covers three sub-categories of support directly to farmers. These are i) per hectare support; ii) support for the conversion to ecological farming; and iii) support to reduce the use of nitrogen, and stop the use of pesticides.
- Support to *plantations improving the countryside and biotopes* (e.g. windbreaks), where the public support covers 40–60% of total costs. Projects can be applied by individual land owners or by a group of minimum seven land stewards. Objectives are to preserve and enhance biodiversity by creating good conditions for animals and plants; preserve and enhance environmental, nature and cultural as well as landscape values and recreative values; establish landscape corridors and increase the share of small biotopes and create natural limits around technical plants. Permanence should be assured a minimum of five years after the final payment.

**ESTONIA IN THE EU SUBMISSION**

SUBMISSION BY **ESTONIA** TO THE CBD NOTIFICATION **2012-23** ON THE  
METHODOLOGICAL AND IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE FOR THE “INDICATORS FOR  
MONITORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION’S STRATEGY FOR  
RESOURCE MOBILIZATION”

<b>Country: Estonia</b>	<b>Name of respondent: Lilika Käis</b>
1. Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<b>X</b> National Focal Point
2. Title and Department of respondent:	Senior officer in Nature Conservation Department
3. Organization of respondent:	Ministry of the Environment of Estonia
4. Email	<a href="mailto:lilika.kais@envir.ee">lilika.kais@envir.ee</a>
5. Telephone	+ 3 726 262 875
6. Date of completion and submission	4 July 2012

Report has been completed with the help of expert Mr Üllas Ehrlich, Chair of Environmental Economics, from Tallinn School of Economics and Business Administration, Tallinn University of Technology. Email: [yllas.ehrlich@tseba.ttu.ee](mailto:yllas.ehrlich@tseba.ttu.ee)

The report is based on financial data of 2010 and is given in Euros. Where exact numbers could not be attained, data is given based on approximations and expert opinions. As methodology could be widely interpreted, some data considered under one category (in Table 2) would be suitable also in another. Information on international financial flows and official development assistance were not gained by the time of completing the report or were available to very limited extent.

**1. Information on International Flows of Financial Resources**

Year:		2010		Currency:		EUR									
		Activity categories:										Total			
Type of financial flows		Category A Biodiversity protection		Category B Policy development and administration		Category C Sustainable use and management		Category D Sustainable production and consumption							
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence		
1.1 Official Development assistance	1.1.1 Bilateral					14000	L					14 000	L		
	1.1.2 Multilateral														
1.2 Other public funds															
1.3 Private/market															
1.4 NGOs															
<b>Total:</b>												14 000			
<p><b>Comments:</b> The sum consists of the Estonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs bilateral development aid (one project). Other aid was not detected. Estonian payments to the EU common budget that are meant for development aid directed to biodiversity conservation are not known.</p>															

2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country

Year:		2010		Currency:		EUR					
Source		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A Biodiversity protection		Category B Policy development and administration		Category C Sustainable use and management		Category D Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1 Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	23 257 343	M	11 720 145	M	75 502 503	H	3 953 464	M	114 433 455	
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	1 676 537	H	2794733,1	M					4 471 270	
2.2 Private/ Market	2.2.1 Enterprises specialised in environmental protection									738 355	
	incl 2.2.1.1 Enterprises with the main activities of environmental protection	418 755	M			283500	M			702 255	
	2.2.1.2 Enterprises with secondary activities of environmental protection					36100	M			36 100	
	2.2.2 Enterprises not specialised in environmental protection					46 016 387	H			46 016 387	
2.3 Other (NGO, foundation, academia)		265 928	H	377 675	M					643 604	
<b>Total:</b>		<b>25 618 564</b>		<b>14 892 553</b>		<b>121 838 490</b>		<b>3 953 464</b>		<b>166 303 071</b>	<b>M</b>

Comments: Category A includes direct physical and non-physical nature conservation expenditures and investments. It includes the EU nature conservation related payments (EAFRD Natura payments; EU Life Nature projects; ERDF payments for nature conservation; CF payments for watercourse protection; INTERREG Nature Conservation Projects); non-EU foreign nature conservation programmes (Norway and EEA, Switzerland); Estonian Environmental Investment Centre's nature conservation programme; direct costs related to nature conservation of Estonian state institutions; direct cost related to nature conservation of Estonian NGO-s; private donations for nature conservation; nature schools and education centres; programme of preservation of agricultural genetic resources.

Category B includes the administrative cost and labour inputs related to nature conservation of Estonian state institutions; academic research cost related to nature conservation; administration of EU funds (ERDF and CF) for nature conservation.

Category C includes ERDF payments (sustainable use of infrastructure and support systems); CF environmental payments; EAGGF payments (Estonian Rural Development Plan II); EAFRD payments (Estonian Rural Development Plan II); costs and investments of enterprises with the main activities of environmental protection; costs and investments of enterprises with the secondary activities of environmental protection; Estonian Energy Company environmental investments.

Category D includes payments for wider environmental awareness (Estonian Environmental Investment Centre Environmental education programme); payments for environmental education.

Abbreviations: EARDF: European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development; EAGGF: European Agricultural Guidance And Guarantee Fund; CF: Cohesion Fund; ERDF: European Regional Development Fund; INTERREG - EU Interregional Cooperation; EEA: European Economic Area.

**3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization**

Steps	Yes /No	Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received (if applicable)	Results achieved
3.1. Assessment of values of biodiversity	Yes, partially	2011/ Ongoing	State resources, NGO resources, university research	* No nation wide activities have been initiated. * There are some projects based activities for some types of ecosystems or parts of them (see comments). * Some universities e.g. Tallinn Technical University and Estonian University of Life Sciences are dealing with the biodiversity and ecosystem services value assessments on scientific bases.
3.2. Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities.	Yes, partially	Ongoing	State resources	* Strategic funding needs, gaps and priorities for biodiversity are defined in draft Nature Conservation Development Plan until 2020. Planned adoption of the plan is summer 2012. No biodiversity needs reported to the CBD.
3.3. Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	Yes, included in different plans	Ongoing	State resources	* Strategic planning for biodiversity financing is covered in draft Nature Conservation Development Plan until 2020. Plan lists the necessary activities and the resources needed for biodiversity conservation. Nature conservation activities are included in the plans for the EU funds distribution and proposals are currently being made for the next financing period.

3.4. Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	Yes, partially	Ongoing	State resources	<p>* Biodiversity and ecosystem services topics are dealt in draft Nature Conservation Development Plan until 2020.</p> <p>* Biodiversity issues are also included in Environmental Strategy until 2030 and Action Plan until 2013.</p> <p>* Proposals are made to incorporate the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services into several other state strategies and development plans (e.g. agriculture).</p>
3.5. Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	Yes, partially	Ongoing		<p>* See above points. However, concept and methodology of how to incorporate values of ecosystem services into national budgets need further development.</p>
<p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>p 3.1. No uniform ecosystem service mapping or value assessment, covering the whole Estonia, has taken place. The following project based activities have been undertaken:</p> <p>a) 'The demand for protected forest by working age population of Estonia' (2011) - economical value for the demand for protected forest was assessed (Ordered by Ministry of Environment);</p> <p>b) 'Public benefits from different agricultural production types' (2012) - environmental and social benefits from different production types were assessed (monetary values not included);</p> <p>c) 'Overview of ecosystem services and their economical value' (2012) - explanatory overview, literature review;</p> <p>d) 'Assessing the economical value of bogs, on the example of Kuresoo bog' (2012) - assessment of economical value of one bog;</p> <p>International project where Estonian NGO has participated: e) BalticSTERN-s report (with 9 Baltic Sea Countries) (2012) about the willingness to pay for a healthier Baltic Sea. See: <a href="http://www.mtt.fi/dp/DP2012_1.pdf">http://www.mtt.fi/dp/DP2012_1.pdf</a></p>				

#### 4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability

##### 4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation

Type of initiative		Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided					
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity building through triangular cooperation					
<b>Comments:</b> No direct initiatives. Through contributions to the common EU budget.					

##### 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies

Incentives	Value	Description	
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out			
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced			
<b>Comments:</b> No country specific activities. Implementing the EU policy, see the EU submission.			

##### 4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism

Type of initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of bio-diversity have been reflected	Description

1.			
<b>Comments:</b> Topic has not been dealt specifically in country level.			

**4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention**

<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)</b>
1. Development plan for collection and conservation of genetic resources of agricultural plants for 2007-2013	Strategy is compiled by the Ministry of Agriculture. Includes priority activities with estimated budget lines. Does not include direct ABS activities, but has a supportive role.
2. Nagoya protocol	Preparations for ratification
<b>Comments:</b> No Nagoya protocol specific activities have been taken place.	

**FINLAND IN THE EU SUBMISSION**

**RESOURCES MOBILISED FOR BIODIVERSITY, Finland**

The Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity with regard to the Strategy for Resource Mobilization invited Parties to the Convention to make use the preliminary reporting framework (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add. 1) as a flexible and tentative framework to monitor resources mobilised for biodiversity at national and global level.

-----

**Identification of respondent**

Country:	Name of respondent:
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<input type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focal point for resource mobilization <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify:
Title and Department of respondent:	Eija Lumme, Ministerial Adviser
Organization of respondent:	Ministry of the Environment, Finland
Email address:	<a href="mailto:eija.lumme@ymparisto.fi">eija.lumme@ymparisto.fi</a>
Telephone contact:	+358 50 364 7358
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	27 June 2012

<b>Table 1. Information on International Flows of Financial Resources</b>			
<b>Years: 2006 - 2010; Finland</b>			
<b>Type of financial flows</b>		<b>Average 2006-2010 x 1000 €</b>	<b>Confidence</b>
<b>1.1 Official Development Assistance (ODA)</b>	<b>1.1.1 Bilateral</b>	<b>8 484</b>	<b>good</b>
	<b>1.1.2 Multilateral</b>	<b>3 171</b>	<b>good, only GEF biodiversity support</b>
<b>1.2 Other public funds</b>			
<b>1.3 Private/ Market</b>			
<b>1.4 Not for profit organizations</b>			
<b>Total:</b>		<b>11 655</b>	

**Comments on Table 1:** It is not possible to analyze ODA funds accurately to categories A - D without consultation with the developing partners. For the definition of ODA, see the footnotes 3, 4 and 5 in the original reporting framework UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add.1

<b>Table 2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country</b>			
<b>Years: 2006 - 2010; Finland</b>			
<b>Source</b>		<b>Average 2006-2010 x 1000 €</b>	<b>Confidence</b>
<b>2.1 Government budgets</b>	<b>2.1.1 Central</b>	<b>130 868</b>	<b>high/medium</b>
	<b>2.1.2 State/ Provincial</b>		
	<b>2.1.3 Local/ Municipal</b>		
<b>2.2 Private/ Market</b>			
<b>2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)</b>			
<b>Total:</b>		<b>130 868</b>	

Comments on Table 2: In general, there is not available exact information about the use of financial resources for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Finnish enterprises. Finnish forest industries have used some resources for this purpose in their research and development activities. Forest industries follow the forest management practices which enhance biodiversity more than just the minimum required by legislation, e.g. by following the rules of forest certification. This can be seen as a factor which reduces maximum potential economic yield and could be calculated. However, it has to be done by enterprises themselves. Obviously this "investment" is noteworthy. Around 95% of the Finnish commercial forests have been certified under the national Finnish Forest Certification System (FFCS), endorsed by the international Programme for Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC). Some Finnish forests have also been certified under another international system, the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC).

Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity has a growing role as a part of social responsibility in other than forest enterprises too. Unfortunately, information about their financial contributions are not available.

In addition, Metsähallitus which provides natural resources sector services to a diverse customer base, from private individuals to major companies, uses annually for biodiversity related activities around 8 M€ which it receives as cash flow financing.

**3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization**

Steps in Finland		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
<b>Comments:</b>				

**4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation**

For developed country Finland (members of OECD -DAC):

Year: Currency:

Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided	<b>Not possible to analyze accurately without consultation with developing partners, practically all ODA-funded projects have both technical assistance and capacity building component(s).</b>			
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity-building through triangular cooperation	<b>South-South cooperation is supported in several regional projects, but triangular projects where Finland has other role than donor (except Finnish experts or companies or NGOs as consultants) are virtually non-existing, although some regional forestry projects have biodiversity components.</b>			
<b>Comments:</b>				

**4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies in Finland**

Year: Currency:

Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out	-	-
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced	-	-
Comments :		

**4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism in Finland**

Year: Currency:

Type of Initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-
Comments:			

**4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention in Finland**

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
-	-
-	-
Comments:	

**5. Activity Classification; Finland**

For the resource classification mentioned in sections 1 and 2 above please indicate which types of initiatives you have considered under each category. A brief description of each of the categories as well as an indicative list of the actions that could be considered under each category is provided below. Please select all that apply. Please also list any additional activities considered under each category.

	Activity classification			
	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D
<b>Default Description</b>	Activities where biodiversity protection is the main purpose, such as activities funded by environmental agencies that directly and intentionally impact biodiversity. Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to policy development and administration carried out in part or entirely by environmental agencies  Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to sustainable use and sustainable management that have co-benefits for biodiversity. Activities under this category would generally be lead by agencies outside of the environmental sector  Activities related to Articles 8, 10 and 11 of the Convention as well Targets 5-8, 10, 14 and 15 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to sustainable production and consumption where the responsibility lies with multiple government entities, the private sector and the general public.  Activities related to Articles 11 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 1-4 of the Strategic Plan
<b>Activities considered</b> <i>(Please check those that apply)</i>	<b>Safeguarding biodiversity</b> <input type="checkbox"/> in situ/ex situ conservation <input type="checkbox"/> Protected areas <input type="checkbox"/> Maintaining genetic diversity <input type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats from invasive alien species <input type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats to specific ecosystems and/or species	<b>Biodiversity Planning</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NBASP development <input type="checkbox"/> CHM related activities  <b>Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ABS frameworks  <b>Biosafety</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biosafety frameworks	<b>Sustainable management of ecosystems</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries, etc)  <input type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to conserve water and prevent pollution  <b>Land use and climate related activities</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Managing land use to protect biodiversity, mitigate climate change and increase resilience	<b>Measures in the wider economy and society</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Planning, fiscal and regularity measures to promote sustainable consumption and production  <input type="checkbox"/> Broad scale public awareness and education measures.
<b>Additional activities</b> <i>(Please add additional activities not already included in the row above)</i>				

**FRANCE IN THE EU SUBMISSION**

**Soumission française relative à la notification n°2012-023**  
**(Secrétariat de la Convention sur la diversité biologique)**  
*Cadre préliminaire de rapportage*  
*relatif à la stratégie de mobilisation des ressources en faveur de la biodiversité*

**Introduction**

Cette soumission, réalisée sur la base du cadre préliminaire de rapportage élaboré par le Secrétariat de la Convention sur la diversité biologique (UNEP/CBD/SRM/ Guidance/1 de janvier 2012), constitue un premier exercice de recensement des flux financiers français en faveur de la biodiversité. Cette soumission complète les éléments apportés par la France dans les réponses aux notifications 2011-071 (activités mises en œuvre par la France en matière de mobilisation des ressources) et 2011-014 (mesures incitatives) du secrétariat de la Convention sur la diversité biologique (CDB).

En raison du caractère préliminaire du cadre de rapportage et de la nouveauté de l'exercice, les éléments apportés par la France dans le cadre de cette soumission constituent un premier ensemble de données synthétiques, dont la qualité pourra être améliorée par la suite. Ils n'ont pas vocation à constituer une compilation chiffrée exhaustive de référenc.

**Stratégie de mobilisation des ressources en faveur de la biodiversité**  
**Cadre préliminaire de rapportage**

**1. Informations sur les flux financiers internationaux**

Période de référence 2006-2010		Monnaie: voir rubriques ci-dessous
Type de flux financier		Estimation totale
1.1 Aide publique au développement	1.1.1 Bilatérale	<p>Concernant la période 2006-2010, les données agrégées publiées par l'OCDE permettent de chiffrer l'aide publique au développement française « biodiversité » à un montant total de 1622,6 millions de dollars américains (soit 324,5 millions de dollars rapportés en moyenne annuelle sur la période donnée).</p> <p>A noter que, conformément à la méthodologie de l'OCDE, les projets classés « marqueurs 1 et 2 » de Rio sont comptabilisés tous deux à 100% sur la période donnée, l'importance des engagements sous marqueur 1 de Rio conduisant à un fort degré d'incertitude sur la contribution directe à la préservation et l'utilisation durable de la biodiversité dans le montant total.</p> <p>L'OCDE insiste sur le fait qu'il ne s'agit pas d'estimation de l'effort financier en matière de biodiversité, mais d'une indication du volume global des projets bilatéraux dont une partie plus ou moins importante porte sur la protection de la biodiversité. (voir commentaire 1 infra)</p>

	1.1.2 Multilatérale	<p>Globalement et sur la période 2006-2010, la France a contribué à hauteur de 77 millions de dollars à la fenêtre « biodiversité » du Fonds pour l'Environnement mondial (FEM) (soit 15,45 millions de dollars rapportés en moyenne annuelle sur les 5 années de la période de référence). Ce chiffre global a été calculé sur la base de la contribution totale de la France au FEM, pondérée par la part des financements engagés en faveur de la biodiversité par le FEM sur la période.</p> <p>S'agissant du Fonds européen de développement (FED), la part française affectée à la biodiversité / ressources naturelles sur la période 2008-2010 est estimée à 30 millions d'euros, soit 10 millions d'euros en moyenne annuelle sur les 3 années de référence.</p> <p>S'agissant des autres fonds multilatéraux qui financent des projets biodiversité, et qui ne font pas encore aujourd'hui l'objet d'une comptabilisation au titre des marqueurs de Rio par le Comité d'Aide au Développement (CAD) de l'OCDE, il n'a pas été possible d'évaluer la part française affectée à la biodiversité sur la période. (voir commentaire 2 infra)</p>
1.2	Autres fonds publics	Données agrégées actuellement non disponibles
1.3	Mécanismes du marché	Données agrégées actuellement non disponibles (voir commentaire 3 infra)
1.4	Organisations à but non lucrative	Données agrégées actuellement non disponibles
<p><b>Observations: Parallèlement à l'Aide publique au développement, la France verse des contributions obligatoires aux principales organisations internationales et accords multilatéraux environnementaux en lien avec la biodiversité</b> (Parmi lesquels : Convention sur la diversité biologique, Convention OSPAR, Plan d'action du PNUE pour les Caraïbes, Convention Alpine, Protocole de Carthage, Convention de Nairobi pour l'Océan Indien Occidental, Convention Ramsar, Programme régional océanien pour l'environnement, Convention sur la conservation des espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage (CMS), Convention internationale pour la protection des végétaux (CIPV), Accord sur la conservation des oiseaux d'eau migrateurs d'Afrique-Eurasie, Plan d'action pour la protection de la Méditerranée contre la pollution, Convention CITES, ACCOBAMS et ASCOBANS, Convention sur la conservation de la faune et la flore marines de l'Antarctique, Commission baleinière internationale, Traité international sur les ressources phylogénétiques pour l'agriculture et l'alimentation, Global Biodiversity Information Facility. Ce montant comprend également la contribution de la France au Programme des Nations Unies pour l'Environnement).</p> <p>Sur la période 2006 à 2010, ces contributions ont atteint un montant total de plus de 50 millions d'euros, soit une moyenne annuelle de 10 millions d'euros.</p>		

**Commentaires :**

1 - Pour des raisons liées aux modalités de rapportage de l'aide publique au développement, en particulier l'application des marqueurs de Rio par le Comité d'Aide au Développement (CAD) de l'Organisation de coopération et de développement économique (OCDE), le chiffrage de

l'aide bilatérale « biodiversité » figurant dans le tableau récapitulatif de la rubrique n°1 ne constitue qu'une indication du volume global dont une partie plus ou moins importante porte sur la protection de la biodiversité. Ceci souligne la nécessité de parfaire l'élaboration d'un cadre d'analyse spécifique au marqueur 1 de Rio (contribution significative, mais secondaire à la biodiversité).

A titre d'illustration, l'Agence française de développement (AFD) a développé un système interne de pondération « marqueurs de Rio » de son portefeuille de projets selon les critères suivants :

Type d'activité	Contenu	Proportion du financement total retenue comme favorable à la biodiversité
Projets marqueur 2 (Rio –Biodiversité)	Aire protégée Appui aux ONG d'environnement Trust-fund Biodiversité Aide budgétaire Biodiversité	100%
Projets marqueur 1 (Rio –Biodiversité)	Gestion durable des forêts REDD	80%
Projets marqueur 1 (Rio –Biodiversité)	Agroécologie Pastoralisme-transhumance Apiculture Gestion durable des pêcheries Gestion locale des ressources biologiques Filières bio-équitable	30%
Projets marqueur 1 (Rio –Biodiversité)	Assainissement des eaux usées Carbone rural (hors plantations forestières) Développement urbain avec volet biodiversité urbaine Traitement durable des déchets – Réduction de l'impact déchet	5%
Projets marqueur 1	Irrigation raisonnée – Economie en eau	1%

(Rio-Biodiversité)	Ligne de crédit environnement (hors climat)	
Projets marqueur 0 (Rio –Biodiversité)	Infrastructure à compensation biodiversité explicite et exemplaire (Secteur minier, Barrages, etc.)	0 %
Personnel	Valeur des personnels dédiés à la Biodiversité	100%
Activité de communication et d'éducation	Activité présentant un volet biodiversité	50%
Activité de recherche Capitalisation Production de connaissances	Etude dédiée à la biodiversité	100%

2 - S'agissant de l'aide publique multilatérale au développement en faveur de la biodiversité, la France soutient l'extension aux marqueurs Rio « biodiversité » de la démarche entamée par le Comité d'Aide au Développement (CAD) de l'OCDE concernant les marqueurs « climat », dans la perspective d'une meilleure comptabilisation de cette aide.

3 - Concernant le chiffrage de la mobilisation financière internationale en faveur de la biodiversité des acteurs de la société civile (dont secteur privé), l'absence de cadre / mécanisme de rapportage international répondant à des indicateurs définis et harmonisés rend cet exercice particulièrement difficile. Une réflexion est entamée sur ce sujet au niveau français.

**2. Informations sur la disponibilité des ressources financières dans chaque pays**

Année : <b>moyenne [2006-2010]</b>		Devise : <b>millions € courants</b>									
Source :		Catégories d'activités :								Total	
		A – Protection de la biodiversité		B – Politique, développement et administration		C – Utilisation et gestion durable		D – Production et consommation durables			
		Montant	Confiance	Montant	Confiance	Montant	Confiance	Montant	Confiance	Montant	Confiance
2.1 Dépenses publiques	2.1.1 État									188,4	
	2.1.2 Régions									291,6	
	2.1.3 Communes									401,6	
2.2 Dépenses secteur privé										69	
2.3 Autres (ONG, fondations, académies)										113,4	
<b>Total :</b>										<b>1064</b>	
<p><b>Commentaires :</b></p> <p>(1) Ce tableau a été renseigné à partir des comptes de l'environnement (<i>source : Service de l'observation et des statistiques du Ministère de l'Écologie français</i>). Les données 2010 sont provisoires, les données 2009 sont semi-définitives, les données 2008 et précédentes sont définitives. Les données 2011 ne sont pas encore disponibles. Les valeurs indiquées sont des moyennes pour la période 2006-2010 soit 5 années.</p> <p>(2) Il n'a pas été possible de distinguer les différentes catégories d'activités (colonnes A à D). Toutes les dépenses prises en compte sont qualifiées de « protection de la biodiversité », mais comprennent également des dépenses de gestion. <b>Voir question 5 pour des commentaires détaillés.</b></p>											

- (3) Les dépenses publiques régionales regroupent les dépenses des régions, des départements et des agences de l'eau.  
(4) Les dépenses du secteur privé sont les dépenses des entreprises.  
(5) La rubrique « Autres » regroupe les dépenses des ménages (qui sont principalement des contributions aux associations) et d'autres dépenses.

**3. Informations sur les mesures prises pour appliquer la stratégie de mobilisation des ressources**

Étapes		Année Début / Fin	Résultats obtenus (si approprié)
3.1 Évaluation des valeurs de la biodiversité	Non <input type="checkbox"/> Oui <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2007 / en cours	Cf (1) ci-dessous
3.2 : Identification et suivi des besoins de financements, des financements manquants et des financements prioritaires	Non <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	/	Cf (2) ci-dessous
3.3 : Développement d'un plan national de financement de la biodiversité	Non <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	/	Cf (3) ci-dessous
3.4 : Intégration et prise en compte de la biodiversité et des services écosystémiques dans les plans et stratégies	Non <input type="checkbox"/> Oui <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	/	Cf (4) ci-dessous
3.4 : Intégrations et prise en compte de la biodiversité et des services écosystémiques dans le budget de l'État.	Non <input type="checkbox"/> Oui <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	/	Cf (5) ci-dessous

Commentaires :

(1) La France a engagé une première réflexion sur l'évaluation des écosystèmes (MEA) dès 2007. Ce travail se poursuit par des travaux d'ordre conceptuel et méthodologique et des évaluations physiques et monétaires. Des valeurs de référence ont été calculées pour les services rendus par plusieurs écosystèmes :

- forêts tempérées (Centre d'Analyse Stratégique, 2009),
- prairies permanentes (Centre d'Analyse Stratégique, 2009),
- zones humides (Ministère de l'Écologie- Commissariat général au développement durable, 2010)

et d'autres évaluations sont actuellement menées sur d'autres écosystèmes (haies, cultures de légumineuses, récifs coralliens) en en balayant tout le champ.

Un travail de synthèse nationale a été réalisé en 2009 (Centre d'Analyse Stratégique, 2009).

(voir également en annexe la liste des principaux travaux réalisés par la France)

(2) Des éléments ponctuels d'analyses des besoins de financement de la biodiversité, des financements manquant et des priorités existent mais ne permettent pas encore de répondre totalement à la question.

(3) La politique nationale de la biodiversité est portée par le ministère de l'écologie, du développement durable et de l'énergie. Elle est inscrite dans la stratégie nationale pour la biodiversité (SNB) adoptée en 2004 et renouvelée en 2011 pour la période 2011-2020. Le texte des engagements de l'État français pour la mise en œuvre de la SNB pour la période 2011-2013 est disponible à l'adresse suivante : [http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/SNB20112020engagement\\_etat.pdf](http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/SNB20112020engagement_etat.pdf)

Toutefois, cette stratégie ne comporte pas encore de plan national de financement de la biodiversité.

(4) La biodiversité est intégrée de manière transversale à plusieurs politiques sectorielles dont l'eau, l'agriculture, le littoral et la montagne.

(5) Des travaux sont en cours sur l'épargne réelle, sur l'impact de la consommation et de la production nationales sur la biodiversité et les écosystèmes à l'étranger.

#### **4. Informations sur des initiatives spécifiques relatives à la disponibilité des ressources**

##### ***4.1 Coopération technique, renforcement des capacités et coopération Sud-Sud***

Période 2006-2010 (monnaie : euros)

Type d'initiative	Description
4.1.1 Coopération technique et renforcement des capacités Nord-Sud	Les montants relatifs à la coopération technique et au renforcement des capacités Nord-Sud en lien avec la biodiversité sont comptabilisés dans la rubrique 1 du cadre de reporting. A noter que le volet « recherche » des projets biodiversité à l'international est évalué à 30 millions par an sur la période. Le volet « assistance technique » (mise à disposition de personnels par les ministères français et l'Agence française de développement confondus) est évalué quant à lui à près de 22 millions d'euros sur la période.

##### ***4.2 Ressources mobilisées grâce à une réforme des mesures d'incitation et des subventions***

La loi de programmation 2009-967 relative à la mise en œuvre du Grenelle de l'environnement prévoit, dans ses articles 26 et 48, que l'État, sur la base d'un audit, déterminera les mesures fiscales défavorables à la biodiversité et proposera de nouveaux outils permettant un basculement progressif vers une fiscalité mieux adaptée aux nouveaux enjeux environnementaux.

La France a conduit en 2011 un important travail d'identification et d'analyse des aides publiques dommageables à l'environnement<sup>60</sup>. S'appuyant sur les travaux préliminaires d'analyse des dépenses fiscales dommageables à l'environnement pilotés par le Commissariat Général au Développement Durable (MEDDTL), le rapport du Comité d'évaluation des dépenses fiscales et des niches sociales a souligné les effets dommageables sur l'environnement des exonérations dont bénéficient certaines consommations d'énergies fossiles.

Sur cette base, le Centre d'analyse stratégique a mis en place, à la demande du gouvernement, un groupe d'experts de la biodiversité, d'économistes, de représentants de syndicats, d'entreprises, d'associations environnementales et de l'administration. Leurs travaux, et le rapport "Les aides publiques dommageables à la biodiversité" qui en est issu, ont eu pour but, tout d'abord, de lister les aides publiques nuisibles à la biodiversité, puis de proposer des pistes d'évolution et de réforme afin de réduire, voire d'annuler, l'impact préjudiciable de ces aides. Ce rapport publié en octobre 2011 est disponible à l'adresse suivante :

[http://www.strategie.gouv.fr/system/files/rapport\\_43\\_web.pdf](http://www.strategie.gouv.fr/system/files/rapport_43_web.pdf)

Ce rapport s'inscrit pleinement dans les objectifs du plan stratégique adopté à Nagoya en octobre 2010 par la Conférence des Parties en matière de réforme des subventions dommageables à la biodiversité et fournit des pistes de réformes des aides publiques et de la fiscalité, dont certaines ont inspiré les évolutions récemment adoptées à l'issue des débats des lois de finances. Quatre dispositifs ont ainsi été réformés dans les domaines suivants :

- reparamétrage des redevances des agences de l'eau,
- modification d'un instrument fiscal<sup>61</sup> dans le domaine de l'immobilier locatif,
- suppression du taux réduit de TVA sur des produits phytosanitaires,
- modification du droit annuel de francisation et de navigation (DAFN) acquitté par les bateaux de plaisance.

##### ***4.3 Mécanismes de financement nouveaux et innovants***

<sup>60</sup> <http://www.economie.gouv.fr/files/rapport-comite-evaluation-depenses-fiscales-et-niches-sociales.pdf>

<sup>61</sup> Dispositif Scellier

Les **paiements pour services environnementaux** : les PSE sont déjà utilisés en France (notamment dans le cadre de la politique agricole commune, ou dans la production d'eau potable). Des réflexions ont été engagées au ministère de l'écologie, du développement durable et de l'énergie, afin de dégager des orientations pour la mise en œuvre de cet outil.

Les **réformes fiscales environnementales engagées depuis 2011** : cf. point 4.2 ci-dessus.

Les **mesures compensatoires** : La France a mis en œuvre une expérimentation d'offre de compensation destinée à répondre aux besoins de projets de faible ampleur. L'expérimentation de l'offre de compensation consiste, pour un opérateur, à anticiper la demande potentielle de compensation, en particulier dans des territoires où la pression attendue sur les milieux est forte. L'opérateur sécurise des terrains et les restaure par des actions de long terme, dans la perspective de les valoriser ultérieurement au titre de la compensation, via la vente d'unités auprès de plusieurs maîtres d'ouvrage ayant l'obligation de mettre en œuvre des mesures compensatoires.

L'expérimentation de l'offre de compensation s'inscrit dans le droit existant. Elle a été initiée en 2008 par une opération de CDC Biodiversité (filiale de la Caisse des Dépôts) sur le site Cossure, en région Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, à laquelle s'ajoutent aujourd'hui 4 nouvelles opérations. Ces opérations seront menées par les opérateurs retenus, sous le pilotage du Ministère en charge de l'écologie et en collaboration avec les parties prenantes de niveaux national et local.

L'évaluation de l'expérimentation, pilotée par le Comité national de l'expérimentation d'offre de compensation, se fera au regard de la plus-value générée en termes d'état de conservation des espèces et de leurs habitats, et de la fonctionnalité des écosystèmes.

Par ailleurs, la France a renforcé les obligations d'évitement et de réduction des impacts qui pèsent sur les mesures de compensation, et a porté, dans le cadre d'un processus de concertation impliquant les différentes composantes de la société civile française (services de l'Etat, collectivités locales, entreprises, ONG), l'élaboration d'une doctrine nationale et de lignes directrices pour piloter la séquence « éviter, réduire, et compenser ».

Les **marchés de produits verts** : la France étudie actuellement le dispositif qui viserait à allouer à la préservation de la biodiversité le produit de la vente aux enchères de permis d'émissions de CO<sub>2</sub>, mécanisme déjà utilisé par l'Allemagne.

La **biodiversité dans la finance internationale** : la France participe au financement de la biodiversité à l'international au travers de l'AFD et du Fonds français pour l'environnement mondial (FFEM), tant avec des prêts bonifiés qu'avec des dons. Elle met activement en œuvre les

instruments innovants de financement, et notamment les fonds fiduciaires de conservation, la certification de produits agricoles, halieutiques ou forestiers, les conversions de dette contre des programmes en faveur de la biodiversité (« C2D Nature »).

La **biodiversité dans les financements pour le climat** : la France participe activement à la préparation de la mise en œuvre du mécanisme REDD+.

La France s'intéresse par ailleurs aux **obligations vertes**, qui peuvent permettre de financer des investissements importants en vue d'une rentabilité à moyen terme, en particulier des projets visant la préservation de la biodiversité et des services écosystémiques. En mars 2012, la Région Ile-de-France a levé 350 millions d'euros grâce à des obligations vertes, et a pu financer des projets énergétiques, des logements sociaux sobres en énergie, et des actions consacrées à la biodiversité et à l'économie sociale et solidaire. La France pourrait étudier ce type de mécanisme à l'avenir.

#### **4.4 Initiatives et mécanismes relatifs à l'accès aux ressources génétiques et au partage des avantages découlant de leur utilisation, compatibles avec les dispositions de la Convention**

Initiative	Description
Mise en œuvre d'une procédure d'accès et de partage des avantages (APA) transitoire non contraignante pour les bénéficiaires, pilotée par le point focal national pour l'APA dans l'attente de la mise en place d'une législation nationale sur l'APA.	Réception et analyse des requêtes formulées par les chercheurs et les entreprises souhaitant accéder à des ressources génétiques en France (y compris ses départements d'outre-mer).  Encouragement à proposer des dispositions d'échanges d'avantages, le plus souvent mais pas exclusivement sous des formes non monétaires (par exemple : collaboration avec des chercheurs français, dépôts de spécimens auprès de collections françaises, etc.)
Mise en œuvre de formations sur l'APA organisées par le Ministère en charge de l'écologie pour les chercheurs, les entreprises et les parties-prenantes.	

**5. Liste des activités considérées :**

- conservation de la biodiversité *in situ* / *ex situ*
- aires protégées
  
- maintien de la diversité génétique
- lutte contre les espèces exotiques envahissantes
- lutte contre menaces spécifiques sur des espèces et sur des écosystèmes
- APA
- Mesures sectorielles de sensibilisation à la conservation et à un usage durable de la biodiversité
- Mesures sectorielles de préservation de la qualité de l'eau et de prévention contre les pollutions
- Actions de sensibilisation

**6. Identification de la personne qui complète le cadre :**

Pays: France	Nom de la personne qui complète le cadre: Emmanuelle Swynghedauw
Veillez indiquer au nom de qui vous complétez ce cadre:	<input type="checkbox"/> Correspondant national de la Convention <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Correspondant pour la mobilisation des ressources <input type="checkbox"/> Autre. Veuillez préciser :
Titre et Service dont relève cette personne:	Chargée de mission, Sous-direction de l'environnement et des ressources naturelles, Direction Générale de la Mondialisation, du Développement et des Partenariats
Organisation dont relève cette personne:	Ministère des Affaires étrangères
Adresse courriel:	<a href="mailto:emmanuelle.swynghedauw@diplomatie.gouv.fr">emmanuelle.swynghedauw@diplomatie.gouv.fr</a>
Numéro de téléphone:	+33 1 43 17 66 93
Date à laquelle le tableau a été complété et présenté:	Finalisation de l'exercice le : <b>19 juin 2012</b>

**Annexe : Bibliographie des travaux réalisés par la France**

MNHN, 2007, Harold Levrel, « Étude de faisabilité pour la réalisation d'un Millenium Ecosystem Assessment en France »  
[http://www2.mnhn.fr/cersp/IMG/pdf/Rapport\\_Faisabilite\\_MEA\\_France1.pdf](http://www2.mnhn.fr/cersp/IMG/pdf/Rapport_Faisabilite_MEA_France1.pdf)

Centre d'analyse stratégique(CAS), 2009, « Évaluation économique de la biodiversité et des services écosystémiques, rapport n°18.  
[http://www.strategie.gouv.fr/article.php?id\\_article=980](http://www.strategie.gouv.fr/article.php?id_article=980). In English: *An economic approach of biodiversity and ecosystem services – Contribution to public decision-making* <http://www.cbd.int/doc/case-studies/inc/cs-inc-report-en.pdf>

Premier ministre, 2010, « Stratégie nationale pour la biodiversité » [http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/1\\_bis\\_-\\_French\\_National\\_Biodiversity\\_Strategy\\_-\\_May\\_2011.pdf](http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/1_bis_-_French_National_Biodiversity_Strategy_-_May_2011.pdf)

MEDDTL-DEB, 2010, *Millenium ecosystem Assessment* en France, étude exploratoire, » [http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/DGALN\\_Synthese\\_Rapport\\_Final\\_MA20100204.pdf](http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/DGALN_Synthese_Rapport_Final_MA20100204.pdf)

MEDDTL-CGDD, 2010, MNHN « Projet de caractérisation des fonctions écologiques des milieux en France » <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/ED20.pdf>

INSEE, MEDDTL, 2010, « Le rapport Stiglitz, un an après : de nombreuses recommandations mises en oeuvre, de nouveaux travaux à venir »  
[http://www.insee.fr/fr/ppp/comm\\_presse/comm/communiqu%C3%A9\\_20Stiglitz\\_2010\\_web.pdf](http://www.insee.fr/fr/ppp/comm_presse/comm/communiqu%C3%A9_20Stiglitz_2010_web.pdf)

MEDDTL-CGDD, 2010, « Donner une valeur à l'environnement : la monétarisation, un exercice délicat mais nécessaire », *Revue du CGDD*, décembre. <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/RevueM.pdf>

MEDDTL-CGDD, 2010, « Conservation et utilisation durable de la biodiversité et des services écosystémiques : une analyse des outils économiques. Rapport de la Commission des comptes et de l'économie de l'environnement » <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/Conservation-et-utilisation.html>

MEDDTL-CGDD, 2010 et 2011, « Évaluation économique des services rendus par les zones humides :

- Un préalable à leur préservation » <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/L-evaluation-economique-des.html>

- Enseignements méthodologiques de monétarisation, 2011 : [http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/Evaluation-economique-des-services\\_24313.html](http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/Evaluation-economique-des-services_24313.html) ; - Complémentarité des méthodes de monétarisation, 2011 : [http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/Evaluation-economique-des-services\\_24314.html](http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/Evaluation-economique-des-services_24314.html)

- Les Aides Publiques dommageables à la Biodiversité, 2011, rapport CAS / G. SAINTENY : <http://www.strategie.gouv.fr/content/les-aides-publiques-dommageables-la-biodiversite-note-de-synthese-246-octobre-2011>

MEDDTL-CGDD, 2011, « Monétarisation des biens, services et impacts environnementaux. Actes du séminaire du 15 décembre 2010 » <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/ED53-2.pdf>

ONEMA, 2012, J.P. Amigues, B. Chevassus-au-Louis, « Evaluer les services écologiques des milieux aquatiques enjeux scientifiques, politiques et opérationnels », [http://www.onema.fr/IMG/pdf/servicesecologiques\\_BD.pdf](http://www.onema.fr/IMG/pdf/servicesecologiques_BD.pdf)

MEDDTL, 2012, CSPNB « La biodiversité à travers des exemples : services compris » <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/La-biodiversite-a-travers-des.27213.html>

**GERMANY IN THE EU SUBMISSION**

**PRELIMINARY REPORT**  
**ON BIODIVERSITY RESOURCE MOBILIZATION**  
**Submission to the CBD notification (2012-023)**

### Identification of Respondent

<i>Country: Germany</i>	<i>Name of respondent: Axel Benemann</i>
<i>Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:</i>	<i>National Focal Point</i>
<i>Titel and Department of respondent</i>	<i>International Cooperation on Biological Diversity"</i>
<i>Email address:</i>	<i>Axel.Benemann@bmu.bund.de</i>
<i>Telephone contact:</i>	<i>+49 228 99305 2615</i>
<i>Organization of Respondent</i>	<i>Federal Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety</i>

### Introduction

This submission is preliminary and does not represent at all a comprehensive assessment of Germany's financial contribution in support of the three objectives of the CBD. Germany has carried out the data collection and reporting with the objective to support further development and refinement of this preliminary reporting framework. The attached information has to be considered as a first draft and the data reported are to be regarded as incomplete. In particular on national level a majority of data is missing (e.g. Federal State level/local level). **The included information is only of an exemplary nature. The numbers are far below the overall biodiversity financing and should therefore not be aggregated !!!**

At this point in time data is not available for all levels of the government and not for private sector or other non-profit organizations. Germany also did not use the categorization of biodiversity activities.

### 1. International Flows of Financial Resources

The German Government is strongly committed to conserve and sustainably manage biodiversity, forests and ecosystem services in particular not only nationally but also through its international cooperation. In

recognition of the importance of Biodiversity for achieving sustainable development, poverty eradication, mitigating greenhouse gas emissions and for the adaptation to climate change, German international cooperation has significantly increased its engagement in this area.

Guiding instrument for German international cooperation with regard to Biodiversity is the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its Strategic Plan 2011-2020: Through supporting the protection and sustainable use of natural resources and incorporating biodiversity into other sectors as e.g. agriculture and good governance, German Development Cooperation safeguards ecosystem services that are inevitable for human development. Further methods of valorising biodiversity and to integrate these values into development policies and economic decision making are supported. An important instrument for valuating Biodiversity is Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) with regard to genetic resources and the German cooperation increasingly supports countries to implement the Nagoya Protocol on ABS. Furthermore German development cooperation supports the implementation of REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) and supports ecosystem based adaptation to climate change. As it is the explicit objective of biodiversity programs implemented through BMZ and BMU to integrate aspects of protection and sustainable use of biodiversity and as these programs often contain support in policy development or administration and also often include measures to support sustainable production and consumption patterns it is not possible to report in categories A to D.

In the following we show the yearly bilateral commitments and multilateral disbursements of the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and the Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) with regard to biodiversity and forest related projects with the main focus and principle objective to support at least one of the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (protection and sustainable use of biodiversity and the fair sharing of benefits)

#### **Biodiversity related ODA, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany (BMZ)**

The following list shows yearly bilateral pledges and multilateral disbursement with regard to biodiversity and forest related projects (bi- and multilateral) in Million Euro:

Source	2008	2009	2010	2011
BMZ bilateral*	159	183	225	350
BMZ multilateral**	10	13	37	22
<b>BMZ total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>372</b>

\* containing technical cooperation that is implemented through Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH and financial cooperation implemented through KfW Entwicklungsbank. Further they contain a specific amount of money provided each year to support the cooperation with civil society and non governmental organization.

Additionally, in the period of 2008 to 2011 15 Mio. Euros in market funds have been raised.

\*\* includes contributions to the Global Environmental Facilities Focal Area "Biodiversity" and to the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility.

The bilateral figures reported above are commitments whereas OECD-DAC reporting is based on actual disbursement records (since 2010 based on biodiversity Rio Marker BTR 2).

For measuring the relevance of ODA with regard to biodiversity each project is being assessed whether its main focus and principle objective is to support at least one of the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (protection and sustainable use of biodiversity and the fair sharing of benefits) and thus can strike Rio Marker BTR 2. Until the year 2011 only projects marked BTR 2 have been taken into account when internally assessing the increase of BMZ funding toward biodiversity. To take into account the concrete positive impact on biodiversity also of projects that have conservation of biodiversity as a significant but not as the main focus (BTR 1, for example a sustainable land management project) so called sectoral components are integrated into BTR 1 projects and will be monitored with a specific related indicator. This biodiversity sectoral component contributes 100 % to at least one of the three objectives of the CBD (e.g. striking CRS-code 41030) and will be accounted 100 % as a contribution towards biodiversity. The other components of the project are not reported as a contribution to Biodiversity. This methodology ensures that only that part of a project which clearly supports one of the objectives of the CBD is measured and reported. The percentage of the biodiversity sectoral component of the overall project might vary from project to project.

**Biodiversity related ODA, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Germany (BMU)**

In 2008 the BMU launched the International Climate Initiative (ICI) to support projects designed to mitigate climate change (including conservation and restoration of natural carbon sinks and REDD+), adapt to climate change impacts (with a particular focus on ecosystem based adaptation) and to conserve biodiversity. A dedicated support area for biological diversity was established within the Initiative in 2011. The resources for these activities are generated by auctioning emission certificates in the European emission trading system. ICI financing in the area of biological diversity targets projects promoting implementation of the Strategic Plan of the CBD. Projects are carried out by the implementing organisations of the German federal government (GIZ and KfW), other state organisations, non-governmental organisations, scientific institutions and international and multilateral organisations and bodies such as the organisations and programmes of the United Nations. The following table lists the projects pledged every year which have a main focus on biodiversity (in Million Euro):

Source	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>BMU bilateral</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>38*</b>	<b>130</b>

\* includes a one time contribution of 10 Mio. Euro to the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

**Aggregation of BMZ and BMU funding (in Million Euro):**

Source	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>BMZ/BMU funding combined</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>502</b>

**NGOs, Foundations**

Several German NGOs, foundations and church foundations are using resources at international level. It was not possible to make a reliable assessment of the resources involved. In the following only some selected examples of the many internationally active NGOs is given. This list is far from being comprehensive. It has to be considered that part of the funding of the NGOs comes from the governmental budget.

<p><b>The Society for Nature Conservation Germany NABU (Der Naturschutzbund Deutschland e.V)</b> Expenditure in 2010</p>	<p>1.48 mln € for international projects to support nature conservation and environmental protection.  Source: NABU Annual Report 2010</p>
<p><b>WWF Germany</b></p>	<p>39,1 mln € for nature conservation and environmental protection, campaigns aducation and awareness building (of this total amount about 15% is used in Germany)  Source: Annual Report 2010/2011</p>
<p><b>ZGF: Frankfurt Zoological Society</b>  The Society supports some 70 conservation projets in 30 countries (5 projets in Germany)  Expenditure in 2010</p>	<p>8,28 mln € (7,32 mio project costs and 0,96 administration an coordination costs)  Source: Frankfurt Zoological Society Annual Report 2012</p>

## 2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country

The Convention on Biological Diversity is implemented on the federal, state, regional and local level. Within the federal system of Germany the competency for nature conservation is at the States level (Länder) and the vast majority of financing for biodiversity is realized on this level. Nevertheless at this point in time data is only available from the federal governmental level. The figures presented in the following thus do not represent the overall spending but solely showcase some of the spending on national level.

Due to the large number of actors in the private market and non-profit sector it was not possible to make a reliable assessment of the resources involved.

The following data on federal level present a first indication of the different areas of financing they are not meant to be exhaustive.

<i>Government Budgets - Central level</i>	
<b>Federal Ministry of Environment (BMU)</b>	24.315.000 € in 2010
Departments for Conservation and Sustainable Use of National Resources	40.795.000 € in 2011 49.307.000 € in 2012
	Amount includes: important domestic nature conservation projects, research for the BMU, National Programme for Biodiversity since 2011, administration costs, maintenance and salary
<b>The Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)</b> is the scientific authority of the federal government for national and international nature conservation. It is one of the research facilities of the government and reports to the Federal Environmental Ministry	22.435.000 € in 2010 24.435.000 € in 2011 26.605.000 € in 2012  Annual budget of the agency
<b>Federal Ministry for Agricultural Development</b>	Data collection ongoing.
<b>Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development</b> in corporation with the Federal Ministry of Environment  - Federal Programme for Reconnecting Biotopes Interrupted by Highways	<b>78.000.000 €</b> for the installation of wildlife crossings over highways (in the last years)  Planned investment <b>180 million</b> euros
<b>Federal Ministry for Education and Research</b>	Data ollection ongoing.

<b>Government Budgets - State and local levels</b>	
State level: Data is not available.	In the following a figure of a single State is presented to give a general idea of the amount of financing at this level. The state of North Rhine Westphalia (one out of 16 States; 21,8% of the total population; 9,5% of the total area) in 2011 spent 20,2 mln Euro for biodiversity protection.
	Local level: Data not available

**Private Market, NGO, Foundation and Academia**

Comprehensive data not available. As example some data from the Annual Reports of some of the largest NGOs and foundations is given (not always specified for biodiversity). This is only a very short list of the many organizations which are active in Germany and is far from being comprehensive. The purpose for the integration in this report is to showcase in an exemplary manner the strong engagement of the civil society in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.

<p><b>NABU The Society for Nature Conservation Germany NABU e.V.</b> – (Der Naturschutzbund Deutschland e.V)</p> <p>The objective of NABU is to contribute to the preservation of nature and safeguard the future</p> <p>The work of NABU includes: Nature conservation in practice , scientific research, political articulation, environmental education and public relations.</p>	<p>Total budget 2010, 23.8 mln €</p> <p>4.56 mln € for national projects on nature conservation and environmental protection</p> <p>1.48 mln € for international projects on nature conservation and environmental protection</p> <p>Source: NABU Annual Report 2010</p>
<p><b>BUND - Friends of the earth Germany</b></p>	<p>Total budget in 2010, 14 mln €</p> <p>9 mln € for conservation measures, actions, public relations, and lobbying in favor of nature and the</p>

<p>The main objective of the BUND is to contribute to a sustainable development in Germany.</p>	<p>environment a national and state level. Source: BUND annual report</p>
<p><b>WWF Germany</b></p>	<p>About 6 mln € for nature conservation and environmental protection, campaignsm aducation and awareness building in Germany Source: Annual Report 2010/2011</p>
<p>The “<b>Deutsche Bundestiftung Umwelt - DBU</b>” (<b>German Federal Environmental Foundation</b>) is one of the largest foundations in Europe. It promotes innovative and exemplary projects for environmental protection</p>	<p>13,7 mln € funding of projets in the area of conservation (approx 6 mln), environmental education, sustainable land use in 2010</p>

### 3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the Stepp (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicabel )
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	Yes	2010 / 2015		
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	No	/		
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	No	/		
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	Yes x	Ongoing		
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets <sup>62</sup>	Yes	Ongoing		
<p><b>Comments:</b> In September 2012, the Federal Ministry of the Environment officially launches the study, natural capital, Germany/TEEB. The aim is to apply this TEEB approach to Germany, generating economic arguments for nature protection policy</p>				

### 4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability

#### 4.1 Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation

The support to technical cooperation and capacity building is included in the response to chapter 1 (International Flows of Financial Resources).

As regards South-South cooperation Germany is engaged in triangular cooperation with different partner countries. With regard to biodiversity German development cooperation is for example promoting the exchange of experiences between representatives of regional organizations that are engaged in cross-border efforts to conserve tropical forests.

#### **4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies**

Year	Currency:EURO	
Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out		Data not available (regarding agro-environmental measures see EU submission)
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced	15 mln € per year (since 2011)  35 mln € per year (start 2013)	Federal Programme for Biodiversity: The governmental programme supports the implementation of the national strategic for biodiversity (to avoid double counting please note that this governmental programme is included in government budget at central level. )  National forest climate fund: The funds are to be used amongst others to develop schemes to restore balanced landscape water resources, to improve adaptation to climate change, to maintain and secure forest mires, to establish new carbon-rich riparian and moist forests, as well as to set up reference areas
<b>Comments</b> One key element of the national strategy is the dialogue with social actors. Currently, the Department for Conservation of the Federal Ministry of the Environment worked together with high level business associations to establish the project "Biodiversity companies 2020", which is a platform for the dialogue and action of the Ministry with the private sector.		

#### **4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism**

Year:	Currency:		
Type of Initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been	Description

		reflected	
Comments:			

#### ***4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention***

As ABS is an important tool to valorize genetic resources and thus to preserve biodiversity and to reduce poverty in our partner countries, bilateral support of German Development Cooperation for partner countries to implement the Nagoya Protocol on ABS has been considerably increased. In addition the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) hosts the ABS-Capacity Development Initiative. Due to its various measures, studies and communication activities the Initiative received broad international recognition for its capacity development approach and significant impacts on the strong and constructive engagement of the African Group in the international ABS negotiations, which lead to the conclusion of the Nagoya Protocol. Today this multi donor initiative is supported by Germany, Denmark, Norway, the EU and the Institut de l'Énergie et de l'Environnement de la Francophonie. The initiative supported the African Group in the negotiation process leading to the Nagoya Protocol and is now supporting countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific region in implementing ABS regimes.

**ITALY IN THE EU SUBMISSION**

## **Italian contribution for the CBD Notification 2012-023**

### Preliminary methodological issues

As already reported in answer to CBD Notification 2011-071, in line with the commitments taken in the frame of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) concerning a Strategy for Resource Mobilization (Decision VIII/13, para. 4) adopted by COP 9 (decision IX/11) and in line with Decision X/3 adopted by COP 10 in Nagoya, Italy has set up a Permanent Board for CBD Resource Mobilization Strategy.

This Board has been promoted by the Ministry of Environment, Land and Sea – CBD Focal Point – jointly with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Economy and Finance. The Board has been furtherly joined by the Ministry of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Policies, the Ministry of Economic Development and Piedmont Region, on behalf of the Italia Regions.

In the last meeting (April 2012), also the National Italian Institute of Statistics (ISTAT) and the National High Institute for Environmental Protection and Research took part to the Board as observers.

The activities started in July 2011 and were characterized by a significant commitment of the Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea Protection that worked to involve other central administrations dealing with the management and funding of biodiversity. The exchange among the central administrations was primarily aimed at identifying the amount of the expenditure for biodiversity (baseline) as recommended by the CBD Secretariat through: "Methodological and Implementation Guidance for the" Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Convention's Strategy for Resource Mobilization "for the compilation of "reporting framework".

This work stressed the difficulty to provide a high confidence level data for the indirect financial flows that are not directly aimed at protecting biodiversity but do not exclude it.

So, in this first step, only direct financial flows were taken into account.

Critical issues concern both central and local government expenditure, as well as international one (ODA flows), especially when there are financial transfers between two or more administrations because it is difficult to avoid double counting.

Moreover, at present, we didn't take into account private financial flows nor those coming from IFMs.

We also discussed about the need to provide comparable data at national level (data of different years) and at international level.

### The Reporting Framework

In the view to give mainly a contribution to finalize the methodology on indicators and reporting framework, the current attached Reporting Framework filled by Italy has to be considered as a draft and the data reported, even though taken from official sources and therefore reliable, are to be considered as tentative, because their appropriateness depend on the methodologies under which they are accounted.

All methodological notes have been included among the comments in the proper sheet of the Reporting Framework.

Anyway, as regards the data concerning the financial flows – as already declared by Italian representatives in coordination meeting, and even in the informal meeting among Ministers on Resource Mobilisation for global biodiversity of the 14th May – Italy has the opinion that only data collected under international validated methodologies have to be considered. In this view, Italy has taken in consideration the classifications CEPA2000 and CRUMA (currently adopted by Eurostat) and believes that a similar common choice could be done by all EU Member States.

It was decided to adopt a standard methodology to increase the level of reliability as well as the level of data comparability and to work by using the following reporting systems of public expenditure that are already recognized at international level:

- CEPA2000 (Classification of Environmental Protection Activities and expenditure)
- CRUMA (Classification of Resource Use and Management Activities and Expenditure).

CEPA and CRUMA are two classification developed in the context the European System for the Collection of Economic Data on the Environment (SERIEE), the framework intended to supply the Member States with a common basis for the collection and presentation of economic data on the environment.

SERIEE comprises two satellite accounts:

- the Environmental Protection Expenditure Account (EPEA), aiming at the description of measures and related expenditures carried out to protect the environment against pollution and degradation phenomena (qualitative perspective);
- the Natural Resource Use and Management Expenditure Account (RUMEA), devoted to the description of measures and related expenditures carried out to manage and save the stock of natural resources against depletion phenomena (quantitative perspective).

For the EPEA, a classification (namely the CEPA2000) is defined and adopted at the international level, while a similar classification has not been developed yet for the RUMEA. The Eurostat Working Group “Environmental Expenditure Statistics” has assigned a high priority to the development of the RUMEA in the next future. CRUMA is a classification built by ISTAT and currently under discussion at Eurostat level.

For financial flows included in Italian Reporting Frameworks, two classes have been considered:

- CEPA 6, that includes all activities and actions to protect and rehabilitate any species of animal or plant and any type of ecosystem or habitat (including the fight against forest fires), to develop and manage protected areas and parks and urban gardens provided having a clear goal as the protection of biodiversity, to protect and restore the natural and semi-damaged (including quarries and abandoned mines). It also includes – when conducted only for the purpose of environmental protection within or in relation to protected natural areas – activities and actions to protect soil degradation process related to erosion and deterioration of the hydrogeological and vegetation cover of soil. It includes, finally, activities and actions aimed to monitoring, control, regulation and administration, designed exclusively for activity sectors included in this class.
- CRUMA 12, that includes all activities and actions aimed to reduce the taking of the resources belonging to wild fauna and flora and to increase the stock of these resources, including activities and management actions, monitoring and control and the regulation and administration solely concerned with flora and fauna. The activities and actions that





**4. Information on specific Issues Related to Resource Availability**

Year:		Currency:			
Type of initiative		Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1	North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided				
4.1.2	Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity building through triangular cooperation				
4.1.3	North-South technical cooperation and capacity building received				
4.1.4	South-South technical cooperation & capacity building received from other developing countries				
4.1.5	South-South technical cooperation and capacity building - Provided				
Comments:					

**4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies**

Year:		Currency:	
Incentives		Value	Description
4.2.1	Removed, reformed or phases-out		
4.2.2	Positive incentives introduced		
Comments:			

**4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism**

Year:		Currency:	
Type of Initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
Comments:			

**4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention**

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
Comments:	

5. Activity classification

		Activity classification			
Default description	Category A	Category B		Category C	Category D
		Activities where biodiversity protection is the main purpose, such as activities funded by environmental agencies that directly and intentionally impact biodiversity.	Activities related to policy development and administration carried out in part or entirely by environmental agencies		Activities related to sustainable use and sustainable management that have co-benefits for biodiversity. Activities under this category would generally be lead by agencies outside of the environmental sector
	Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan		Activities related to Articles 8, 10 and 11 of the Convention as well Targets 5-8, 10, 14 and 15 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to Articles 11 and 12- 21 of the Convention as well Targets 1-4 of the Strategic Plan
Activities considered (Please check those that apply)	<b>Safeguarding biodiversity</b>	<b>Biodiversity Planning</b>		<b>Sustainable management of ecosystems</b>	<b>Measures in the wider economy and society</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in situ/ex situ conservation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NBASP development		<input type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries, etc)	<input type="checkbox"/> Planning, fiscal and regulatory measures to promote sustainable consumption and production
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protected areas	<input type="checkbox"/> CHM related activities		<input type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to conserve water and prevent pollution	<input type="checkbox"/> Broad scale public awareness and education measures.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maintaining genetic diversity	<b>Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources</b>		<b>Land use and climate related activities</b>	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats from invasive alien species	<input type="checkbox"/> ABS frameworks			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats to specific ecosystems and/or species	<b>Biosafety</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> Managing land use to protect biodiversity, mitigate climate change and increase resilience		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety frameworks			

<p><b>Additional activities</b> (Please add additional activities not already included in the row above)</p>	
--	--

Identification of respondent

Country: <b>Italy</b>	Name of respondent: <b>Dott. Renato Grimaldi</b>
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>National Focal Point</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Focal point for resource mobilization</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other. Please specify:</b>
Title and Department of respondent:	<b>General Directorate for nature and sea protection</b>
Organization of respondent:	<b>Italian Ministry of the Environment, Land and Sea</b>
Email address:	<a href="mailto:pnm-udg@minambiente.it">pnm-udg@minambiente.it</a>
Telephone contact:	0039 06/5722 3433 - 3428
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	22/06/2012

**NETHERLANDS IN THE EU SUBMISSION**

**Resource Mobilisation, based on the reporting framework ([UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add.1, 11 april 2012](#))**

Introductory remarks

The resources reported by the Netherlands in this report are under the reservation that they are a result of an interpretation and a first application of the CBD reporting framework, based on a limited national and international experience with the framework. The data provided by the Netherlands in this report are related to the year 2010 (Table 1 and Table 2).

The report contains national expenditure and national budgets directly related to Biodiversity. Where possible a differentiation between categories A to D was made in table 1 and 2. This was not always possible because classifications and definitions we use nationally cannot easily be applied to the categories A to D. Budget used for water quality and soil quality have been included in the report as well, because of the relationship with the quality of ecosystems and biodiversity. This is also the case for the budget for Ecosystems and natural resources.

Resources that could only be attributed to biodiversity in a very limited or indirect way have been left out, in order to improve the robustness of the report. This affects to total reported numbers only in a very limited way.

Some difficulty we encountered is that OECD-DAC classifications not fully resemble the categorization and classification indicators we use nationally. This leads to a difference in the figures in our national reporting systems compared to those in the in OECD DAC. The data we use in the Reporting Framework are based on our national methodology.

No complete picture can be given of financial resources of the private market and the not for profit organizations. The large number of actors prohibit us to make a responsible judgment of the resources involved. Data on a more generic level is not easily available.

Based on the tables 1 and 2 the total resources for biodiversity of the Netherlands in 2010 sum up to a amount of 1.047 mln € (2010). This includes financial flows from Not For Profit Organisations (1.4) but excludes the Private Market.

## Identification of Respondent

Country: <b>Netherlands</b>	Name of Respondent: <b>Wieger Dijkstra</b>
Please Indicate on whose behalf this is being completed	<input type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input type="checkbox"/> Focal Point for Resource Mobilisation <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify: <b>Senior Policy Advisor</b>
Title and Department of respondent:	<b>Policy advisor at Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment</b>
Organization of Respondent:	<b>Unit Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment</b>
Email address:	<a href="mailto:wieger.dijkstra@minienm.nl">wieger.dijkstra@minienm.nl</a>
Telephone Contact:	<b>0031 6 52740243</b>
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	<b>22 June 2012</b>

## 1 Information on International flows of Financial Resources

<b>Year: 2010</b>		<b>Currency: 1.000 k€</b>									
Type of financial flows		Activity Categories								Total	
		A		B		C		D			
		amount	Confidence	amount	confidence	amount	confidence	amount	confidence	amount	confidence
1.1 ODA	1.1.1 Bilateral	38				24				62	
	1.1.2 Multilateral									32	
1.2 Other Public Funds											
1.3 Private Market											
1.4 Not for profit Organizations										60 (b)	Low
<b>Total:</b>										<b>154 (a)</b>	
<b>Comments:</b> 1.1. Source: Ministerie Buitenlandse Zaken / Ministry of Foreign Affairs  (a) This includes 11,3 mln € for Initiatief Duurzame Handel (IDH / sustainable trade initiative) and 33% (6 mln €) of our total national GEF-contribution (20 mln €) (b) Estimate											

## 2 Information on the availability of financial Resources in each country

<b>Year: 2010</b>		<b>Currency: 1.000 k€</b>									
Type of financial flows		Activity Categories								Total	
		A		B		C		D		amount	Confidence
		amount	Confidence	amount	confidence	amount	confidence	amount	confidence		
2.1 Government Budgets	2.1.1 Central	14 (a) 443 (g)	Med.			8,9 (b) 13,3 c) 22.2 (d) 11.4 (e) 22,9 (f)				535,7	
	2.1.2 Provincial	330 (h)								330	
	2.1.3 Local	21 (i)								21	
2.2 Private / Market											
2.3 Other											
<b>Total:</b>		808				78,7				886,7	
<b>Comments and References:</b> 2.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Budget for Connectivity (preventing ecological and nature fragmentation) in the national Infrastructure Fund: The <a href="#">Meerjaren Programma Ontsnippering</a> (MJPO). In total 250 mln EUR for 2005 – 2018. Estimate for 2010.</li> <li>b) Sustainable Production: Improvement of environmental quality of Soil en Water: Artikel 4 (Duurzaam Producteren), <a href="#">VROM-jaarverslag 2010</a>: 8.937 k€</li> <li>c) Sustainable Production: Sustainable use of ecosystems and natural resources: Artikel 4 (Duurzaam Producteren), VROM jaarverslag 2010: 13.345 k€</li> <li>d) Sustainable use of soil, sub-surface and groundwater, Artikel 10 (Leefomgevingskwaliteit), <a href="#">VROM-jaarverslag 2010</a>: 22.262 k€</li> <li>e) Waddenfonds: Expenditure and Programme: resp. 6.256 k€ en 5.216 k€ (total: 11.472 k€) (reference: <a href="#">VROM-jaarverslag 2010</a>)</li> <li>f) <a href="#">VenW, Annual Report 2010</a>, Water Quality (Art. 31.04): 22.965 k€ (including Water Framework Directive and Marine Strategy)</li> <li>g) Acquisition of protected Areas 41.682 k€, Development of protected Areas 136.619 k€, Management of Protected Areas 264.446 k€</li> <li>h) Budget for Provinces for nature</li> <li>i) Municipality Fund for nature</li> </ul>											

### 3 Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	Yes	2010		TEEB NL is in progress. This <a href="#">first publication</a> in a series of six TEEB studies explores costs and benefits of nature for health and health care. Estimated benefits are 400 mln €/year.
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	No			
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	No			
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	Yes	2011 (ongoing)		Duurzaamheidsagenda (Sustainability Agenda, 2011, <a href="#">Link to website</a> ). The agenda is a Green Growth Strategy and contains 5 focal areas under which: Resources and Product chains, Sustainable water and land use, food and climate and energy. Within these areas several initiatives in different economic sectors have been agreed to target green growth. Biodiversity is part of the overall framework.
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	No			
Comments:				

#### 4.1 Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation

Year: 2010 Currency: 1.000 k€

Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1 North South Technical Cooperation and capacity building provided		62		Through ODA (a)
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity building through triangular cooperation				
Comments:	(a) To avoid double counting please note that this 62 mln € has already been reported in table 1			

#### 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies.

Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed, phased out		
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced	14% of Dutch tax revenues (2010) can be considered as green taxation	Revenues of Green taxation in 2010, not defined to which extend these may be attributed to biodiversity

## 4.3 New and Innovative Financial Mechanisms

Type of initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
Environmental Fiscal reforms: <i>Green taxation</i>	14% of Dutch tax revenue (2010)	It has not been estimated to what extent these revenues can be attributed to biodiversity benefits	
Business Biodiversity Partnerships: <i>Green Deals</i>	No direct government funding but contributions on the level of legal framework, including the removing of legal obstacles to make green initiatives possible.	A number of 11 <a href="#">green deals</a> has a special focus on biodiversity and ecosystems e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity and Economy: formation of a Public Private Partnership (Platform Biodiversiteit en Bedrijfsleven)</li> <li>• Biodiversity+ label</li> <li>• Productive landscape:</li> <li>• And others</li> </ul>	Several Green deals have been agreed between private sector and government. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove (legal) barriers (central government), support sustainable use (private sector, citizens, municipalities) of resources, water, including biodiversity.</li> <li>• Leading to new economic initiatives and activities and cost reductions.</li> </ul>
Markets for Green Products: <i>Duurzaam Inkopen/ Green Procurement</i>	Government procurement (central, provincial, municipal, education etc.) of products and services accounts for about 50 bln €/year.	Procurement needs to fulfill environmental and social criteria.	Monitoring and evaluation of procurement and criteria every 2 years. In developing criteria there is a close collaboration between governmental organisations en private sector.
Payment for Ecosystem services: <i>GDI, Green Development Initiative</i>	VROM: 430.000 (2005 – 2012), exclusief tweede fase (vanuit IPB)	Methodology development Raising awareness and sharing knowlegde Conferences Workshops Reporting	Green Development Initiative: Mobilizing Private Sector Finance for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use. The Netherlands has been one of the initiators and co funders of de development of the GDI. Goal is to create a voluntary, transparent international market for private sector funding of GDI-certified areas.

<b>Type of initiative</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected</b>	<b>Description</b>
Biodiversity offset mechanisms: <i>BBOP, Business Biodiversity Offsetting Program</i>	450.000 € (2005 – 2012), waarvan ca 400.000 uit IPB en ca 50.000 VROM	Methodology development Raising awareness and sharing knowlegde Conferences Workshops Reporting	BBOP is an international collaboration between companies, financial institutions, government agencies and civil society organizations. The members are developing best practice in following the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, minimize, restore, offset) to achieve no net loss or a net gain of biodiversity.
<i>NVI, Natural Value Initiative</i>	VROM: 250.000 (2005 – 2012), exclusief de subsidie vanuit IPB	Methodology development Raising awareness and sharing knowlegde Conferences Workshops Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build awareness of corporate dependence on ecosystem services and impact on biodiversity and the links to corporate risk;</li> <li>• Build expertise both in companies and investors on evaluating and managing biodiversity and ecosystem services (BES) risks and opportunities;</li> <li>• Stimulate improved performance within the private sector and encourage greater reward of responsible behavior;</li> <li>• Mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services (BES) into investment analysis</li> </ul>

Type of initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
Forest Carbon Partnership Facility/ FCPF	Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken : 15 mln EUR 2008- 2012	Methodology development Raising awareness and sharing knowlegde Conferences Workshops Reporting	The FCPF intends to assist developing countries in their efforts to <i>reduce emissions from deforestation and degradation/REDD</i> . The FCPF will be comprised of two separate mechanisms. 1) <u>Readiness Mechanism</u> : the Facility intends to assist developing tropical and sub-tropical countries prepare themselves to participate in a large scale system of positive incentives for REDD 2) Carbon Finance Mechanism: The Facility will support a few countries that will have successfully participated in the Readiness Mechanism to join a second mechanism through which the Facility will test and evaluate incentive payments for REDD programs in five developing countries.
Global Crop Diversity Trust. Innovatieve funding mechanism. Set up in 2004. Funded by governments, foundations (e.g. Gates), companies, NGO's, individual donors. Resource mobility is enhanced and translated by using the endowment fund's interest to finance programmes.	NL has contributed \$ 1,8 mio (of \$ 2,5 mio pledged)  Total mounts up to \$ 172 mio.	Food is one of the main ecosystem services biodiversity lends us. Working on genetic resources for food and agriculture, works to guarantee the effective conservation - and crucially, the ready availability to those who wish to use it - of the biological basis of all agriculture.	The interest from the endowment fund will ensure that the conservation of this most vital and natural resource is placed forever on a firm foundation. The Trust does so by funding, developing and executing demand-driven projects with regards to sustainable use and conservation of genetic resources for food and agriculture, in particular ex-situ, in order to preserve their diversity.
Offset mechanisms and integration with climate policy: Trees for Travel		Planting of trees contributes to sustainable land use and local sustainable development	Government travel CO2 offsetting and tree planting scheme (2010)

4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms (please indicate the number of initiatives and mechanisms your country has undertaken that enhance resource mobilization)

Initiative	Description
<p>ABS Capacity Development Initiative for Africa. Multi-donor Initiative. Co-founded in 2006 by Germany and the Netherlands. NL contributed € 2,5 mio being a partner 2006-2010.</p>	<p>Enabling African states and stakeholders to use benefits generated by the use of genetic resources for biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation.</p>
<p>Comments: Resource mobility is enhanced by exchanging knowledge, raising awareness, and building capacities in the African region about the possibilities of access &amp; benefit-sharing for sustainable development. E.g. best practices, joint programming, studies.</p>	

**POLAND IN THE EU SUBMISSION**

**PRELIMINARY REPORT  
ON BIODIVERSITY RESOURCE MOBILIZATION**

**Identification of respondent**

Please complete the following table:

Country: Poland	Name of respondent: Bozena Haczek
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	CBD National Focal Point
Title and Department of respondent:	Minister's Counsellor/ Department of Forestry and Nature Protection
Organization of respondent:	Ministry of the Environment
Email address:	bozena.haczek@mos.gov.pl
Telephone contact:	+48 22 57 92 423
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	20.06.2012

**1. Information on International Flows of Financial Resources**

Year: 2011		Currency: USD									
Type of financial flows		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management.		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
1.1 ODA	1.1.1 Bilateral			203 169	high	1 483 700	high			1 686 869	high
	1.1.2 Multilateral										
1.2 Other public funds											
1.3 Private/ Market											
1.4 Not for profit organizations											
<b>Total:</b>				203 169	high	1 483 700	high			1 686 869	high
<b>Comments:</b> amount of resources provided in support of biodiversity in developing countries, including energy saving projects											

**2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country**

Year: 2009		Currency: PLN									
Source		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Govern ment budgets	2.1.1 <i>Central</i>	202 102 000	high					34 010 000	high	236 112 000	high
	2.1.2 <i>State/Pro vincial</i>	26 476 000	high							26 476 000	high
	2.1.3 <i>Local/ Municip al</i>										
2.2 Private/ Market											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)											
<b>Total:</b>		228 578 000	high					34 010 000	high	262 588 000	high
<p><b>Comments:</b> data for local budgets, private/market and other not available; data for category A include data for category B and C</p>											

Year: 2010		Currency: PLN									
Source		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	229 052 000	high					30 446 000	high	259 498 000	high
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	28 594 000	high							28 594 000	high
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal										
2.2 Private/ Market											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)											
<b>Total:</b>		257 646 000	high					30 446 000	high	288 092 000	high
<b>Comments:</b> data for local budgets, private/market and other not available; data for category A include data for category B and C											

**3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization**

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	Yes	2005/2007	Not applicable	As a part of NBSAP; for a period 2007-2013 funding needs: 281,1 mln PLN
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	Yes	2008/-	Not applicable	Nature protection included into national priorities in the State Ecological Policy for 2009-2012, and beyond by 2016. Biodiversity included into national priorities in the draft National Development Strategy by 2020
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	Yes	2008/2011	Not applicable	Biodiversity distinguished in government and self-government budgets

**4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability**

**4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation**

Year:

Currency:

Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided				
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity-building through triangular cooperation				
<b>Comments:</b> no data available				

#### 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies

Year: Currency:

Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out		
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced		
<b>Comments</b> : no initiatives undertaken		

#### 4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism

Year: 2010 Currency: PLN

Type of Initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management	99 466 000	Projects and other activities on biodiversity and sustainable forestry	below
<b>Comments:</b> The National Fund of Environmental Protection and Water Management (NFEP&WM) which was established in 1989 as a result of the regime transformation in Poland, in cooperation with voivodeship funds for environmental protection and water management is the pillar of the Polish system of financing environmental protection, including biodiversity. The basis of the National Fund's operation as a State legal person is the Act on Environmental Protection Law. The mission of the National Fund, according to the NFEP&WM Strategy for 2009-2012, is to financially support undertakings intended for environmental protection and respecting its value, on the basis of the principle of sustainable development included in the constitution. It participates in implementation of the environmental policy of Poland as a source of financing and cooperate, along with the Ministry of the Environment, with commissions of environmental protection at the Sejm and Senate. The National Fund and voivodeship funds provide financial support for projects which contribute to enforcement of Polish environmental obligations, including implementation of the Convention on biological diversity. The amount of money, mentioned above is included in the central government budget in the second table under para 2			

#### 4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
<b>Comments:</b> no initiatives undertaken	

**SPAIN IN THE EU SUBMISSION**

**Contribución Española en respuesta a la Notificación 2012-023 de la Secretaría del Convenio de Naciones Unidas sobre Diversidad Biológica**

En contestación a la **Notificación 2012-023** de la Secretaría del CDB, en la que se anima a las Partes del Convenio a hacer uso de la estructura de información, se adjunta a continuación la información relativa a la aplicación en España del marco de información preliminar sobre la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos.

De conformidad con las directrices para el uso del marco de información preliminar, se aporta la información disponible para el periodo comprendido entre los años **2006 y 2010**. Todas las cantidades se indican en **euros (€)** para el periodo correspondiente.

Para la aplicación de este marco preliminar de información ha sido necesario consultar y contar con la colaboración de numerosas instituciones y organismos que disponen de la información relevante en la materia. En particular, se han realizado consultas a los organismos de la Administración Estatal responsable en materia de cooperación internacional al desarrollo y, en varios campos relacionados con la conservación del medio natural, así como a los responsables en materia de biodiversidad y naturaleza en las Comunidades Autónomas, y a la Federación Española de Municipios y Provincias. Asimismo, se han realizado consultas a instituciones representativas del sector privado y a organizaciones no gubernamentales y fundaciones relevantes.

Pese a los esfuerzos realizados por recopilar la máxima información disponible, no ha resultado posible responder a todos los campos requeridos. Si bien la información aportada como respuesta a este marco de información corresponde a la mejor información disponible, se trata de datos parciales e incompletos, por lo que no debe interpretarse como una cuantificación completa ni exhaustiva de todos los recursos de financiación movilizados en España para la conservación y el uso sostenible de la biodiversidad. No obstante, esta Subdirección General prevé continuar con este ejercicio de recopilación y consolidación de información, a fin de seguir completando y mejorando la información sobre los flujos nacionales e internacionales de financiación para la biodiversidad.

A continuación se señala la metodología que se ha utilizado para la toma de datos, así como las principales dificultades y carencias que se han encontrado durante la aplicación del marco de información preliminar.

### 1.1. Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo

Los datos de Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo (AOD) aportados para la Categoría A corresponden a la AOD identificada con el código CRS41030 (biodiversidad) del CAD/OCDE. El nivel de fiabilidad de estos datos se considera alto, por tratarse de información oficial que se recoge sistemáticamente.

No es posible aportar datos para las categorías B, C y D puesto que no existen metodologías para contabilizar cuantitativamente la cantidad de financiación que contribuye a la biodiversidad a través de otras actividades sectoriales. No obstante, existe constancia de que, además de las actividades identificadas con el marcador CRS41030, muchas actividades identificadas con otros códigos CRS contribuyen también a los objetivos del Convenio de Diversidad Biológica. Por ejemplo, los marcadores CRS 41010 (política medioambiental y gestión administrativa), CRS 41081 (educación ambiental) y CRS 41082 (investigación medioambiental) pueden resultar relevantes en el contexto de este marco de información. Sin embargo, se ha optado por no incluir la información de estos marcadores por no poder cuantificarse la contribución concreta que, a través de esas actividades, se realiza a los objetivos de biodiversidad. Los datos correspondientes a dichos CRS, no obstante, se encuentran disponibles en los informes oficiales enviados por España al OCDE/CAD y pueden ser utilizados, en caso de considerarse oportuno.

Por otro lado, el marcador de Río sobre diversidad biológica puede aportar información cualitativa relevante, puesto que permite identificar las actividades que contribuyen a la conservación de la biodiversidad, si bien no proporciona información cuantitativa. En este sentido, el desarrollo de directrices metodológicas para el posible uso o revisión de los marcadores de Río, en línea con la invitación del párrafo 12 de la Decisión X/3, podría contribuir a la obtención de una información más sólida sobre la financiación para biodiversidad a través de la Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo.

En todo caso, se considera que la metodología para obtener la información relativa a la financiación para biodiversidad a través de la Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo debe poder obtenerse de forma directa y sencilla, a partir de la información oficial que se remite al Comité de Ayuda al Desarrollo de la OCDE (OCDE/CAD).

### 1.2. Otros fondos públicos:

Aunque existe información relativa a otros fondos públicos diferentes de la ODA en los datos relativos a "otros flujos financieros" (OFF), no existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la

biodiversidad a través de estos otros flujos financieros. Por tanto, no ha sido posible aportar los datos relativos a la financiación para la biodiversidad a través de otros fondos públicos. Para ello, sería necesario el desarrollo y aplicación de metodologías que permitieran la identificación y cuantificación de la parte de OFF que contribuye a la protección de la biodiversidad.

### 1.3. Sector privado / mercados:

No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través del sector privado.

### 1.4. Organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro:

No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro. Este Ministerio ha realizado una consulta a algunas de las principales ONG de medio ambiente en España, a fin de realizar una estimación orientativa de los fondos destinados a biodiversidad a nivel internacional por estas instituciones. No obstante, la falta de información disponible no ha permitido realizar este tipo de estimaciones.

### 2.1. Presupuestos gubernamentales:

Para la estimación de los presupuestos gubernamentales destinados a la protección de la biodiversidad, se han realizado consultas a diferentes Direcciones Generales de la Administración General del Estado con competencias directas o indirectas en esta materia, y a los órganos competentes de las Comunidades Autónomas, así como a la Federación Española de Municipios y Provincias.

Los datos de los presupuestos de la **Administración Central** (punto 2.1.1.) se han calculado a partir de los presupuestos ejecutados destinados a la protección de biodiversidad, incluyendo los presupuestos de los siguientes organismos:

- presupuesto de la entonces Dirección General de Medio Natural y Política Forestal, destinado a las siguientes líneas de actuación: conservación de la biodiversidad; inventario y seguimiento de la biodiversidad; difusión y comunicación ambiental; lucha contra incendios forestales; hidrología; ordenación forestal; material genético forestal; lucha contra agentes nocivos; inventario forestal; vías pecuarias; banco de datos de biodiversidad; y análisis territorial.

- Presupuesto de la Fundación Biodiversidad, destinado íntegramente a la protección de la biodiversidad y el medio natural.
- Presupuesto ejecutado por el Organismo Autónomo de Parques Nacionales destinado directamente a protección de la biodiversidad.
- Presupuesto ejecutado por la Dirección General de Sostenibilidad de la Costa y el Mar a favor de la protección de la biodiversidad marina y costera, que incluye actividades de protección, rehabilitación y gestión de sistemas litorales naturales y actuaciones desarrolladas por la División de la Protección del Mar.
- Presupuesto ejecutado por la Dirección General de Recursos Pesqueros y Acuicultura que contribuyen a la protección de la biodiversidad: presupuestos relacionados con acuerdos y organizaciones regionales de pesca; presupuesto ejecutado en reservas marinas pesqueras, arrecifes artificiales y medidas de mitigación de capturas accidentales; y presupuesto para el cartografiado y caracterización de los fondos marinos.
- Presupuesto de la Dirección General del Agua que contribuye a la protección de la biodiversidad, entre los que se incluyen actuaciones destinadas principalmente a la conservación y mejora de cauces y riberas.

En el cálculo de estos presupuestos se ha descontado la parte de estos presupuestos correspondientes a cofinanciación de la Unión Europea, a fin de evitar duplicidades con los datos aportados por los presupuestos comunitarios. Para este cálculo, se ha descontado ente el 70% y el 80% de los presupuestos de las líneas de actuación que cuentan con co-financiación comunitaria. Esta metodología constituye una aproximación ya que no siempre se conoce con precisión si esos presupuestos cuentan con cofinanciación comunitaria y, en ese caso, el porcentaje concreto de cofinanciación, El grado de fiabilidad debe considerarse por tanto relativamente bajo.

En cuanto a los datos correspondientes a la **Administración Autonómica (2.1.2) y local (2.1.3)**, la recopilación de toda la información relevante ha resultado de gran complejidad, debido al alto número de organismos involucrados. Por este motivo, y pese a la colaboración prestada por varias Comunidades Autónomas, dada las dificultades que entraña identificar y recopilar una información exhaustiva de todos los organismos relevantes en esta materia, se ha optado por utilizar como fuente de información los datos existentes de acuerdo con la Clasificación de las Funciones de las Administraciones Públicas. Los datos aportados en este caso se han extraído de la clasificación funcional de los empleos de las Administraciones Públicas, que ofrece información sobre el gasto realizado por las Administraciones Públicas atendiendo a su finalidad. Esta información, que se publica anualmente en los informes de Cuentas de las Administraciones Públicas, se obtiene aplicando la metodología de la Clasificación de las Funciones de las Administraciones Públicas (CFAP) de las Naciones Unidas, recogida en el Reglamento (CE) nº 113/2002 de la Comisión Europea, de 23 de enero de 2002.

En concreto, se han utilizado para este apartado los datos correspondientes a la subfunción 05.4, relativa a al gasto público en protección de la diversidad biológica y del paisaje. En esta categoría se incluyen los gastos relativos a actividades como:

protección y recuperación de especies y hábitats; protección de paisajes naturales y seminaturales; y actividades de medición, control y laboratorios y similares.

No ha sido posible, en este caso, establecer una distinción entre las cuatro categorías, por lo que la información obtenida se ha incluido como total, incluyendo a todas las categorías.

## 2.2. Sector privado/mercados

La información que se aporta sobre la financiación del sector privado ha sido tomada de la Encuesta del gasto de las empresas en protección ambiental, elaborada por el Instituto Nacional de Estadística ([www.ine.es](http://www.ine.es)). Esta información incluye los resultados de una encuesta realizada al sector industrial español. Los datos que se han considerado para esta contestación se refieren únicamente al gasto realizado por el sector empresarial industrial español en equipos, instalaciones y actividades para la protección de la naturaleza, que incluyen: compra de terrenos por razones de protección de la naturaleza; repoblación; recuperación del paisaje después de excavaciones; zonas verdes alrededor de actividades industriales; adaptación de estructuras para prevenir colisiones de animales.

No se han tenido en cuenta los co-beneficios para la biodiversidad derivados de otro tipo de actuaciones (como descontaminación de aguas, reducción de la contaminación, etc.) por la dificultad que entraña identificar con fiabilidad la proporción de esas actividades que efectivamente contribuye a la conservación de la diversidad biológica.

Puesto que la información aportada se refiere exclusivamente al sector industrial, se considera que el grado de fiabilidad es medio, puesto que a esta cantidad debería añadirse la contribución de otros sectores empresariales, como el sector de servicios. No existen datos disponibles, ni se han podido obtener datos fiables sobre otros sectores empresariales, que pueden tener una contribución significativa para la protección de la biodiversidad.

## 2.3. Otros: ONG, fundaciones y academia.

No ha sido posible recabar información fiable y completa sobre los recursos movilizados para la biodiversidad por otros agentes como las organizaciones no

gubernamentales o las fundaciones y academias. Esta información se encuentra muy disgregada y no existen fuentes de información oficiales en esta materia.

**Identification of respondent**

Country: <b>Spain</b>	Name of respondent: <b>Miguel Aymerich</b>
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input type="checkbox"/> Focal point for resource mobilization <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify
Title and Department of respondent:	Head of Unit of Nature.
Organization of respondent:	Ministry on Agriculture, Food and Environment.
Email address:	MAymerich@magrama.es
Telephone contact:	91.7493614
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	1 <sup>st</sup> July 2012

**1. Information on International Flows of Financial Resources.**

Year: 2006		Currency: €									
Type of financial flows:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1. Bilateral	5.116.690	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1.1.2. Multilateral	1.160.871	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2. Other public funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3. Private/Market		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.4. Not profit organizations		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>		<b>6.277.561</b>	Low								
<b>Comments:</b>											
<p>1.1. Los datos de Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo (AOD) aportados para la Categoría A corresponden a la AOD identificada con el código CRS41030 (biodiversidad) del CAD/OCDE. (Fuente: datos de la AOD de España). El nivel de fiabilidad de estos datos se considera medio por tratarse de información oficial que se recoge sistemáticamente, pero que no incluye necesariamente la totalidad de la ODA que contribuye a la biodiversidad, sino únicamente aquellas actuaciones identificadas con el CRS 41030.</p> <p>1.2., 1.3, 1.4: No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través de otros fondos públicos, el sector privado o las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro. No ha sido posible obtener estimaciones de estos flujos.</p>											

Year: 2007		Currency: €									
Type of financial flows:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1. Bilateral	5.477.733	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1.1.2. Multilateral	4.193.144	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2. Other public funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3. Private/Market		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.4. Not profit organizations		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>		<b>9.670.877</b>	Low								
<b>Comments:</b>											
<p>1.1. Los datos de Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo (AOD) aportados para la Categoría A corresponden a la AOD identificada con el código CRS41030 (biodiversidad) del CAD/OCDE. (Fuente: datos de la AOD de España). El nivel de fiabilidad de estos datos se considera medio por tratarse de información oficial que se recoge sistemáticamente, pero que no incluye necesariamente la totalidad de la ODA que contribuye a la biodiversidad, sino únicamente aquellas actuaciones identificadas con el CRS 41030.</p> <p>1.2., 1.3, 1.4: No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través de otros fondos públicos, el sector privado o las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro. No ha sido posible obtener estimaciones de estos flujos.</p>											

Year: 2008		Currency: €									
Type of financial flows:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1. Bilateral	15.571.808	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1.1.2. Multilateral	3.359.193	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2. Other public funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3. Private/Market		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.4. Not profit organizations		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>		<b>18.931.000</b>	Low								
<b>Comments:</b>											
<p>1.1. Los datos de Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo (AOD) aportados para la Categoría A corresponden a la AOD identificada con el código CRS41030 (biodiversidad) del CAD/OCDE. (Fuente: datos de la AOD de España). El nivel de fiabilidad de estos datos se considera medio por tratarse de información oficial que se recoge sistemáticamente, pero que no incluye necesariamente la totalidad de la ODA que contribuye a la biodiversidad, sino únicamente aquellas actuaciones identificadas con el CRS 41030.</p> <p>1.2., 1.3, 1.4: No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través de otros fondos públicos, el sector privado o las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro. No ha sido posible obtener estimaciones de estos flujos.</p>											

Year: 2009		Currency: €									
Type of financial flows:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1. Bilateral	8.488.664	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1.1.2. Multilateral	6.972.175	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2. Other public funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3. Private/Market		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.4. Not profit organizations		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>		<b>15.460.839</b>	Low								
<b>Comments:</b>											
<p>1.1. Los datos de Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo (AOD) aportados para la Categoría A corresponden a la AOD identificada con el código CRS41030 (biodiversidad) del CAD/OCDE. (Fuente: datos de la AOD de España). El nivel de fiabilidad de estos datos se considera medio por tratarse de información oficial que se recoge sistemáticamente, pero que no incluye necesariamente la totalidad de la ODA que contribuye a la biodiversidad, sino únicamente aquellas actuaciones identificadas con el CRS 41030.</p> <p>En el año 2009, el 4,20% de las actuaciones de la Cooperación Española tienen incorporada la biodiversidad en mayor o menor grado, es decir, un total de 718 actuaciones. Dentro de las actuaciones marcadas, hay un mayor número de significativas (508) que de principales (210), sumando un total de 181 millones de euros. Por tanto, puede concluirse que un 5,2% de la AOD bilateral en 2009 contempla la diversidad biológica. (Fuente: informe de Seguimiento PACI 2009).</p> <p>1.2., 1.3, 1.4: No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través de otros fondos públicos, el sector privado o las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro. No ha sido posible obtener estimaciones de estos flujos.</p>											

Year: 2010		Currency: €									
Type of financial flows:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1. Bilateral	7.015.707	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1.1.2. Multilateral	4.272.743	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2. Other public funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3. Private/Market		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.4. Not profit organizations		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>		<b>11.288.450</b>	<b>Low</b>								
<b>Comments:</b>											
<p><b>1.1.</b> Los datos de Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo (AOD) aportados para la Categoría A corresponden a la AOD identificada con el código CRS41030 (biodiversidad) del CAD/OCDE. (Fuente: datos de la AOD de España). El nivel de fiabilidad de estos datos se considera medio por tratarse de información oficial que se recoge sistemáticamente, pero que no incluye necesariamente la totalidad de la ODA que contribuye a la biodiversidad, sino únicamente aquéllas actuaciones identificadas con el CRS 41030.</p> <p>De acuerdo con los datos aportados por los marcadores de Rio, en el año 2010, del total de la AOD bilateral española, 192 millones de euros (578 contribuciones), que representan el 6,7% del total, incluían aspectos vinculados a la biodiversidad.</p> <p><b>1.2., 1.3, 1.4:</b> No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través de otros fondos públicos, el sector privado o las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro. No ha sido posible obtener estimaciones de estos flujos.</p>											

**2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in Spain.**

Year: 2006		Currency: €									
Source:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1. Government budgets	2.1.1. Central	158.093.638	medium	-	-	20.381.851	medium	-	-	178.475.489	low
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.098.000.000	low
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	195.000.000	low
2.2. Private/Market		46.589.236	medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	46.589.236	low
2.3. Other (NGOs, foundation, academia)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1.518.064.725</b>	<b>low</b>
<b>Comments:</b>											
<p><b>2.1.1.</b> Los datos aportados en la categoría A se han calculado a partir de los presupuestos ejecutados destinados a la protección de biodiversidad de los siguientes organismos: la entonces Dirección General de Medio Natural y Política Forestal (111.182.166€) + Fundación Biodiversidad (10.072.480 €) + Organismo Autónomo de Parques Nacionales ( 34.713.891 €) + Dirección General de Sostenibilidad de la Costa y el Mar (2.125.101 €)</p> <p>Los datos aportados en la categoría C se han calculado a partir del presupuesto que contribuye a la conservación y protección de la biodiversidad ejecutado por la Dirección General de Recursos Pesqueros y Acuicultura (5.432.604 €) + la Dirección General del Agua (14.949.247€)</p> <p><b>2.1.2. y 2.1.3.</b> Se incluyen en estos apartados los datos de gasto público en protección de la diversidad biológica y del paisaje de las Comunidades Autónomas y las Entidades Locales, de acuerdo con la clasificación funcional de los empleos de las Administraciones Públicas, aplicando la metodología de la Clasificación de las Funciones de las Administraciones Públicas (CFAP) de las Naciones Unidas. (Fuente: Cuentas de las Administraciones Públicas 2007).</p>											

2.2: La información que se aporta sobre la financiación del sector privado ha sido tomada de la Encuesta del gasto de las empresas en protección ambiental, elaborada por el Instituto Nacional de Estadística ([www.ine.es](http://www.ine.es)), que se refiere únicamente al sector industrial, por lo que el grado de fiabilidad se considera medio. No existen datos disponibles ni se han podido obtener datos fiables sobre otros sectores empresariales que pueden tener una contribución significativa para la protección de la biodiversidad.

2.3: No ha sido posible recabar información fiable y completa sobre los recursos movilizados para la biodiversidad por otros agentes como las organizaciones no gubernamentales o las fundaciones y academias. Esta información se encuentra muy disgregada y no existen fuentes de información oficiales en esta materia.

Year: 2007		Currency: €									
Source:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1. Government budgets	2.1.1. Central	170.560.402	medium	-	-	42.365.677	medium	-	-	212.926.079	low
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.003.000.000	low
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	266.000.000	low
2.2. Private/Market		64.857.736	medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	64.857.736	low
2.3. Other (NGOs, foundation, academia)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.546.783.815	low

**Comments:**

2.1.1. Los datos aportados en la categoría A se han calculado a partir de los presupuestos ejecutados destinados a la protección de biodiversidad de los siguientes organismos: la entonces Dirección General de Medio Natural y Política Forestal (116.857.669€) + Fundación Biodiversidad (13.293.907 €) + Organismo Autónomo de Parques Nacionales ( 37.790.383 €) + Dirección General de Sostenibilidad de la Costa y el Mar ( 2.569.443 €) + División de Protección del Medio marino ( 49.000 €)

Los datos aportados en la categoría C se han calculado a partir del presupuesto que contribuye a la conservación y protección de la biodiversidad ejecutado por la Dirección

General de Recursos Pesqueros y Acuicultura (7.230.360 € ) + la Dirección General del Agua (35.135.317€)

2.1.2. y 2.1.3. Se incluyen en estos apartados los datos de gasto público en protección de la diversidad biológica y del paisaje de las Comunidades Autónomas y las Entidades Locales, de acuerdo con la clasificación funcional de los empleos de las Administraciones Públicas, aplicando la metodología de la Clasificación de las Funciones de las Administraciones Públicas (CFAP) de las Naciones Unidas. (Fuente: Cuentas de las Administraciones Públicas 2007).

2.2: La información que se aporta sobre la financiación del sector privado ha sido tomada de la Encuesta del gasto de las empresas en protección ambiental, elaborada por el Instituto Nacional de Estadística ([www.ine.es](http://www.ine.es)), que se refiere únicamente al sector industrial, por lo que el grado de fiabilidad se considera medio. No existen datos disponibles ni se han podido obtener datos fiables sobre otros sectores empresariales que pueden tener una contribución significativa para la protección de la biodiversidad.

2.3: No ha sido posible recabar información fiable y completa sobre los recursos movilizados para la biodiversidad por otros agentes como las organizaciones no gubernamentales o las fundaciones y academias. Esta información se encuentra muy disgregada y no existen fuentes de información oficiales en esta materia.

Year: 2008		Currency: €									
Source:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1. Government budgets	2.1.1. Central	161.251.604	medium	-	-	-	50.202.623	medium	-	211.454.228	low
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.032.000.000	low
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	273.000.000	low
2.2. Private/Market		75.395.062	medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	75.395.062	low
2.3. Other (NGOs, foundation, academia)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.591.849.290	low

**Comments:**

**2.1.1.** Los datos aportados en la categoría A se han calculado a partir de los presupuestos ejecutados destinados a la protección de biodiversidad de los siguientes organismos: la entonces Dirección General de Medio Natural y Política Forestal (107.378.544€) + Fundación Biodiversidad (9.340.478 €) + Organismo Autónomo de Parques Nacionales ( 41.789.911 €) + Dirección General de Sostenibilidad de la Costa y el Mar ( 1.937.856 €) + División de Protección del Medio marino ( 804.815 €)

Los datos aportados en la categoría C se han calculado a partir del presupuesto que contribuye a la conservación y protección de la biodiversidad ejecutado por la Dirección General de Recursos Pesqueros y Acuicultura ( 7.076.041 €) + la Dirección General del Agua (43.126.582€)

**2.1.2. y 2.1.3.** Se incluyen en estos apartados los datos de gasto público en protección de la diversidad biológica y del paisaje de las Comunidades Autónomas y las Entidades Locales, de acuerdo con la clasificación funcional de los empleos de las Administraciones Públicas, aplicando la metodología de la Clasificación de las Funciones de las Administraciones Públicas (CFAP) de las Naciones Unidas. (Fuente: Cuentas de las Administraciones Públicas 2007).

**2.2:** La información que se aporta sobre la financiación del sector privado ha sido tomada de la Encuesta del gasto de las empresas en protección ambiental, elaborada por el Instituto Nacional de Estadística ([www.ine.es](http://www.ine.es)), que se refiere únicamente al sector industrial, por lo que el grado de fiabilidad se considera medio. No existen datos disponibles ni se han podido obtener datos fiables sobre otros sectores empresariales que pueden tener una contribución significativa para la protección de la biodiversidad.

**2.3:** No ha sido posible recabar información fiable y completa sobre los recursos movilizados para la biodiversidad por otros agentes como las organizaciones no gubernamentales o las fundaciones y academias. Esta información se encuentra muy disgregada y no existen fuentes de información oficiales en esta materia.

Year: 2009		Currency: €									
Source:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende
2.1. Government budgets	2.1.1. Central	213.524.303	medium	-	-	96.034.816	medium	-	-	309.559.119	low
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.046.000.000	low
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	442.000.000	low
2.2. Private/Market		39.937.424	medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	39.937.424	low
2.3. Other (NGOs, foundation, academia)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
<b>Total:</b>		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>1.837.496.543</b>	low

**Comments:**

**2.1.1.** Los datos aportados en la categoría A se han calculado a partir de los presupuestos ejecutados destinados a la protección de biodiversidad de los siguientes organismos: la entonces Dirección General de Medio Natural y Política Forestal (146.005.455€) + Fundación Biodiversidad (22.636.686 €) + Organismo Autónomo de Parques Nacionales ( 41.575.041€) + Dirección General de Sostenibilidad de la Costa y el Mar (3.269.943 €) + División de Protección del Medio marino (37.178 €)

Los datos aportados en la categoría C se han calculado a partir del presupuesto que contribuye a la conservación y protección de la biodiversidad ejecutado por la Dirección General de Recursos Pesqueros y Acuicultura (7.731.293 €) + la Dirección General del Agua (88.303.523€)

**2.1.2. y 2.1.3.** Se incluyen en estos apartados los datos de gasto público en protección de la diversidad biológica y del paisaje de las Comunidades Autónomas y las Entidades Locales, de acuerdo con la clasificación funcional de los empleos de las Administraciones Públicas, aplicando la metodología de la Clasificación de las Funciones de las Administraciones Públicas (CFAP) de las Naciones Unidas. (Fuente: Cuentas de las Administraciones Públicas 2007).

2.2: La información que se aporta sobre la financiación del sector privado ha sido tomada de la Encuesta del gasto de las empresas en protección ambiental, elaborada por el Instituto Nacional de Estadística ([www.ine.es](http://www.ine.es)), que se refiere únicamente al sector industrial, por lo que el grado de fiabilidad se considera medio. No existen datos disponibles ni se han podido obtener datos fiables sobre otros sectores empresariales que pueden tener una contribución significativa para la protección de la biodiversidad.

2.3: No ha sido posible recabar información fiable y completa sobre los recursos movilizados para la biodiversidad por otros agentes como las organizaciones no gubernamentales o las fundaciones y academias. Esta información se encuentra muy disgregada y no existen fuentes de información oficiales en esta materia.

Year: 2010		Currency: €									
Source:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende
2.1. Government budgets	2.1.1. Central	152.835.288	medium	-	-	104.345.417	medium	-	-	257.180.705	low
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.2. Private/Market		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.3. Other (NGOs, foundation, academia)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Comments:</b>											
2.1.1. Los datos aportados en la categoría A se han calculado a partir de los presupuestos ejecutados destinados a la protección de biodiversidad de los siguientes organismos: la entonces Dirección General de Medio Natural y Política Forestal (110.974.305€) + Fundación Biodiversidad (7.908.740 €) + Organismo Autónomo de Parques Nacionales (30.534.807 €) + Dirección General de Sostenibilidad de la Costa y el Mar ( 2.464.657 €) + División de la Protección del Medio marino ( 952.779 €)											

Los datos aportados en la categoría C se han calculado a partir del presupuesto que contribuye a la conservación y protección de la biodiversidad ejecutado por la Dirección General de Recursos Pesqueros y Acuicultura (8.496.200 €) + la Dirección General del Agua (95.849.217€)

2.1.2. y 2.1.3. No se aportan datos para este año por no estar aún disponibles los datos de gasto público en protección de la diversidad biológica y del paisaje de las Comunidades Autónomas y las Entidades Locales para el año 2010.

2.2: No se aporta información relativa al sector privado por no estar aún disponibles los datos de la Encuesta del gasto de las empresas en protección ambiental para el año 2010.

2.3: No ha sido posible recabar información fiable y completa sobre los recursos movilizados para la biodiversidad por otros agentes como las organizaciones no gubernamentales o las fundaciones y academias. Esta información se encuentra muy disgregada y no existen fuentes de información oficiales en esta materia.

**3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization**

Steps		Year initiated/completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	Yes	Primer informe de resultados publicado en 2011. Actualmente, está en marcha la segunda fase del proyecto.	Proyecto coordinado por la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, con el apoyo de la Fundación Biodiversidad.	Proyecto de Evaluación de Ecosistemas del Milenio en España, elaborado por la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid con el apoyo de la Fundación Biodiversidad. <a href="http://www.ecomilenio.es">www.ecomilenio.es</a>
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	Yes	El Plan Estratégico del Patrimonio Natural y la Biodiversidad, que incluye una identificación de las necesidades de financiación y de las prioridades de actuación, fue aprobado en septiembre de 2011.		El Plan Estratégico del Patrimonio Natural y la Biodiversidad incluye una estimación del presupuesto que se consideraría necesario para un desarrollo adecuado de las acciones establecidas. <a href="http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/legislacion/rd_plan_estrategico_patrimonio_natural_biodiversidad.aspx">http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/legislacion/rd_plan_estrategico_patrimonio_natural_biodiversidad.aspx</a>
				El Plan Estratégico del Patrimonio Natural y la Biodiversidad incluye

3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	Yes	El Plan Estratégico del Patrimonio Natural y la Biodiversidad fue aprobado por Consejo de Ministros en septiembre de 2011.		una serie de acciones destinadas al objetivo de movilizar los recursos financieros de todas las fuentes para asegurar la adecuada financiación de la política de conservación de biodiversidad. Se considera, por tanto, que este Plan Estratégico incluye, así, el plan de financiación para biodiversidad. <a href="http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/legislacion/rd_plan_estrategico_patrimonio_natural_biodiversidad.aspx">http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/legislacion/rd_plan_estrategico_patrimonio_natural_biodiversidad.aspx</a>
Steps		Year initiated/completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	Yes	El III Plan Director de la Cooperación española fue aprobado por Consejo de Ministros para el periodo 2009-2011.		El III Plan Director de la Cooperación española reconoce el medio ambiente como base del desarrollo, considerándolo una prioridad horizontal y sectorial.  Se apuesta por un nuevo paradigma de desarrollo, caracterizado por economías sostenibles que respeten los límites de la naturaleza, con altos índices de biodiversidad, justicia social y equidad y bajas emisiones de dióxido de carbono y por la transversalización del medio ambiente en todas sus acciones.

				De este modo, la consideración de la biodiversidad y de los servicios de los ecosistemas han sido integrados en el Plan Director de la Cooperación española.  <a href="http://www.aecid.es/galerias/publicaciones/descargas/libro1_PlanDirector_LR.pdf">http://www.aecid.es/galerias/publicaciones/descargas/libro1_PlanDirector_LR.pdf</a>
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	Yes	En todos los años comprendidos en el periodo 2006-2010, los Presupuestos Generales del Estado incluyen un programa presupuestario (456C) destinado a la protección y mejora del medio natural.		Los presupuestos generales del Estado incluyen un programa presupuestario (456C) destinado específicamente a la protección y mejora del medio natural.  <a href="http://www.minhap.gob.es/es-ES/Areas%20Tematicas/Presupuestos%20Generales%20del%20Estado/Paginas/Presupuestos.aspx">http://www.minhap.gob.es/es-ES/Areas%20Tematicas/Presupuestos%20Generales%20del%20Estado/Paginas/Presupuestos.aspx</a>
<b>Comments:</b>				

#### **4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability**

##### **4.1. Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South cooperation**

Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1 North-South technical cooperation and capacity-building provided	-	-	-	-
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity building through triangular cooperation	-	-	-	-
<b>Comments:</b>				

##### **4.2. Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies**

Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out	-	-
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced	-	-
<b>Comments</b>		

**4.3. New and innovative financial mechanisms**

Type of initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Comments:			

**4.4. Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention**

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
-	-
-	-
Comments:	

## SWEDEN IN THE EU SUBMISSION

### Submission of information from Sweden, in response to CBD Notification 2012-023 on Methodological and Implementation Guidance for the "Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Convention's Strategy for Resources Mobilization"

In response to the CBD Notification 2012-023 and the invitation of the Conference of the Parties and the Working Group on the Review of Implementation to use the preliminary reporting framework (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add.1) as a flexible and tentative framework to monitor resources mobilised for biodiversity at national and global level, Sweden would like to submit the following information.

The latest figures on disbursed biodiversity financing in Sweden's Official Development Assistance have been reported to the OECD Development Assistance Committee. According to this report, in the year 2010 about 2045 million SEK (approximately USD 284 million) was provided for biodiversity activities in developing countries<sup>1</sup>. These figures were calculated by applying the so called Rio markers.

The most comprehensive information available on domestic spending and other issues of relevance for the implementation of the reporting framework were submitted in Sweden's fourth national report to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

*01 A 0*

SWITZERLAND, RECEIVED ON 20 JULY 2012

**Report on Swiss Public and Private Financial Contributions in Support of the Objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity**

Dear Mr. De Souza Dias,

Please find enclosed Switzerland's submission regarding public and private financial contributions in support of the objectives of the CBD.

To ensure reliability, official reports, such as government reports, international databases, government statistical data, or annual reports were used as a basis for collecting the data. However, in most cases detailed expenditure information was not available regarding "biodiversity mainstreaming expenditures" beyond the traditional biodiversity sectors of environment. Expenditures by the private sector (at the domestic level as well as internationally) were even more difficult to track. As a result, not all those expenditures have been fully counted in this assessment. Hence, this report required estimates for a number of indicators. Methodological details are provided under each specific indicator and category.

The study also showed that some of the indicators are either not applicable or not known or not monitored / measured at present in Switzerland. We therefore suggest that the reports submitted by Parties are thoroughly studied and comments regarding the methodology considered before furthering reporting requirements.

**Contents:**

Page

<b>Key Points</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Swiss Public and Private Financial Contributions to the Objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2 General Note on Methodology</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3 Financial flows for achieving the Convention's three objectives, by category:</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1 Official Development Assistance (ODA)	11
3.2 Domestic Budget at all levels (Federal, Cantonal, Local)	14
3.2.1 Estimation of the Federal budget in support of the objectives of the CBD	14
3.2.2 Estimation of the Cantonal budgets in support of the objectives of the CBD	16
3.2.3 Estimation of the Communal budgets in support of the objectives of the CBD	17

<b>3.3</b>	<b>Private Sector</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3.4.1</b>	<b>Non-governmental organizations and foundations</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3.4.2</b>	<b>Academia</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>3.5</b>	<b>International Financial Institutions</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3.6</b>	<b>United Nations organizations, funds and programmes</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Non-ODA public funding</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3.8</b>	<b>South-South Cooperation initiatives</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Technical cooperation</b>	<b>28</b>

## Key Points

### Background

- The present report is Switzerland's contribution to the monitoring of the CBD Strategy for Resource Mobilization (COP decisions IX/11) and its indicators (COP decision X/3, paragraph 7(1)).
- The report compiles information pertinent to the indicators for monitoring the implementation of the CBD Strategy for Resource Mobilization as requested by the CBD Conference of the Parties (COP decision X/3, paragraph 8(b)).

### Aim of the report

- The report is a first attempt to assess Switzerland's financial contributions from public and private sources in support of the three objectives of the Convention and an effective implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
- The report aims at establishing a methodology for the assessment at regular intervals.

### Methodology

- The report is based on the CBD Methodological Guidance - *Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization*, which differ considerably from indicators used in earlier assessments of spending for biodiversity.
- Spending for the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of its components is rarely specifically shown in public and private sector accounts. In order to estimate the contribution of a budgetary item to the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity, a so called Biodiversity-factor (**BD-factor**) was used to adjust expenditures where necessary.
- The BD-factor was defined in collaboration with experts from the Federal administration and of the scientific community as well as from NGO's.

**Table 1:** The BD-Factor is an estimate of the extent a budgetary item contributes to the objectives of the CBD.

Estimated relevance for CBD objectives	Biodiversity factor	
	Value (0 - 1)	%
Budgetary item supports CBD's objectives to its <b>full extent</b>	1.00	100%
Budgetary item supports CBD's <b>significantly</b>	0.75	75%
<b>About half</b> of the Budgetary item supports CBD's objectives	0.50	50%
Budgetary item contributes to CBD's objectives for the <b>smaller part</b>	0.25	25%
A <b>minor part</b> of the budgetary item contributes to CBD objectives	0.10	10%
A <b>marginal part</b> of the budgetary item contributes to CBD objectives	0.05	5%

- Whenever possible, the results obtained for each indicator were compared to similar assessments/aggregations in order to check their plausibility.
- Against this background it becomes apparent, that an aggregation of financial flows in support of the implementation of the CBD results in an estimate which shows the magnitude of resources provided, rather than a definite amount. The financial flows depicted are not conclusive for the budgets of the business entities referred to in the report.

## Results

**Table 2:** Switzerland's financial contributions (by category) according to the Methodological Guidance - *Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization* (Draft Proposal for Expert Consultation, June 2011).

	Millions of CHF / USD (constant 2009 USD millions)					
		Low estimate		High estimate		Average estimate
<b>Total financial contributions to the objectives of the CBD</b>	CHF	968.8	CHF	1'161.6	CHF	1'066.4

<b>Official Development Assistance (ODA)</b>	<b>CHF*</b>	<b>63.7</b>	<b>CHF*</b>	<b>104.5</b>	<b>CHF*</b>	<b>84.2</b>
<b>Official Development Assistance (ODA)</b>	<b>USD</b>	<b>58.7</b>	<b>USD</b>	<b>96.2</b>	<b>USD</b>	<b>77.5</b>
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	USD	49.5	USD	87.0	USD	68.3
Contribution to the GEF	USD	9.2	USD	9.2	USD	9.2
<b>Domestic budgets at all levels for domestic action</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>715.8</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>715.8</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>715.8</b>
Federal budget (2010)	CHF	453.7	CHF	453.7	CHF	453.7
Cantonal budgets (2009)	CHF	169.6	CHF	169.6	CHF	169.6
Municipal budgets (2008)	CHF	92.5	CHF	92.5	CHF	92.5

<b>Private sector</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>58.8</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>137.5</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>98.1</b>
Business Expenditures	CHF	58.8	CHF	137.5	CHF	98.1
<b>NGO's, foundations, and academia</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>130.5</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>203.8</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>168.3</b>
National NGO's	CHF	60.3	CHF	85.1	CHF	73.8
NGO's predominantly active abroad	CHF	13.0	CHF	19.5	CHF	16.3
Zoological Gardens	CHF	3.2	CHF	3.2	CHF	3.2
Academia	CHF	54.0	CHF	96.0	CHF	75.0

\* Data source: OECD CRS (2009); Average annual exchange rate 2009: 1.086 CHF per U.S. Dollar.

**Table 3:** Further contributions of Switzerland to multilateral institutions, organisations, funds and programmes, according to the Methodological Guidance - *Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization* (Draft Proposal for Expert Consultation, June 2011). Contributions to those institutions which are earmarked with the Rio marker *Biodiversity* or the marker *Environment* are incorporated in the indicator ODA (see table 3).

<b>Millions of CHF / USD (constant 2009 USD millions)</b>	
<b>Total financial contributions to International Financial Institution in support of the objectives of the CBD</b>	<b>CHF 107.6</b>
<b>International Financial Institution</b>	<b>CHF 74.7</b>
<b>International Financial Institution</b>	<b>USD 68.7</b>
World Bank Group	USD 51.1
Regional Development Banks	USD 17.6
<b>UN organizations, funds and programmes</b>	<b>CHF 32.9</b>
<b>UN organizations, funds and programmes</b>	<b>USD 30.3</b>
United Nations organizations, funds and programmes	USD 30.3

### Analysis - main findings

- The overall Swiss contribution to the objectives of the CBD was estimated at CHF 1'066.4 million in 2009 (low estimate: CHF 968.8 mln, high estimate: CHF 1'161.6 mln). *Table 2.*
- When also considering Switzerland's contributions to International Financial Institution in support of the objectives of the CBD, the overall expenditures amount to CHF 1'174 million in 2009 (low estimate: CHF 1'076.4 mln, high estimate: CHF 1'267.9 mln). *Table 2 and 3.*

- These figures differ considerably from the CHF 440.0 million (2009) of public expenditures for species- and landscape protection purposes according to the federal statistic on environmental expenditures<sup>1</sup>. The main reason for this major difference is that this statistic builds on more narrow definitions and does for example not include expenditures by the private sector, NGO, foundations, etc.
- The average overall annual Swiss contribution to the objectives of the CBD thus corresponds to approximately 0.2% of Switzerland's GDP (Switzerland's GDP 2009: CHF 535'650 mln; Source: Federal Statistical Office (FSO): Gross Domestic Product (GDP) - Data, indicators, [www.bfs.admin.ch](http://www.bfs.admin.ch), State January 2012).
- The average overall annual per capita contribution is around CHF 150.- (Switzerland's population size (2009): 7'785'806; Source: Federal Statistical Office (FSO): Population size and population composition – Data, indicators, [www.bfs.admin.ch](http://www.bfs.admin.ch), State January 2012). Accord-

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/de/index/themen/02/05/blank/data.html> (accessed 2012-07-04), document je-d-02.04.01 - Öffentliche Umweltschutzausgaben

ing to the Creditor Reporting system of the OECD, the official development assistance provided by Switzerland was CHF 1'875 mln (USD 1'726.6 million) in 2009. Thereof, an estimated average of CHF 84.2 mln or 4.5% were dedicated to supporting developing countries' efforts under the CBD.<sup>2</sup>

- Spending of the public sector in support of an effective implementation of the CBD amounts to CHF 907.7 mln (average, 2009)<sup>3</sup>.
- 
- From the overall expenditures (average, CHF 1'174 mln) an estimated amount of CHF 208 mln<sup>4</sup> is spent at the international level.
  - Information on spending for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity is important. However, such information needs to be considered in the context of the values of biodiversity and the financial needs for its conservation, sustainable use and the maintenance of ecosystem services.

- At the international level, different needs assessments are currently being undertaken. At Swiss domestic level, only very few studies addressing financial needs for biodiversity conservation in Switzerland exist. The most recent one concludes that the protection and the maintenance of the biotopes of national importance would require annual investments between CHF 148 million and CHF183 million to meet all legal requirements. This is more than the double of the sum allocated today to this task by the federal and cantonal authorities<sup>5</sup>.

## Conclusions

- The definition of a baseline for Switzerland's annual financial contribution to the objectives of the CBD is feasible, even though the estimate is afflicted with uncertainties.
- Whereas activities related to the conservation of biodiversity are more or less tangible, the definition of categories of activities contributing to sustainable use of biodiversity remains a major challenge and requires further exploring.
- In Switzerland, the availability of data on biodiversity financing is fair. However, for the present report, in some cases the expenditures needed to be estimated based on expert knowledge.

---

<sup>2</sup> For details regarding the ODA expenditures in support of the objectives of the CBD, including the different methodologies to measure it, see box "Plausibility check" at the end of 3.1.

<sup>3</sup> Indicators: ODA, domestic budgets at all levels, international financial institutions, UN organisations, funds and programmes.

<sup>4</sup> Indicators: ODA, international financial institutions, NGO's predominantly active abroad, UN organisations, funds and programmes.

<sup>5</sup> Ismail S. et al (2009). Kosten eines gesetzeskonformen Schutzes der Biotope von nationaler Bedeutung. WSL, Pro Natura und Forum Biodiversität Schweiz. The study further identified the need for a non-recurrent investment of CHF 700 - 1500 million to restore strongly degraded biotopes of national importance to their former conditions. A national Biodiversity Strategy was adopted in April 2012; in the context of the work currently under way for an Action Plan to implement the Strategy, the financial needs will be reassessed.

- For the further development of the draft indicators for resource mobilisation, it is recommended to focus on a limited set of robust indicators, rather than refining the indicators in subcategories that cannot be derived from existing accountings.
- Before initiating work at the international level on baselines or global needs, reports and assessments like this one need to be evaluated.

## **Swiss Public and Private Financial Contributions to the Objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity**

### **1 Introduction**

Switzerland ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity on November 21 1994 and therewith committed itself to achieve - in collaboration with other Parties - the Convention's three objectives, i.e. the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources.

Under CBD Article 20(1), each Party undertakes to provide financial support and incentives in respect of national activities intended to achieve the objectives of the Convention. Further, developed country Parties agreed that they may provide new and additional financial resources - through bilateral, regional and other multilateral channels (Art. 20(3)) - to enable developing country Parties to meet the incremental costs of implementing measures in order to fulfil the obligations of the Convention (Art. 20(2)).

Virtually all Parties have been facing financial obstacles to achieve the Convention's objectives. The second and third national reports have pooled country opinions about resource limitation or challenges for the implementation of the Convention. The overall average rating from the second national report returns indicates that availability of resources is limited. According to the third national reports, the overall level of financial challenges has increased from being considered a medium challenge to a high challenge. Information thus suggests that the perceived level of financial limitations or challenges has increased by over 20 percent from the period of 1998-2002 to the period of 2002-2006<sup>6</sup>.

To address the financial obstacles, a Strategy for Resource Mobilization was adopted by the Ninth Conference of the Parties to the CBD (COP-9) to assist the Parties and relevant organizations to mobilize adequate and predictable financial resources to support the achievement of the Convention's three objectives (COP decision IX/11). The Strategy considers the full range of possible local, national, regional and international funding sources, both public and private.

---

<sup>6</sup> UNEP/CBD/COP/9/16, para 7

At the Tenth Conference of the Parties (COP-10) in October 2010, Parties agreed on a set of indicators to measure progress on implementing the Strategy for Resource Mobilization (COP decision X/3, paragraph 7(1)):

- a) *Official Development Assistance (ODA);*
- b) *Domestic budgets at all levels;*
- c) *Private sector;*
- d) *Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia;*
- e) *International financial institutions;*
- f) *United Nations organizations, funds and programmes;*
- g) *Non-ODA public funding;*
- h) *South-South cooperation initiatives;*
- i) *Technical cooperation*

The indicators were based on the mission of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization in Support of the Achievement of the Three Objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its eight goals Decision COP IX/11 B. It was further agreed that additional efforts were required to establish methodologies and guidelines for collecting data on these indicators and to set baselines. Accordingly, Parties to the Convention were requested to submit information pertinent to the indicators (COP decision X/3, paragraph 8(b)).

The present report aims at compiling information pertinent to the indicators for monitoring the implementation of the CBD strategy for resource mobilization (CBD COP decision X/3, paragraph 7) in response to CBD COP decision X/3, paragraph 8(b). The report contributes to the knowledge required to set a global baseline in order to measure gaps and needs as well as progress in the increase in, and mobilization of, resources for the achievement of the three CBD objectives.

## **2 General Note on Methodology**

The present report is a first attempt to identify potential baseline data of Switzerland's public and private contributions to the objectives of the CBD. The assessment builds on the set of indicators as agreed in CBD COP decision X/3 paragraph 7 and is understood as a contribution to monitoring of the CBD Resource mobilization strategy as well as to the effective implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

### **Methodological Approach**

The assessment is based on the following approach:

- The assessment is based on the **Methodological Guidance - Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization** of the CBD (Draft Proposal for Expert Consultation, June 2011).
- According to the **Methodological Guidance - Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization**, it is foreseen to calculate the indicators annu-

ally or bi-annually. Therefore, the assessment aims also at establishing a **methodology emphasizing replicability** and supporting potential future national reporting.

- The analysis of current level of Switzerland's financial contribution draws on **existing information sources and data**, such as international and national databases, official reports, government reports, national indicators, and other annual reports.
- The assessment is based on the **most recent data available**. The year of reference can therefore vary between indicators, depending on the available data-source.
- In order to secure the replicability of the assessment, the data-sources are clearly identified and the **methodology applied is described for each indicator**. Expert opinion, e.g. on estimates to which degree an activity contributes to sustainable use of biodiversity, is disclosed.
- In addition, a **plausibility check** for each indicator was conducted, based on existing internal reports<sup>7</sup> and expert opinions. This is to further underpin the approximation.
- The currency used in the figures are Swiss francs CHF, unless otherwise indicated.

## Obstacles

During the work on this report, the following issues required particularly careful consideration:

- In general, public and private entities address **biodiversity as a cross-cutting issue**. Spending for the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of its components are rarely specifically displayed in accounts but often aggregated with other disbursements, e.g. for environmental protection in general, for agriculture, forestry, wastewater, etc. In most cases expenditure information specific for biodiversity was not available.
- Beside the traditional biodiversity sectors of environment, wildlife and protected areas, many other **activities contribute to sustainable use of biodiversity in a more or less direct way** (e.g. measures against air pollution, climate change activities at large etc.). The decision, whether an activity contributes to the implementation of the CBD and to which extent it does so, cannot be determined precisely and depends subjective perception.
- **Avoiding double countings** is a challenge, especially in fields where many stakeholders interact and contribute, e.g. regarding the indicator *Academia* with resources allocated by private as well as public sources from all levels or e.g. payments from a national level to a regional level and then to private actors.
- In this report the presented **financial contributions include investment outlays and write-offs**. Distinction of investment outlays and write-offs in an economically precise

---

<sup>7</sup> e.g. ECOPLAN (2009): Expenditures for Biodiversity in Switzerland; Input paper; BAFU

way was not possible. Therefore, double counting had to be accepted when investment outlays appear again as write-offs in the financial statements or annual reports.

- One NGO indicated that their budget allocation to biodiversity was higher for the year 2010 - the **International Year of Biodiversity 2010** - than usual. This could also apply for the budgets of other NGO's.

Against this background it becomes apparent that an aggregation of financial flows in support of the implementation of the Convention results in an **estimate** providing the **magnitude of re-sources** available rather than a definite amount.

### The biodiversity factor (BD-factor)

Some budgetary items contribute to the objectives of the CBD to some extent, but not entirely. This is especially true for the indicators *Domestic budget at all levels* (chapter 3.2) *Private sector* (chapter 3.3), and *Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia* (chapter 3.4). For these indicators, the effective contribution of budgetary items to the objectives of the CBD needed to be estimated on a case by case basis, drawing on the expertise of stakeholders in the field of biodiversity conservation and/or in payments for ecosystem services.

In order to emphasize replicability, the contribution of budgetary items is described through a biodiversity factor (BD-factor) which is used to readjust the expenses (see Table 4) and is disclosed where applied. This approach aims at facilitating future assessments along with securing comparability of the result.

For the indicators addressed in the report, the BD-factor was defined based on expert knowledge with the collaboration of experts from the Federal administration, the scientific community and from NGO's.

**Table 4:** The BD-factor is used to readjust expenses listed in the official budgets. It is an estimate of the extent a budgetary item supports the objectives of the CBD.

Estimated relevance for CBD objectives	Biodiversity factor	
	Value (0 - 1)	%
Budgetary item supports CBD's objectives to its <b>full extent</b>	1.00	100%
Budgetary item supports CBD's <b>significantly</b>	0.75	75%
<b>About half</b> of the Budgetary item supports CBD's objectives	0.50	50%
Budgetary item contributes to CBD's objectives for the <b>smaller part</b>	0.25	25%
A <b>minor part</b> of the budgetary item contributes to CBD objectives	0.10	10%
A <b>marginal part</b> of the budgetary item contributes to CBD objectives	0.05	5%

### **3 Financial flows for achieving the Convention's three objectives, by category:**

#### **Definition according to the CBD draft proposal on Methodological Guidance:**

*The indicator can be defined as the aggregated total of financial support from all entities of biodiversity financing as defined by the Implementation Guidelines on Indicators.*

*Aggregated financial flows, in the amount and where relevant percentage, of biodiversity-related funding, per annum, for achieving the Convention's three objectives, in a manner that avoids double counting, both in total and in, inter alia, the following categories:*

- a) Official Development Assistance (ODA);*
- b) Domestic budgets at all levels;*
- c) Private sector;*
- d) Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia;*
- e) International financial institutions;*
- f) United Nations organizations, funds and programmes;*
- g) Non-ODA public funding;*
- h) South-South cooperation initiatives;*
- i) Technical cooperation*

#### **Methodology:**

Aggregation of the financial contributions calculated according to the categories mentioned above.

## Switzerland's aggregated financial flows

**Table 5:** Overview on Switzerland's contributions to the objectives of the CBD.

	Millions of CHF / USD (constant 2009 USD millions)					
	Low estimate		High estimate		Average estimate	
<b>Official Development Assistance (ODA)</b>	<b>USD</b>	<b>58.7</b>	<b>USD</b>	<b>96.2</b>	<b>USD</b>	<b>77.7</b>
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	USD	49.5	USD	87.0	USD	68.3
Contribution to the GEF	USD	9.2	USD	9.2	USD	9.2
<b>Domestic budgets at all levels</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>715.8</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>715.8</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>715.8</b>
Federal budget (2010)	CHF	453.7	CHF	453.7	CHF	453.7
Cantonal budgets (2009)	CHF	169.6	CHF	169.6	CHF	169.6
Communal budgets (2008)	CHF	92.5	CHF	92.5	CHF	92.5
<b>Private sector</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>58.8</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>137.5</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>98.1</b>
Business Expenditures	CHF	58.8	CHF	137.5	CHF	98.1
<b>Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>130.5</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>203.8</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>168.3</b>
National NGO's	CHF	60.3	CHF	85.1	CHF	73.8
NGO's predominantly active abroad	CHF	13.0	CHF	19.5	CHF	16.3
Zoological Gardens	CHF	3.2	CHF	3.2	CHF	3.2
Academia	CHF	54.0	CHF	96.0	CHF	75.0

**Table 6:** Further contributions of Switzerland to multilateral institutions, organisations, funds and programmes, according to the Methodological Guidance - *Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization*. Contributions to these institutions which are earmarked with the Rio marker *Biodiversity* or the marker *Environment* are incorporated in the indicator ODA (see table 3).

	Millions of USD (constant 2009 USD millions)		
	Low estimate	High estimate	Average estimate
<b>International Financial Institution</b>	<b>68.7</b>	<b>68.7</b>	<b>68.7</b>
World Bank Group	51.1	51.1	51.1
Regional Development Banks	17.6	17.6	17.6
<b>United Nations organizations, funds and programmes</b>	<b>30.3</b>	<b>30.3</b>	<b>30.3</b>
United Nations organizations, funds and programmes	30.3	30.3	30.3

### 3.1 Official Development Assistance (ODA)

#### Definition according to the CBD draft proposal on Methodological Guidance:

*Official Development Assistance (ODA) refers to flows of official financing administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as the main objective, and which are concessional in character with a grant element of at least 25 percent (using a fixed 10 percent rate of discount). By convention, ODA flows comprise contributions of donor government agencies, at all levels, to developing countries ("bilateral ODA") and to multilateral institutions. ODA receipts comprise disbursements by bilateral donors and multilateral institutions. Lending by export credit agencies—with the pure purpose of export promotion—is excluded. Grants, Loans and credits for military purposes are excluded. Transfer payments to private individuals (e.g. pensions, reparations or insurance payouts) are in general not counted.*

#### Methodology:

Switzerland's international financial contributions to the objectives of the CBD are determined using the **Creditor Reporting System (CRS)** database of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)<sup>8</sup>. The use of a single data source supports data coherence and facilitates avoiding double countings, especially regarding indicators such as e.g. "International Financial Institutions" or "UN Organisations, funds and programmes".

The methodology applied is based on the one developed by the **"2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership"**<sup>9</sup> for the indicator *Official Development Assistance provided in support of the Convention on Biological Diversity*<sup>10</sup>

The approach consists in estimating an under limit (**lower estimate**) corresponding to the total disbursement for projects having **disclosed biodiversity objectives**, i.e. projects tagged with the Rio Marker "*Only Biodiversity*", "*Biodiversity and Climate Change*", "*Biodiversity and desertification*", and "*Biodiversity and Climate Change and Desertification*" and principally or significantly contributing to Biodiversity. The datasets obtained from the CRS database were checked for double countings using the "OECD id" and the "donor project id". As no double countings could be detected, the 4 datasets were summed up (Disbursements gross (constant 2009 USD millions)).

To address sustainability, a broader approach was used (**high estimate**) by identifying projects contributing to the **policy objective "Environment"** (irrespective of the Rio Marker used) and marked with "*Environment Only*", "*Gender and Environment*", "*Environment and Participatory Development/Good Governance*", and "*Gender and Environment and Participatory Development/Good Governance*". The exact amount of the high estimate contributing to environmental sustainability is unknown since activities marked with the policy objective "*Environment*" do not

<sup>8</sup> OECD Creditor Reporting System: <http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=CRSNEW>

<sup>9</sup> Key Indicator Partners: UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) in collaboration with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

<sup>10</sup> Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (2009) Measuring aid targeting the objectives of the Rio Conventions; <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/45/7/42812122.pdf>.

necessarily target environment sustainability in their entirety. However, the sum of aid to environment as an objective gives an upper limit of aid targeting environment sustainability.

Switzerland's contribution to the GEF was also retrieved from the CRS (Development > Aggregate Aid Statistics > ODA by Donor > 1.6 Global Environmental facility (96%)). According to the fourth overall performance study of the GEF, 32.5% of the funds were allocated to projects within the focal area "biodiversity"<sup>11</sup>. Accordingly, the amount of Switzerland's contribution (2009) accounting to biodiversity is USD 9.20 Million (constant prices).

### Results for Switzerland's Official Development Assistance

**Table 7:** Switzerland's Official Development Assistance for the year 2009 according to the OECD Creditor Reporting System

	Millions of USD (constant 2009 USD millions)		
	Low estimate	High estimate	Average estimate
<b>Official Development Assistance (ODA)</b>	<b>58.7</b>	<b>96.2</b>	<b>77.5</b>
ODA (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC, State Secretariat for Economic Affairs SECO, Federal Office for the Environment FOEN, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs DFA)	49.5	87.0	68.3
GEF contribution	9.2	9.2	9.2

The **Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC** is the largest government office provider of ODA in Switzerland, supporting 137 projects contributing to biodiversity conservation and 234 projects contributing to the sustainable use of biodiversity. The projects supported by SDC have - in line with SDCs' policy - a strong interlinkage to rural development and food security, climate change and environment, governance, and economic integration.

The **State Secretariat for Economic Affairs SECO** contributes to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity through promoting sustainable production and fair traded products (e.g. through its support to UNCTAD's Biotrade Initiative), the promotion of technical standards, and sustainable value chains in line with the sustainable use of biodiversity. Furthermore, SECO supports activities targeting the conservation and sustainable use of tropical forests, e.g. through the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) and the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO).

The ODA provided by the **Federal Office for the Environment FOEN** includes the contribution to the GEF and further contributions to international organisations, such as voluntary contributions to the CBD or contributions to the IUCN and UNCTAD.

<sup>11</sup> GEF Evaluation Office (2010), OPS 4: Progress toward Impact - Fourth Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPS4)

Through its ODA, the **Federal Department of Foreign Affairs** supports specific activities by the UNESCO.

#### **Plausibility check**

##### ***Official Development Assistance***

***58.7 - 96.2 mln USD***

The amount of aid to biodiversity provided by Switzerland varies significantly, depending on the aim of the respective study and the data used, hence the need to operate with estimates:

The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC monitors its aid to biodiversity and publishes the statistics within the programme "Biodiversity Monitoring Switzerland", indicator M7 "*Financial Resources for Nature and landscape Conservation*". According to indicator M7, Switzerland's aid to biodiversity amounted to CHF 92.3 mln in 2009 (bilateral aid: CHF 53.3 mln; multilateral aid CHF 39.0 mln). These data were used for national reporting under the CBD.

An input paper commissioned by the Federal Office for the Environment FOEN estimated Switzerland's ODA relating to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use to amount to CHF 52-87 Million in 2008 (ECOPLAN (2009): Expenditures for Biodiversity in Switzerland; Input paper; FOEN).

According to the Development Co-operation Report 2011 of the OECD, Switzerland's ODA commitments targeted at the objectives of the CBD amount to USD 39 mln in 2009 (OECD (2011) Development Co-operation Report 2011: 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Edition).

### 3.2 Domestic Budget at all levels (Federal, Cantonal, Local)

**Definition according to the CBD draft proposal on methodological guidance:**

*Domestic budgets at all levels include only government budgets at national, regional and local levels.*

**Table 8:** Domestic budgets at all levels without Official Development Assistance and intramural Research & Development expenditures.

	Millions of CHF		
	Low estimate	High estimate	Average estimate
<b>Domestic budgets at all levels</b>	<b>715.8</b>	<b>715.8</b>	<b>715.8</b>
Federal budget (2010)	453.7	453.7	453.7
Cantonal budgets (2009)	169.6	169.6	169.6
Communal Budgets (2009)	92.5	92.5	92.5

	Millions of CHF		
	Low estimate	High estimate	Average estimate
<b>Domestic budgets at all levels</b>	<b>715.8</b>	<b>715.8</b>	<b>715.8</b>
Federal budget (2010)	453.7	453.7	453.7
Cantonal budgets (2009)	169.6	169.6	169.6
Communal Budgets (2009)	92.5	92.5	92.5

#### 3.2.1 Estimation of the Federal budget in support of the objectives of the CBD

##### Methodology

The financial contribution of the Swiss Confederation in support of the objectives of the CBD was extruded from the Model of the Federal Finance administration (FS-Modell 2009; *F11.7.5: Ausgaben nach Funktionen, Bund*)<sup>12</sup>. This model describes Federal budgets according to major budgetary items and does, however, not include staffing expenditures. Most of the identified budgetary items contribute to some extent to the objectives of the CBD, but not in their entirety. Therefore, the biodiversity factor (BD-factor) was used to readjust the expenses.

<sup>12</sup> Federal Finance Administration FFA:

[http://www.efv.admin.ch/d/dokumentation/zahlen\\_fakten/finanzstatistik/index.php](http://www.efv.admin.ch/d/dokumentation/zahlen_fakten/finanzstatistik/index.php)

Expenses related to ODA and intramural research & development are not taken into account for the present indicator, but are included under chapter 3.1 Official Development Assistance and chapter 3.4.2 Academia.

### Results for the budget at Federal level

**Table 9:** Domestic budgets at Federal level without Official Development Assistance ODA and intramural Research & Development expenditures

Code	Category	Total expenses in Millions of CHF annual (fiscal year: 2009)	BD- factor	Expenses supporting the CBD targets in Millions of CHF annual (fiscal year: 2009)
311	Museums and fine arts	35.4	0.05	1.8
741	Water engineering	149.2	0.10	14.9
750	Species conservation and landscape protection	103.0	0.75	77.3
761	Air pollution control and climate protection	121.1	0.10	12.1
769	Countering environmental pollution, NES*	6.7	0.25	1.7
779	Environment protection, NES*	134.8	0.25	33.7
790	Regional development	13.0	0.10	1.3
813**	Improvement of animal breed	442.0	0.05	22.1
814**	Improvement of crop production	101.6	0.1	10.2
816	Agriculture: direct support schemes	2742.2	0.10	274.2
820	Forestry	26.6	0.10	2.7
830	Hunting and fisheries	7.5	0.25	1.9
<b>Total expenses supporting the CBD targets in Millions of CHF annual (2009):</b>				<b>CHF 453.7</b>

\* NES: not elsewhere specified

\*\* The expenses related to the improvement of animal breeds and crop production (Code 813 and 814) target the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources. The total amount of both categories roughly corresponds to the budgetary item of the "Sélection végétale et élevage" of the Federal Office for Agriculture FOAG (OFAG (2011): Rapport Agricole 2011, Tableau 52, p. A58).

### Plausibility check

#### **Budget at Federal level**

**453.7 mln CHF**

The share of the Federal budget contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity was also estimated using a more sophisticated / more detailed approach, based on the State financial statements (2010).

A total of 28 budgetary items relevant for biodiversity were identified within the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs SECO, the Federal Office for Agriculture FOAG, the Federal Veterinary Office FVO, the Swiss Federal Office of Energy SFOE, the Federal Office for the Environment FOEN and the Federal Office for Spatial Development ARE. Based on this detailed approach, the contributions of the federal budget are estimated to be CHF 426.4 million in 2010.

### 3.2.2 Estimate of the Cantonal budgets in support of the objectives of the CBD

#### Methodology

The estimate of the contributions by the Cantons to the objectives of the CBD is based on the Model of the Federal Finance administration (FS-Modell 2009; *F10.2.5 Ausgaben nach Funktionen, Kantone im Vergleich*)<sup>13</sup>. This model describes cantonal budgets according to major budgetary items.

The contribution of relevant budgetary items to biodiversity objectives was estimated using the biodiversity factor described in Table 4). In order to avoid double-countings of financial flows from the Confederation to the Cantons, the biodiversity factor was adjusted as described in Table 10. An adjustment was necessary for the items financed in majority or in their entirety by the Confederation, e.g. "Species conservation and landscape protection" and "Agriculture: direct support schemes".

**Table 10:** Adjustment of the biodiversity factor for Cantonal budgets.

Code	Category	Cause of adaptation	BD- factor
311	Museums and fine arts	-	0.05
741	Water engineering	-	0.10
750	Species conservation and landscape protection	Deduction of federal funds	0.25
761	Air pollution control and climate protection	Deduction of federal funds	0.10
769	Countering environmental pollution, NES*	Deduction of federal funds	0.10
779	Environment protection, NES*	-	0.25
790	Regional development	-	0.10
813	Improvement of animal breed	-	0.05
814	Improvement of crop production	-	0.1
816	Agriculture: direct support schemes	Direct support schemes are paid with federal funds	0
820	Forestry	Deduction of federal funds	0.05
830	Hunting and fisheries	Deduction of federal funds	0.05

<sup>13</sup> Federal Finance Administration FFA:  
[http://www.efv.admin.ch/d/dokumentation/zahlen\\_fakten/finanzstatistik/index.php](http://www.efv.admin.ch/d/dokumentation/zahlen_fakten/finanzstatistik/index.php)

## Results for the budgets at cantonal level

**Table 11:** Domestic budgets at Cantonal level.

Code	Category	Total expenses in Millions of CHF annual (2009)	BD- factor	Expenses supporting the CBD targets in Millions of CHF annual (fiscal year: 2009)
311	Museums and fine arts	176.9	0.05	8.8
741	Water engineering	325.7	0.10	32.6
750	Species conservation and landscape protection	152.6	0.25	38.1
761	Air pollution control and climate protection	8.6	0.10	0.9
769	Countering environmental pollution, NES*	29.6	0.10	3.0
779	Environment protection, NES*	147.5	0.25	36.9
790	Regional development	187.9	0.10	18.8
813	Improvement of animal breed	92.1	0.05	4.6
814	Improvement of crop production	45.0	0.1	4.5
816	Agriculture: direct support schemes	2792.8	0	–
820	Forestry	361.9	0.05	18.1
830	Hunting and fisheries	65.78	0.05	3.3
<b>Total expenses supporting the CBD targets in Millions of CHF annual (2009):</b>				<b>CHF 169.6</b>

\* NES: not elsewhere specified

### 3.2.3 Estimate of the Municipal budgets in support of the objectives of the CBD

The estimate of the contributions by the municipalities to the objectives of the CBD is based on the Model of the Federal Finance administration (FS-Modell 2009; *F 23.7.5.Ausgaben, Gemeinden insgesamt*)<sup>14</sup>. The same approach as described for the Federal and Cantonal budgets was applied, including an adjustment of the biodiversity factor.

<sup>14</sup> Federal Finance Administration FFA:

[http://www.efv.admin.ch/d/dokumentation/zahlen\\_fakten/finanzstatistik/index.php](http://www.efv.admin.ch/d/dokumentation/zahlen_fakten/finanzstatistik/index.php)

## Results for the budgets at municipal level

**Table 12:** Domestic budgets at municipal level (Annual expenses, fiscal year 2009)

Code	Category	Total expenses in Millions of CHF	BD- factor	Expenses supporting the CBD targets in Millions of CHF
311	Museums and fine arts	193.3	0.05	9.7
741	Water engineering	210.5	0.05	10.5
750	Species conservation and landscape protection	56.3	0.50	28.2
761	Air pollution control and climate protection	3.5	0.05	0.2
769	Countering environmental pollution, NES*	7.6	0.10	0.8
779	Environment protection, NES*	58.7	0.25	14.7
790	Regional development	227.1	0.05	11.4
813	Improvement of animal breed	7.4	0.05	0.4
814	Improvement of crop production	9.0	0.1	0.9
820	Forestry	311.6	0.05	15.6
830	Hunting and fisheries	2.4	0.05	0.1
<b>Total expenses supporting the CBD targets in Millions of CHF annual (2009):</b>				<b>CHF 92.5</b>

\* NES: not elsewhere specified

### 3.3 Private Sector

#### Definition according to the CBD draft proposal on methodological guidance:

*According to the UN System for National Accounts, the private sector comprises private corporations, households and non-profit institutions serving households (NPISHs). It is proposed that the private sector only refers to private corporations.*

#### Methodology

Environmental Protection expenditures in the business sector are assessed by the Federal Statistical Office (FSO)<sup>15</sup>. According to the 2011 FSO publication "*Environmental Protection Expenditures in the economy in 2009 - First results*" enterprises operating in Switzerland<sup>16</sup> spent a total of

<sup>15</sup> FSO: Dépenses de protection de l'environnement des entreprises - Fiche signalétique; www.bfs.admin.ch, status décembre 2011.

<sup>16</sup> The survey does not consider the agricultural sector. In the present assessment, the agricultural sector is addressed under the indicator Domestic Budget at all Levels (chapter 3.2).

CHF 2.75 billion in 2009 on the protection of the environment<sup>17</sup>, that is to say 0,5% of gross domestic product (GDP)<sup>18</sup>. These expenditures are composed by 80% of current expenditures (CHF 2.18 billion) and by one fifth of investments (CHF 0.57 billion), the latter targeting the prevention of pollution (65%) and the treatment of pollution (35%).

Environmental expenditures of Swiss companies are aggregated according to the following categories:

1. Noise control, conservation of biodiversity, research and development on environmental protection, and management activities regarding soils, groundwater and landscape;
2. Air quality management and climate change mitigation;
3. Waste Management;
4. Wastewater Treatment.

The four categories of expenditures have all beneficial effects on the environment but can, however, not always be assigned directly to biodiversity. Therefore, a BD-factor was defined in order to estimate the expenditures of the private sector in support of the objectives of the CBD.

#### Results for the private sector

**Table 13: Contributions to the objectives of the CBD from Private Sector in Millions of CHF / year 2009.**

Category	Total expenses	BD-factor low / high	Low estimate	High estimate	Average estimate
1) Noise control, conservation of biodiversity, research and development on environmental protection, management activities regarding soils, groundwater, landscape	400.0	0.10 / 0.25	40.0	100.0	70.0
2) Air quality management, climate change mitigation	375.0	0.05 / 0.1	18.8	37.5	28.1
3) Waste management	1'281.0	0.0 / 0.0	-	-	-
4) Wastewater treatment	694.0	0.0 / 0.0	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>2'750.0</b>		<b>58.8</b>	<b>137.5</b>	<b>98.1</b>

<sup>17</sup> Except agriculture, investments and current internal expenditures for certain services, for which only the purchase cost of third-party suppliers and the communal royalties were collected.

<sup>18</sup> FSO: Dépenses de protection de l'environnement de l'économie en 2009 - Premiers résultats (available in fr /de); www.bfs.admin.ch, status august 2011.

### Plausibility check

#### *Private Sector*

**58.8- 137.5 mln CHF**

National data on expenditures of the private sector on environmental purposes are scarce. According to available data, the private sector spent a total of CHF 2.75 billion on environmental purposes in 2009. The expenditures relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity correspond to approximately 2-5 % of the total spending for environmental purposes.

### 3.4 Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia

**Table 14:** Aggregated financial flows for the indicator NGOs, foundations, and academia.

	Millions of CHF		
	Low estimate	High estimate	Average estimate
<b>Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia</b>	<b>130.5</b>	<b>203.8</b>	<b>168.3</b>
National NGO's	60.3	85.1	73.8
NGOs predominantly active abroad	13.0	19.5	16.3
Zoological Gardens	3.2	3.2	3.2
Academia	54.0	96.0	75.0

#### 3.4.1 Non-governmental organizations and foundations

##### **Definition according to the CBD draft proposal on methodological guidance:**

*Non-governmental organizations, including those non-profit organizations representing major groups addressed in Agenda 21, are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from any government. Independence is a major attribute of non-governmental organizations. Operational non-governmental organizations mobilize financial resources, materials and volunteers to develop and implement projects and programmes in the field.*

*Foundations are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds and support to other organizations, or provide the source of funding for its own philanthropic purposes.*

##### **Methodology**

There are numerous national and regional NGO's as well as foundations in Switzerland committed to activities related to the objectives of the CBD. However, the present indicator is limited to

NGO's and foundations being active at the national level, i.e. having the right to appeal<sup>19</sup> (Verbandsbeschwerderecht) or implementing development cooperation activities. The list was complemented with those zoological gardens implementing conservation projects abroad.

An overview on expenditures/revenues of NGOs and foundations does so far not exist. Therefore, the data for the present indicator had to be gathered on a case-by-case basis, by reviewing each NGO's financial statements and/or annual report.

The work of all the NGO's listed hereinafter has positive effects on biodiversity. Their support of the objectives of the CBD is far from limited to policy making. Year after year these organizations generate substantive funding, mainly from private donors, to carry out biodiversity-related projects. From the total expenditures the one relating to biodiversity were estimated based on available information in annual reports. Finally, only the project costs are summarized and transformed in a BD-factor, all administrative efforts to run the NGO's are excluded, as is - in order to avoid double countings - the financial support received from the federal, cantonal and communal administrations.

### Results for NGOs and foundations

**Table 15:** Contributions to the objectives of the CBD from national NGOs.

	<b>Total expenses [CHF]</b>	<b>BD-factor low / high</b>	<b>Low estimate [CHF]</b>	<b>High estimate [CHF]</b>	<b>Average estimate [CHF]</b>
<b>Total national NGOs</b>	<b>146'045'735</b>		<b>60'342'000</b>	<b>85'062'000</b>	<b>73'820'500</b>
Greenpeace Switzerland <sup>20</sup>	25'710'000	0.50 / 0.75	12'855'000	19'283'000	16'069'000
Pro Natura <sup>21</sup>	19'628'000	0.75 / 0.75	14'721'000	14'721'000	14'721'000
Pro Specia rara <sup>22</sup>	3'393'000	0.50 / 0.75	1'697'000	2'545'000	2'121'000
SVS/BirdLife Switzerland <sup>23</sup>	4'534'000	0.50 / 0.75	2'267'000	2'297'000	3'400'500
Swiss Transport and Environment Association <sup>24</sup>	16'096'000	0.10 / 0.25	1'610'000	4'024'000	2'817'000
WWF Switzerland <sup>25</sup>	40'860'000	0.50 / 0.75	20'430'000	30'645'000	25'537'500
Fifteen other NGOs					9'154'500

<sup>19</sup> The Bern Declaration was also included in the assessment, due to its important collaboration on ABS.

<sup>20</sup> Greenpeace Schweiz; Dossier 2010

<sup>21</sup> Pro Natura; Betriebsrechnung 2010, Leistungsbericht 2010

<sup>22</sup> Pro Specia Rara; Bericht der Revisionsstelle an den Stiftungsrat (Jahresrechnung 2010)

<sup>23</sup> BirdLife Schweiz SVS; Rechnung 2010

<sup>24</sup> VCS Verkehrs-Club Schweiz; Jahresrechnung 2010

<sup>25</sup> WWF Schweiz; Finanzbericht 2010

**Table 16:** Contributions to the objectives of the CBD from NGOs predominantly active abroad.

	Total expenses [CHF]	BD-factor low / high	Low estimate [CHF]	High estimate [CHF]	Average estimate [CHF]
<b>Total NGOs predominantly active abroad</b>	<b>240'418'000</b>		<b>13'001'000</b>	<b>19'527'000</b>	<b>16'264'000</b>
HELVETAS <sup>26</sup>	71'720'000	0.05 / 0.10	3'586'000	7'172'000	5'379'000
Swissaid <sup>27</sup>	19'594'000	0.10 / 0.25	1'959'000	4'899'000	3'429'000
Caritas <sup>28</sup>	93'430'000	0.05 / 0.05	4'672'000	4'672'000	4'672'000
HEKS <sup>29</sup>	55'674'000	0.05 / 0.05	2'784'000	2'784'000	2'784'000

**Table 17:** Contributions to the objectives of the CBD from Zoological Gardens.

	Total expenses [CHF]	BD-factor low / high	Low estimate [CHF]	High estimate [CHF]	Average estimate [CHF]
<b>Total Zoological Gardens</b>	<b>63'407'000</b>		<b>3'170'000</b>	<b>3'170'000</b>	<b>3'170'000</b>
Basel Zoo <sup>30</sup>	38'823'000	0.05 / 0.05	1'941'000	1'941'000	1'941'000
Zurich Zoo <sup>31</sup>	24'584'000	0.05 / 0.05	1'229'000	1'229'000	1'229'000

### Plausibility check

#### **NGOs and foundations**

**76.5 - 107.8 mln CHF**

This is the first time that the financial resources of Swiss based NGO's and foundations operating at national or international level in support of the objectives of the CBD have been assessed. However, it should be noted that the multitude of local NGO's and foundations, which do a very important job for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Switzerland, are not taken into account by the present assessment.

Efforts by charitable foundations are not included in this report, due to very scarce publicly available information about their financial resources. It is thus plausible that the financial resources provided by NGO's and foundations are larger than listed in this report. Additional work is necessary to get a more adequate assessment.

<sup>26</sup> HELVETAS; Finanzbericht 2010

<sup>27</sup> Swissaid; Jahresbericht 2010, ongoing projects (ending 03.05.2011)

<sup>28</sup> Caritas Schweiz; Finanzbericht 2010, North-South Cooperation 2010/2011

<sup>29</sup> HEKS; Finanzbericht 2010, Homepage

<sup>30</sup> Zoologischer Garten Basel; Jahresbericht 2009, funding for projects in protected areas

<sup>31</sup> Zoo Zürich; Homepage, funding for the Masoala National Parc

### 3.4.2 Academia

#### **Definition according to the CBD draft proposal on methodological guidance:**

*Academia refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational establishments and research institutions.*

---

#### **Methodology**

Biodiversity-related research and education supports the objectives for the CBD as well, in direct and more in indirect forms. This section provides an overview of existing data in this sector and an estimate of the yearly expenses in Switzerland for research and education.

Data from surveys undertaken by Swiss Statistics and official reports, such as annual reports and audited financial statements were used as a basis for collecting information:

#### **A) Swiss National Science Foundation SNSF**

The Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) is the most important agency promoting scientific research in Switzerland. It supports, as mandated by the Swiss Federal government, all disciplines, from philosophy and biology to the nanosciences and medicine. The yearly statistics provided by SNSF include all applications processed and approved during the financial year as well as contributions paid out in the area of National Centres of Competence in Research. In 2010 the SNSF granted funding to the total value of CHF 726 million<sup>32</sup>.

A full text search in the SNSF project database<sup>33</sup> for biodiversity resulted in 41 (Title / Keywords) respectively 61 (Titel / Keywords / Abstracts) current projects. The financial support amounts to approximately CHF 115'000 for each project and year. This results in yearly expenditures of CHF 4.72 to 7.59 millions. That means that about 0.65% to 1.0% of the yearly granted funding from SNSF supports biodiversity related projects.

The allocation of SNSF-grants is directed by a scientific committee. Therefore, the above-mentioned statistics of the SNSF (0.65% and 1.0%) provide helpful values for further estimates of biodiversity-related research in relation to general expenses for research on universities and universities of applied sciences.

#### **B) Swiss Statistics<sup>34</sup>**

Publications and the online portal of the Swiss Federal Statistical Office (FSO) provide plenty of high quality data about "Education and Science". Unfortunately, the data and indicators are not directly biodiversity-sensitive. Nevertheless, the data provide valuable basic information on general research and education expenses in Switzerland:

---

<sup>32</sup> SNSF: Statistics 2010 – Full version

<sup>33</sup> SNSF: <http://www.projectdb.snf.ch/WebForms/Frameset.aspx>

<sup>34</sup> FSO: [www.bfs.admin.ch](http://www.bfs.admin.ch)

- *Swiss research and development (R&D) expenditure in 2008:* According to estimates from the FSO, private enterprise, the Swiss government and the universities spent CHF 16.3 billion on research and development (R&D) activities in 2008. Approximately CHF 4 billion was used for R&D-projects at universities and associated research centers.

An adjustment of the expenditure on R&D is made with the above-mentioned statistics of the SNSF (0.65% - 1.0%).

- *Costs of the universities 2009:* In 2009 the Swiss universities spent over CHF 3 billion on education. Approximately CHF 440 million were used for biodiversity-related disciplines like Environmental Sciences, Earth Sciences, Biology, Geography, Agriculture or Forestry.

An adjustment of the expenditure on education in universities is made with the BD-factor (5% - 10%).

- *Costs of universities of applied sciences (Fachhochschulen) 2009:* In 2009 the Swiss universities of applied sciences spent nearly CHF 2 billion on education. Approximately CHF 115 million were used for biodiversity-related disciplines like Life-Sciences, Agriculture or Forestry.

An adjustment of the expenditure on education in universities of applied sciences is made with the BD-factor (5% - 10%).

## Results for Academia

With the above-mentioned information and a rough estimate of yearly expenses for education and research in the wide field of biodiversity is feasible.

**Table 18:** Aggregated financial flows for biodiversity related research and education.

	Millions of CHF annual		
	Low estimate	High estimate	Average estimate
<b>Academia</b>	<b>54.0</b>	<b>96.0</b>	<b>75.0</b>
Research and development expenditures at universities and universities of applied sciences (including SNSF-projects)	26.0	40.0	33.0
Educational expenditures at universities	22.0	44.0	33.0
Educational expenditures at universities of applied sciences	6.0	12.0	9.0

### Plausibility check

**Academia**

**54 - 96 mln CHF**

**Estimation based on the number of scientific papers published**

The costs for the scientific work leading to a scientific publication, is roughly estimated to be CHF 100'000.-. According to the Database *Web of Sciences*, Swiss scientists published a total of 506 papers related to the topic "biodiversity" in the years 2009 - 2011 (August 2011), i.e. approximately 200 papers per year, thus generating costs of approximately CHF 20 million per year. This estimate is broadly in accordance with the low estimate for costs related to research and development expenditures at universities and universities of applied science (see table 14).

#### **Enquiry among experts of the Swiss Biodiversity Forum**

A non-representative enquiry among experts of the Swiss Forum Biodiversity resulted in an estimate of the costs related to research and development expenditures at universities and universities of applied science between CHF 11-150 Million (see table 14).

#### **Estimation based on the costs for students at universities and universities of applied sciences**

In the year 2009, a total of CHF 130 Million were spend for the basic and advanced study periods at universities (field of study: biology) and universities of applied sciences (field of study: civil engineer). These costs are certainly not relevant for biodiversity in their entity. However, biodiversity relevant parts of other degree programmes - such as forestry and agronomy - probably compensate the non biodiversity relevant parts of the biology and civil engineer degree programmes.

#### *Sources:*

- FSO: *Finanzen der Fachhochschulen 2009: Basisdaten*; [www.bfs.admin.ch](http://www.bfs.admin.ch), Status October 2011
- FSO: *Kosten der universitären Hochschulen 2009*; [www.bfs.admin.ch](http://www.bfs.admin.ch), Status October 2011
- FSO: *Studierende an den Fachhochschulen 2009/2010*; [www.bfs.admin.ch](http://www.bfs.admin.ch), Status October 2011
- FSO: *Studierende an den universitären Hochschulen 2009/2010*; [www.bfs.admin.ch](http://www.bfs.admin.ch), Status October 2011

### **3.5 International Financial Institutions**

#### **Definition according to the CBD draft proposal on methodological guidance:**

*International financial institutions include World Bank Group and regional development banks.*

#### **Methodology**

Switzerland's financial contributions to the World Bank Group and to regional development banks are estimated using the OECD Creditor Information System by identifying the ODA channelled

through multilateral organisations. The contribution was obtained by addition of Switzerland's disbursement for the year 2009 per institution. To avoid double-counting with the indicator ODA, contributions to the policy objective "Environment" or tagged with a Rio Marker including "Biodiversity" were identified and subtracted from the gross contribution.

### Results for International Financial Institutions

**Table 19:** Aggregated financial flows to the World Bank Group.

	Millions of USD (constant 2009 USD millions)		
	Contributions to the World Bank Group	Contributions already taken into account for the indicator ODA (chapter 3.1)	Net contributions to the World Bank Group
<b>World Bank Group</b>	<b>51.3</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>51.1</b>
World Bank Group:	6.2	0	6.2
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	17.2	0.2	17.0
International Development Association	6.3	0	6.3
International Finance Corporation	21.6	0	21.6

**Table 20:** Aggregated financial flows to regional development banks.

	Millions of USD (constant 2009 USD millions)		
	Contributions to development banks	Contributions already taken into account for the indicator ODA (chapter 3.1)	Net contributions to regional development banks
<b>Regional Development Banks:</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17.6</b>
African Development Bank	0.5	0	0.5
African Development Fund	2.9	0	2.9
Asian Development Bank	1.7	0	1.7
Asian Development Fund	1.6	0	1.6
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development	7.8	0	7.8
Inter-American Development Bank, Inter-American Investment Corporation and Multilateral Investment Fund	0.3	0	0.3
Regional Development Banks	2.8	0	2.8

### **3.6 United Nations organizations, funds and programmes**

#### **Definition according to the CBD draft proposal on methodological guidance:**

This indicator has so far not been defined.

Our understanding is that the indicator describes financial contributions for the establishment and maintenance of a global environmental governance system in a very broad sense as well as multilateral funding in favour of developing countries and countries with economies in transition in view of supporting the establishment of a national environment governance architecture in those countries. This includes for instance contributions capacity building efforts in the fields of environmental policy, administration and management, legal judicial development, human rights, etc.

Financial contributions to the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of its components through United Nations organisations, funds and programmes are included in chapter 3.1)

#### **Methodology**

Switzerland's financial contribution to the United Nations organisations, funds and programmes is collected from OECDs' CRS database, using the Channel "*Multilateral Organisations*" to identify relevant disbursements.

To avoid double counting with the indicator *ODA* (chapter 3.1), contributions to the policy objective "Environment" or tagged with a Rio Marker including "Biodiversity" were identified and subtracted from the contributions identified using the Channel "*Multilateral Organisations*".

Further, some contributions, such as the contribution of the FOEN to the UNEP Fund, are already included in the indicator "Domestic budget at Federal level" (chapter 3.2.1).

**Table 21: Aggregated financial flows to United Nations organizations, funds and programmes.**

	Millions of USD ( <i>constant 2009 USD millions</i> )		
	Contributions identified using the Channel "Multilateral Organisations"	Contributions already taken into account for the indicator ODA (chapter 3.1)	Net contributions to United Nations organizations, funds and programmes
<b>United Nations organizations, funds and programmes</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>30.3</b>
United Nations Development Programme	16.5	0.9	15.6
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development	1.7	0.6	1.1
United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (extrabudgetary contributions only)	0.1	0.1	0
United Nations Environment Programme	1.0	0.7	0.3
Food and Agricultural Organisation	3.7	1.3	2.4
United Nations Agencies, Funds and Commissions	10.9*	0.0	10.9*

\* The contributions of the Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport (DDPS) to United Nations Agencies, Funds and Commissions are not taken into account (-0.666 mln).

### 3.7 Non-ODA public funding

N/A

### 3.8 South-South Cooperation initiatives

N/A

### 3.9 Technical cooperation

All relevant contributions to technical cooperation have either been included under Official Development Assistance ODA or Domestic Budgets at all levels.



1.4 Not for profit organizations											
<b>Total:</b>											53
<p><b>Comments:</b> Data was extracted from the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS), official Government of Canada reports</p> <p>* Data for Canadian public sector expenditures is done on a fiscal year basis: April 1 – March 31. As a result, Canada is reporting data from Fiscal Year 2006-2007 (April 1, 2006 – March 31, 2007) under “2006”. This methodology was followed for all tables for subsequent years.</p> <p>- Due to the difficult separation between certain climate change and biodiversity spending, particularly in relation to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, these activities were not included in this report. This ensures that there is no double-counting of climate change-related expenditures, as per the methodological guidelines issued by the CBD Secretariat.</p> <p>- 1.1 includes the biodiversity-related proportion of Canada’s multilateral contributions to the Global Environment Facility.</p>											

Year: 2007		Currency: Millions of CAN\$ (current prices)										
Type of financial flows		Activity categories								Total		
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management.		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption				
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	
1.1 Official Development Assistance	1.1.1 Bilateral										67	High
	1.1.2 Multilateral											
1.2 Other public funds												
1.3 Private/ Market												
1.4 Not for profit organizations												
<b>Total:</b>											67	
<p><b>Comments:</b> Data was extracted from the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS), official Government of Canada reports</p> <p>- 1.1 includes the biodiversity-related proportion of Canada’s multilateral contributions to the Global Environment Facility.</p>												

Year: 2008		Currency: Millions of CAN\$ (current prices)										
Type of financial flows		Activity categories								Total		
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management.		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption				
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	
1.1 Official Development Assistance	1.1.1 Bilateral										74	High
	1.1.2 Multilateral											
1.2 Other public funds												
1.3 Private/ Market												



**2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country**

Year: 2006			Currency: Millions of CAN\$ (current prices)									
Source			Activity categories						Total			
			Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management.				Category D: Sustainable production and consumption	
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central										2,150	High
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										2,316	High
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal										2,521	Med
2.2 Private/ Market											1,013	Med
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)											402	Med
<b>Total:</b>											8,402	
<b>Comments:</b>												
Data was retrieved directly from published sources of federal and provincial governments, official data from Statistics Canada, and official published reports from private organizations.												

Year: 2007			Currency: Millions of CAN\$ (current prices)									
Source			Activity categories						Total			
			Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management.				Category D: Sustainable production and consumption	
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central										2,447	High
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										2,697	High
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal										2,679	Med
2.2 Private/ Market											914	Low
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)											405	Med
<b>Total:</b>											9,143	
<b>Comments:</b>												
Data was retrieved directly from published sources of federal and provincial governments, official data from Statistics Canada, and official published reports from private organizations. Private sector was calculated by averaging 2006 and 2008 expenditures.												

Year: 2008		Currency: Millions of CAN\$ (current prices)										
Source		Activity categories								Total		
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management.		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption				
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence	
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central										2,442	High
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										2,596	High
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal										2,914	Med
2.2 Private/ Market											810	Med
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)											563	Med
<b>Total:</b>											9,325	
<b>Comments:</b> Data was retrieved directly from published sources of federal and provincial governments, official data from Statistics Canada, and official published reports from private organizations.												

Year: 2009		Currency: Millions of CAN\$ (current prices)										
Source		Activity categories								Total		
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management.		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption				
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence	
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central										2,036	High
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										2,808	High
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal										3,115	Med
2.2 Private/ Market											737	Low
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)											549	Med
<b>Total:</b>											9,245	
<b>Comments:</b> Data was retrieved directly from published sources of federal and provincial governments, official data from Statistics Canada, and official published reports from private organizations. Private sector expenditure was estimated based on trend from 2006-2008.												

Year: 2010		Currency: Millions of CAN\$ (current prices)									
Source		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management.		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central									2,221	High
	2.1.2 State/Provincial									2,652	High
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal									3,312	Low
2.2 Private/ Market										678	Low
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)										480	Low
<b>Total:</b>										9,343	
<p><b>Comments:</b> Data was retrieved directly from published sources of federal and provincial governments, official data from Statistics Canada, and official published reports from private organizations. Local governments, private sector and academia expenditures were largely estimated based on trends.</p>											

**3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization**

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	In progress - the Value of Nature to Canadians Study will be completed in 2013.	
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A		
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A		
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A		
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	Note: Canada can highlight that its recent Federal Sustainable Development Strategy has the objective of integrating government wide actions and results, linking sustainable development planning and reporting to the Government's core expenditure planning reporting system, and providing effective measurement, monitoring and reporting tools to track and report on progress.	
<b>Comments:</b> 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4: Not applicable – indicators intended for developing countries.				

#### **4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability**

##### ***4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation***

Year:

Currency:

Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided				
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity-building through triangular cooperation				
<b>Comments:</b> No data available / Not applicable.				

##### ***4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies***

Year:

Currency:

Incentives	Value	Description

<b>4.2.1</b> Removed, reformed or phased-out		
<b>4.2.2</b> Positive incentives introduced		
<b>Comments :</b> No information currently available.		

#### ***4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism***

**Year:**

**Currency:**

Type of Initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
<b>Comments:</b> No information currently available.			

#### ***4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention***

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
<b>Comments:</b> Not applicable to Canada at present.	

### **Information on the Existing Resources Mobilized by Canada for Biodiversity Annex 1: Methodology**

#### **Environment Canada**

**Final Version: July 9, 2012**

#### **CONTEXT:**

- In response to a decision made by the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), this report focuses on providing information regarding Canadian public and private financial contributions that support the objectives of the CBD, using a diverse range of publicly-available and published source data and information.
- The CBD Secretariat will use this and other Parties' information as input to initiate discussions on setting resource mobilization baselines and targets, and further fine-tune methodological guidelines for Parties to follow in collecting this data.
- As a result, it is not expected that this report be completely comprehensive. Rather it is intended to give an indicative estimate of the scale and scope of resources being mobilized by Canada and Canadians in support of the objectives of the CBD.

**SUMMARY:**

	Millions of CAN\$ (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
<b>Official Development Assistance</b>	<b>\$ 53.35</b>	<b>\$ 66.70</b>	<b>\$ 73.80</b>	<b>\$ 85.06</b>	<b>\$ 136.93</b>
Government of Canada	\$ 45.61	\$ 42.72	\$ 46.94	\$ 62.46	\$ 95.00
International Financial Institutions & UN	\$ 7.74	\$ 23.98	\$ 26.85	\$ 22.59	\$ 41.94
<b>Domestic public budgets at all levels</b>	<b>\$ 6,986.65</b>	<b>\$ 7,823.76</b>	<b>\$ 7,951.53</b>	<b>\$ 7,959.74</b>	<b>\$ 8,184.20</b>
Federal	\$ 2,149.67	\$ 2,447.47	\$ 2,442.05	\$ 2,036.29	\$ 2,220.74
Provincial	\$ 2,315.98	\$ 2,696.85	\$ 2,595.88	\$ 2,808.11	\$ 2,651.81
Local	\$ 2,521.00	\$ 2,679.45	\$ 2,913.60	\$ 3,115.35	\$ 3,311.65
<b>Private Sector</b>	<b>\$ 1,012.94</b>	<b>\$ 914.10</b>	<b>\$ 810.23</b>	<b>\$ 736.50</b>	<b>\$ 677.88</b>
Business expenditures	\$ 437.75	\$ 339.95	\$ 242.15	\$ 182.71	\$ 135.89
User fees (parks fees, licenses)	\$ 575.19	\$ 574.15	\$ 568.08	\$ 553.79	\$ 541.99
<b>NGOs, foundations, and academia</b>	<b>\$ 402.22</b>	<b>\$ 405.23</b>	<b>\$ 563.02</b>	<b>\$ 548.83</b>	<b>\$ 480.45</b>
Non-governmental organizations, foundations	\$ 275.85	\$ 270.79	\$ 417.85	\$ 405.00	\$ 338.96
Academia	\$ 126.37	\$ 134.44	\$ 145.18	\$ 143.82	\$ 141.50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 8,455.16</b>	<b>\$ 9,209.79</b>	<b>\$ 9,398.58</b>	<b>\$ 9,330.13</b>	<b>\$ 9,479.47</b>

**BACKGROUND:**

The United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) entered into force in 1993. It has three main objectives: the conservation of biological diversity; the sustainable use of the components of biological diversity; and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources.

At the Ninth Conference of the Parties (COP-9) of the CBD, Parties established a Strategy for Resource Mobilization to assist the Parties and relevant organizations to mobilize adequate and predictable financial resources to support the achievement of the Convention's three objectives. The Strategy considers the full range of possible local, national, regional and international funding sources, both public and private.

At the Tenth Conference of the Parties (COP-10) in October 2010, Parties agreed on a set of indicators to measure progress on implementing the Strategy for Resource Mobilization (Decision X/3). The indicators were based on the Strategy's mission and eight goals, with subsequent methodological and implementation guidance for collecting data developed by the CBD Secretariat at the request of Parties:

(1) Aggregated financial flows, in the amount and where relevant percentage, of biodiversity-related funding, per annum, for achieving the Convention's three objectives, in a manner that avoids double counting, both in total and in, inter alia, the following categories:

- (a) Official Development Assistance (ODA);
- (b) Domestic budgets at all levels;
- (c) Private sector;
- (d) Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia;
- (e) International financial institutions;
- (f) United Nations organizations, funds and programmes;
- (g) Non-ODA public funding;
- (h) South-South cooperation initiatives;
- (i) Technical cooperation;

- (2) Number of countries that have:
  - (a) Assessed values of biodiversity, in accordance with the Convention;
  - (b) Identified and reported funding needs, gaps and priorities;
  - (c) Developed national financial plans for biodiversity;
  - (d) Been provided with the necessary funding and capacity-building to undertake the above activities;
- (3) Amount of domestic financial support, per annum, in respect of those domestic activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of this Convention;
- (4) Amount of funding provided through the Global Environment Facility and allocated to biodiversity focal area;
- (5) Level of CBD and Parties' support to other financial institutions that promote replication and scaling-up of relevant successful financial mechanisms and instruments;
- (6) Number of international financing institutions, United Nations organizations, funds and programmes, and the development agencies that report to the Development Assistance Committee of Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/DAC), with biodiversity and associated ecosystem services as a cross-cutting policy;
- (7) Number of Parties that integrate considerations on biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services in development plans, strategies and budgets;
- (8) Number of South-South cooperation initiatives conducted by developing country Parties and those that may be supported by other Parties and relevant partners, as a complement to necessary North-South cooperation;
- (9) Amount and number of South-South and North-South technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives that support biodiversity;
- (10) Number of global initiatives that heighten awareness on the need for resource mobilization for biodiversity;
- (11) Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries to contribute to achieving the Convention's objectives;
- (12) Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;
- (13) Resources mobilized from the removal, reform or phase-out of incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity, which could be used for the promotion of positive incentives, including but not limited to innovative financial mechanisms, that are consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations, taking into account national social and economic conditions;

(14) Number of initiatives, and respective amounts, supplementary to the financial mechanism established under Article 21, that engage Parties and relevant organizations in new and innovative financial mechanisms, which consider intrinsic values and all other values of biodiversity, in accordance with the objectives of the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization;

(15) Number of access and benefit-sharing initiatives and mechanisms, consistent with the Convention and, when in effect, with the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization, including awareness-raising, that enhance resource mobilization.

### **GENERAL NOTE ON METHODOLOGY**

This report focuses on providing information regarding Canadian public and private financial resources that support the objectives of the CBD, using a diverse range of publicly available and published source data and information, in response to CBD COP Decision X/3 (1). An estimate is provided of annual expenditures from 2006 to 2010 on biodiversity by both public and private sector sources using the categories agreed to in this Decision. Since calendar year data was not always available, fiscal year data was used (i.e. FY 2006-2007 is considered calendar year 2006). All figures in this report were obtained from publicly available, previously published data sources. To ensure reliability, official reports such as government reports, annual reports and audited financial statements were used as a basis for collecting the information, with references provided. Data from surveys undertaken by Statistics Canada were also extremely important for some categories, as well as data from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Creditor Reporting System as extracted from OECD.Stat. Data for more recent years was sometimes not available for certain categories so it was forecast using linear, geometric or polynomial regression. The specific method used was determined based on the trend of the available data. Additional methodological details are provided under each specific indicator and category below.

It is important to note that the vast majority of activities that contribute to the implementation of the CBD are diverse in nature. In a best case scenario, determining if an activity contributes to the implementation of the CBD should, in addition to examining the traditional biodiversity sectors of environment, wildlife and protected areas, consider actions and expenditures in the resource sectors of agriculture, forestry and fisheries, and eco-tourism, as well as development assistance projects that focus on natural resources and sustainable livelihoods. Likewise, actions by industrial sectors, municipalities, urban and rural areas that contribute to protection of lands, aquatic areas, wildlife, and sustainable use of biological resources, etc., all make contributions to the CBD. Expenditures on planning, environmental impact assessments, environmental education are additional examples of activities and expenditures that contribute to both the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of biological resources. However, in most cases detailed expenditure information was not available at this level. As a result, many of these expenditures have not been fully counted in this study in order to ensure that overall results are not over-estimated. Therefore, the figures reported in this study are likely lower than the actual amounts of resources mobilized in support of the CBD.

All figures in this document are in current Canadian dollars. Conversions from US dollars were made using average annual exchange rates published by the Bank of Canada.

## 17. Financial flows for achieving the Convention's three objectives, by category:

### (j) Official Development Assistance (ODA):

	Millions of CAN\$ (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
<b>Official Development Assistance (ODA)</b>	<b>\$ 53.35</b>	<b>\$ 66.70</b>	<b>\$ 73.80</b>	<b>\$ 85.06</b>	<b>\$ 136.93</b>
<b>Government of Canada</b>	<b>\$ 45.61</b>	<b>\$ 42.72</b>	<b>\$ 46.94</b>	<b>\$ 62.46</b>	<b>\$ 95.00</b>
<i>CIDA, IDRC, Environment Canada</i>	\$ 28.64	\$ 25.80	\$ 26.02	\$ 41.15	\$ 73.22
<i>Finance Canada</i>	\$ 16.97	\$ 16.92	\$ 20.43	\$ 20.90	\$ 21.28
<i>Parks Canada</i>	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0.49	\$ 0.41	\$ 0.50
<b>International Financial Institutions &amp; UN</b>	<b>\$ 7.74</b>	<b>\$ 23.98</b>	<b>\$ 26.85</b>	<b>\$ 22.59</b>	<b>\$ 41.94</b>
<i>Global Environment Facility</i>	\$ 0	\$ 13.42	\$ 18.12	\$ 15.49	\$ 22.35
<i>FAO</i>	\$ 4.53	\$ 7.13	\$ 5.38	\$ 3.92	\$ 16.61
<i>UNDP</i>	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.82	\$ 2.73	\$ 2.52	\$ 2.31
<i>UNESCO</i>	\$ 0.61	\$ 0.61	\$ 0.62	\$ 0.67	\$ 0.67

### xii. Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), International Development Research Centre (IDRC), and Environment Canada:<sup>132</sup>

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) reports nearly all ODA activities undertaken by the Government of Canada to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC). While the OECD tabulates biodiversity ODA using the Rio Markers, significant methodological issues prevent the use of these figures in this estimate.

In order to accurately estimate the portion of ODA which contributes to achieving the objectives of the CBD, data was extracted from the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS). Reported activities are coded using DAC sector codes. Sectors in areas that contribute directly to the implementation of the CBD's objectives were identified. These are:

- 014015: Water Resources Protection
- 041020: Biosphere Protection
- 041030: Bio-diversity
- 041040: Site preservation
- 031100: Agriculture, forestry and fishing
- 041010: Environmental policy and Administrative Management
- 041050: Flood Prevention and Control
- 041081: Environmental Education and Training
- 041082: Environmental Research

<sup>132</sup> See Annex 1

Activities within each sector were analysed to determine what percentage of expenditures in 2010 could be considered as supporting the objectives of the CBD. These percentages were used to estimate biodiversity related ODA for years 2006 through 2009.

CIDA's core contribution to the Global Environment Facility has not been taken into account in these figures and will be listed separately in this report in the section on International Organizations.

**xiii. Other ODA Flows**

- **Department of Finance Canada:**

	Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
International Development Association	\$ 353.52	\$ 352.58	\$ 425.72	\$ 435.48	\$ 443.28
4.8%	\$ 16.97	\$ 16.92	\$ 20.43	\$ 20.90	\$ 21.28

The Department of Finance Canada is a large contributor of ODA, including the provision of financial resources to the World Bank Group. The International Development Association (IDA) of the World Bank is the largest multilateral channel of concessional financing to the world's poorest countries, providing funding supports to boost economic growth, reduce poverty, and improve the living conditions.<sup>1</sup> Finance Canada channels Canada's contribution to IDA.

A portion of IDA resources, estimated at 7 percent, is directed toward its Environment and Natural Resource Management sector.<sup>2</sup> Of this, approximately 68% supports activities related to the three objectives of the CBD.<sup>3</sup> Based on this, approximately 4.8% of Canada's annual contribution could be considered as supporting the implementation of the CBD.

Note that data for other World Bank Group expenditures, such as the IBRD and the IFC, was not included here. First of all, some of Canada's "contributions" to the World Bank Group has come in the form of capital contributions, with these resources being used and re-used, leveraged and loaned, and even mixed with grant resources, on a regular basis. This makes it difficult to establish clear contributions from Canada on an annual given that World Bank Group reporting often groups these resources together. Secondly, most of the World Bank's additional expenditures related to biodiversity are loans that will eventually be paid back. As a result, most of these biodiversity expenditures amount to a net flow of zero. Lastly, the World Bank also provides a substantial amount of grant-based funding to biodiversity through various thematic trust funds. However, any contribution to these from Canada would be captured in CIDA's annual reports on ODA and likely covered in the previous section.

- **Parks Canada:<sup>4</sup>**

	Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
Parks Canada ODA	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0.49	\$ 0.41	\$ 0.50

Parks Canada provides ODA for protected areas and heritage initiatives. Activities, such as park operations management and use of science and conservation tools are directly supportive of the implementation of the CBD, and thus, all of Parks Canada's ODA is included in the total ODA contribution.

## International Financial Institutions and United Nations Organizations, Funds and Programmes

### xiv. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO):<sup>5</sup>

	Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
Annual Contribution	\$ 12.18	\$ 19.16	\$ 14.45	\$ 10.53	\$ 44.65
<b>37.2%</b>	<b>\$ 4.53</b>	<b>\$ 7.13</b>	<b>\$ 5.38</b>	<b>\$ 3.92</b>	<b>\$ 16.61</b>

Canada's annual contribution to the FAO is embedded in CIDA's Official Development Assistance reports; however, it is not included in the sectoral analysis above. As a result, this amount has not been included in the section above on CIDA's ODA, but included here in the section on International Financial Institutions and United Nations Organizations. It is also important to note that a large portion of Canada's contribution to the FAO is provided by DFAIT.

Much of the FAO's activities appear to be related to the objectives of the CBD. The FAO's Programme of Work details 12 key areas of work<sup>6</sup>, of which the following are directly related to meeting the objectives of the CBD and represent approximately 37.2% of the FAO's budget:

- Sustainable intensification of crop production
- Increased sustainable livestock production
- Sustainable management and use of fisheries and aquaculture resources
- Sustainable management of forests and trees
- Sustainable management of land, water and genetic resources

### xv. Global Environment Facility:<sup>7</sup>

	Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
Annual Contribution	\$ 0	\$ 36.27	\$ 48.98	\$ 41.87	\$ 60.41
<b>37%</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 13.42</b>	<b>\$ 18.12</b>	<b>\$ 15.49</b>	<b>\$ 22.35</b>

Of Canada's annual contribution to the GEF, approximately 27.9 percent of these resources is programmed directly for the biodiversity focal area, including sustainable forest management. However, there are substantial levels of funding included in the GEF's international waters and land degradation focal areas that are biodiversity activities. This brings the proportion of GEF-5 biodiversity-related resources up to 37%.

While this amount is embedded in CIDA's Official Development Assistance reports, it is not normally classified as "biodiversity funding". As a result, this amount has not been included in the section above on CIDA's ODA, but included here in the section on International Financial Institutions and United Nations Organizations.

### xvi. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP):<sup>8</sup>

	Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
Core Funding	\$ 56.25	\$ 60.94	\$ 59.06	\$ 54.38	\$ 49.83
4.63%	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.82	\$ 2.73	\$ 2.52	\$ 2.31

UNDP reports that its “portfolio of biodiversity projects consists of 177 initiatives under implementation, with a value of US\$ 1.879 billion. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) is the largest financier of these projects, contributing US\$ 533 million in funds administered by UNDP. Other financiers of projects include the German-funded International Climate Initiative, bilateral agencies, governments and the private sector. In addition, the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP), implemented by UNDP has established operations in over 120 countries. A number of other UNDP environment programmes also contribute towards biodiversity management, including the Poverty–Environment Initiative, the UN–REDD Programme, UNDP’s GEF supported International Waters Programme and initiatives of the Nairobi based Drylands Development Centre.”<sup>9</sup>

It would appear, therefore, that almost all of UNDP’s biodiversity-related activities are funded through the GEF or through specific funding from bilateral donors. As Canada’s contribution to the GEF has already been counted above, it would not be consistent to attempt to count any resources reported by UNDP.

However, the Government of Canada’s core contribution made by CIDA to UNDP is additional to any funding that CIDA counts as a contribution to the GEF. From 2004-2007, UNDP disbursed US\$1.58 billion on environmental programming, of which US\$181.8 million came from regular resources<sup>10</sup>. Over this same time period US\$1.1 billion was contributed to UNDP as regular, core resources by donors. Therefore, it could be estimated that on average 16.52% of UNDP’s core resources are used for environmental programming. Of this amount, approximately 28% went to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.<sup>11</sup> As a result, an estimated 4.63% of Canada’s contributions to UNDP’s core funding can be counted as biodiversity-related funding.

**xvii. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)<sup>12</sup>**

	Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
Assessed Contribution	\$ 9.78	\$ 9.80	\$ 10.02	\$ 10.76	\$ 10.79
6.2%	\$ 0.61	\$ 0.61	\$ 0.62	\$ 0.67	\$ 0.67

UNESCO reported that in 2010 \$34 million of its resources paid from assessed contributions (\$377 million) was used to fund its “Natural Sciences” program<sup>13</sup>, 69% of which supports biodiversity and coastal management issues according to 2010-11 Programme of Work and Budget<sup>14</sup>. Therefore, an estimated 6.2% of Canada’s assessed contributions to UNESCO contribute to the objectives of the CBD.

**xviii. Multilateral Development Banks:**

Canada provides substantial levels of funding (over \$500 million) to several multilateral development banks such as the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development

Bank, the African Development Bank and the World Bank, amongst others. While these entities provided substantial support for the objectives of the CBD, it was ultimately deemed not possible at this point to arrive at a credible estimate for this contribution. On one hand, it was difficult to differentiate between what these entities provided as grants and what was provided as loans. Additionally, it was challenging to identify what portion of each organization's "environment" or "natural resources" portfolios was directly related to biodiversity activities.

**(k) Domestic budgets at all levels:**

	Millions of CAN\$ (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
<b>Domestic public budgets at all levels</b>	<b>\$ 6,986.65</b>	<b>\$ 7,823.76</b>	<b>\$ 7,951.53</b>	<b>\$ 7,959.74</b>	<b>\$ 8,184.20</b>
<i>Federal</i>	\$ 2,149.67	\$ 2,447.47	\$ 2,442.05	\$ 2,036.29	\$ 2,220.74
<i>Provincial</i>	\$ 2,315.98	\$ 2,696.85	\$ 2,595.88	\$ 2,808.11	\$ 2,651.81
<i>Local governments</i>	\$ 2,521.00	\$ 2,679.45	\$ 2,913.60	\$ 3,115.35	\$ 3,311.65

**i. Federal Government Departments:<sup>15</sup>**

Data was examined from federal departments' annual performance reports. These reports identify expenditures carried out in each program area. Included in the estimate are annual expenditures made in program areas directly related to the objectives of the CBD. In cases where biodiversity-related funding was evident, but a clear, direct relationship to the objectives of the CBD was not evident, a proportion of the total amount reported was estimated. The range of federal organizations included: Agriculture and Agri-food Canada, Environment Canada, Parks Canada, Natural Resources Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Foreign Affairs Canada, and the Canadian Museum of Nature.

	Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
Biodiversity, Wildlife and Sustainable Ecosystems	\$ 203.10	\$ 246.20	\$ 232.10	\$ 173.50	\$ 146.20
Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture	\$ 663.80	\$ 760.50	\$ 866.20	\$ 635.00	\$ 633.00
Parks and Protected Areas	\$ 497.12	\$ 526.72	\$ 569.55	\$ 661.91	\$ 773.49
Agri-Environment	\$ 364.40	\$ 444.50	\$ 331.60	\$ 177.90	\$ 179.50
Forest Management	\$ 178.10	\$ 206.70	\$ 183.50	\$ 167.40	\$ 211.00
Northern Biodiversity Protection	\$ 86.41	\$ 74.56	\$ 82.14	\$ 98.38	\$ 124.92
Water Management - Source Protection	\$ 95.70	\$ 102.00	\$ 113.40	\$ 87.40	\$ 118.00
Education and Awareness	\$ 59.76	\$ 85.09	\$ 62.34	\$ 33.44	\$ 33.28
Support to the CBD	\$ 1.28	\$ 1.20	\$ 1.22	\$ 1.36	\$ 1.35
	\$ 2,149.67	\$ 2,447.47	\$ 2,442.05	\$ 2,036.29	\$ 2,220.74

**ii. Canadian Provinces and Territories:<sup>16</sup>**

Annual expenditures by provinces and territories to enhance and protect to biodiversity were determined through an analysis of departmental annual reports and Finance Department reports. In many cases, annual reports were available for those ministries and departments responsible for biodiversity-related activities. When these reports were not available, either year-end lists of

expenditures prepared by finance departments, or backward-looking expenditures reported in budget estimates for future years were used to extract biodiversity-related expenses.

The organizational structures of each jurisdiction were initially reviewed to identify the most relevant biodiversity related Ministries or Departments. The range of Ministries or Departments included: energy, mines, natural resources, environment, sustainable development, agriculture, tourism, parks, conservation, forestry, range management, fisheries and aquaculture, with significant variation among jurisdictions. Departments of agriculture proved most challenging in determining expenditures on biodiversity related activities. Departments that included several resources (energy, mines, tourism and aquaculture, etc.) were also sometimes difficult to determine expenditures on biological resources, likely leading to underestimating expenditures.

Additional time would be required to further refine estimated contributions of provinces and territories, and would in some cases, require contacting various government agencies to obtain more detailed information than is available online. Forest fire control was included when this information was available. Fire control has both a positive and negative influence on forest biodiversity, but is particularly important in achieving the sustainable use of forest resources. Fire control is an element of the CBD programme of work on forest biodiversity.

	Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
Forest, Fish and Wildlife Management	\$ 1,507.78	\$ 1,479.25	\$ 1,561.59	\$ 1,878.38	\$ 1,763.14
Biodiversity-related Environmental Stewardship and Protection	\$ 351.95	\$ 664.85	\$ 320.00	\$ 278.06	\$ 268.73
Parks and Protected Areas	\$ 143.84	\$ 180.79	\$ 299.60	\$ 232.78	\$ 221.66
Biodiversity-related Environmental Sustainability	\$ 86.61	\$ 103.42	\$ 115.13	\$ 144.87	\$ 143.25
Water Management - Source Protection	\$ 60.83	\$ 86.50	\$ 110.39	\$ 89.04	\$ 77.64
Land Management	\$ 65.47	\$ 66.88	\$ 67.07	\$ 73.97	\$ 75.34
Agri-Environment and Aquaculture	\$ 41.87	\$ 49.76	\$ 49.69	\$ 39.36	\$ 40.12
Environmental Science and Program Management	\$ 30.79	\$ 38.23	\$ 31.00	\$ 35.58	\$ 39.40
Corporate Policy and Planning	\$ 26.83	\$ 27.17	\$ 41.39	\$ 36.07	\$ 22.53
	\$ 2,315.98	\$ 2,696.85	\$ 2,595.88	\$ 2,808.11	\$ 2,651.81

### iii. Local Governments:

Attempting to review specific expenditure data for every municipality in Canada would not be feasible or practical for this study. As a result, it was decided to estimate the financial contributions of local governments to the objectives of the CBD using government expenditure data available from Statistics Canada<sup>17</sup>.

This information does not however enable specific determination of actual expenditures on activities that contribute to the implementation of the CBD. Firstly, it classifies some local government expenditures as “Environment” and then sub-classifies these into “Water purification and supply”, “Sewage collection and disposal”, “Garbage, waste collection and disposal”, and “Other environmental services”. While all of these elements may be important for environmental protection, they probably do not all make direct contributions to conserve

biodiversity or sustainably use biological resources. Expenditures labelled as “Other environmental services” may include biodiversity-related activities.

Given that activities related to water, sewage and waste are counted separately under their own sub-category in this data, separate from “Environment” expenditures, it would be conservative to estimate that at least 25% of the sub-category “Environment” expenditures are likely to contribute to the objectives of the CBD.

Secondly, Statistics Canada classifies some local government expenditures as “Resource conservation and industrial development”. Noting that some of these expenditures relate to “industrial development” rather than “resource conservation”, it was estimated that 10% of this category contributes to the objectives of the CBD.

As a result, according to Statistics Canada, Canadian local governments expended the following biodiversity related expenditures:

		Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
		FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
Resource conservation and industrial development		\$ 1,015.00	\$ 1,127.00	\$ 1,256.00	\$ 1,331.00	\$ -
	(10%)	\$ 101.50	\$ 112.70	\$ 125.60	\$ 133.10	\$ -
Environment		\$ 9,678.00	\$ 10,267.00	\$ 11,152.00	\$ 11,929.00	\$ -
	(25%)	\$ 2,419.50	\$ 2,566.75	\$ 2,788.00	\$ 2,982.25	\$ -
		\$ 2,521.00	\$ 2,679.45	\$ 2,913.60	\$ 3,115.35	\$ 3,311.65

\* Data was not available for 2010-11 so it was estimated using a linear trend.

### (l) Private sector:

		Millions of CAN\$ (current prices)				
		FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
Private sector		\$ 1,012.94	\$ 914.10	\$ 810.23	\$ 736.50	\$ 677.88
Business expenditures		\$ 437.75	\$ 339.95	\$ 242.15	\$ 182.71	\$ 135.89
User fees (parks fees, licenses)		\$ 575.19	\$ 574.15	\$ 568.08	\$ 553.79	\$ 541.99

#### i. Business expenditures:<sup>18</sup>

		Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
		FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
Wildlife and Habitat Monitoring		\$ 266.20	\$ 185.50	\$ 104.80		
Environmental Monitoring		\$ 420.00	\$ 374.55	\$ 329.10		
	25%	\$ 105.00	\$ 93.64	\$ 82.28	\$ -	\$ -
Environmental Assments and Audits		\$ 266.20	\$ 243.25	\$ 220.30		
	25%	\$ 66.55	\$ 60.81	\$ 55.08	\$ -	\$ -
		\$ 437.75	\$ 339.95	\$ 242.15	\$ 182.71	\$ 135.89

According to the 2008 Statistics Canada publication *Environmental Protection Expenditures in the Business Sector*, businesses operating in Canada spent \$9.1 billion in 2008 on environmental protection. This amount is based on both capital and operating expenditures in the following areas:

- Waste management and sewerage services;

- Pollution prevention processes;
- Pollution abatement and control - end-of-pipe;
- Reclamation and decommissioning;
- Environmental monitoring;
- Wildlife and habitat protection; and
- Environmental assessments and audits.

Activities in all of the above areas would make some contribution to the implementation of the CBD, in particular, the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of biological resources objectives. However, it would be difficult to justify including expenditures from the first four categories as directly related to the objectives of the CBD.

“Environmental monitoring” refers to expenditures for purchase of equipment, supplies, labour and services required to monitor pollutant emissions that would affect air, water or soil quality. As a result, at least a portion of these expenditures could be included as contributing to the objectives of the CBD. The same could be said of “Environmental assessments and audits”, defined as expenditures made to review the current compliance of operations with regulations and to evaluate the environmental impact of proposed projects. “Wildlife and habitat protection” is clearly related to the objectives of the CBD and could be included in its full amount.

Statistics Canada has not yet released the 2010 report, so figures for 2009-10 and 2010-11 were estimated using an exponential regression. This was found to be the best method to estimate for future years. Additionally, the figures included for 2007 was calculated by finding the average of the 2006 and 2008 figures.

**ii. User fees:**<sup>19</sup>

	Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
<i>National Protected Areas</i>	\$ 107.50	\$ 107.33	\$ 114.24	\$ 115.88	\$ 112.23
<i>Provincial Protected Areas</i>	\$ 259.99	\$ 267.33	\$ 281.61	\$ 310.08	\$ 313.45
<i>Other user fees (i.e. fishing and hunting licenses)</i>	\$ 207.70	\$ 199.49	\$ 172.23	\$ 127.83	\$ 116.31
	\$ 575.19	\$ 574.15	\$ 568.08	\$ 553.79	\$ 541.99

An additional area of private sector expenditures relates to user fees, including direct fees, licenses and permits. In the case of protected areas, for example, users pay fees to use recreational facilities in parks and campsites. Resource users, such as fishers and loggers, also pay for licenses and permits, although in some cases it would be very difficult to determine if the purpose of these license fees are related to the objectives of the CBD. In many cases, however, governments have specific accounts used to collect and disburse these funds.

There are numerous other innovative areas of private sector financing for biodiversity. These include biodiversity offsets, land conservation tax incentives, schemes for payment for ecosystem services (PES), and the sale of green products. However, experience (and data) related to these in Canada is limited at present. Therefore, no additional effort was made in this study to estimate financial flows from these areas.

It is worth noting that most of the estimates above largely do not include investments and expenditures made by the private sector related to many of the sustainable uses of biodiversity resources. For example, a case could be made to include private sector expenditures related to sustainable agriculture, forestry and fishing, just to name a few sectors. Unfortunately, at this point dependable, disaggregated national data for these sectors is not available. Attempting to estimate, for example, the % of total agriculture spending related to “sustainable use” of biological resources would not be prudent. But it would be important to note here that these three primary sectors of the Canadian economy represent over \$22.6 billion in annual economic activity.<sup>20</sup> If even 10% of this activity is directly related to the sustainable use of biological resources, this would more than triple the estimated biodiversity expenditures estimated above for the private sectors.

In regards to Canadian private sector expenditures for biodiversity made outside of Canada, this study did not find a reliable or practical source of information yet to estimate this figure.

**(m) Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia:**

	Millions of CAN\$ (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
<b>NGOs, foundations, and academia</b>	<b>\$ 402.22</b>	<b>\$ 405.23</b>	<b>\$ 563.02</b>	<b>\$ 548.83</b>	<b>\$ 480.45</b>
<i>Non-governmental organizations, foundations</i>	\$ 275.85	\$ 270.79	\$ 417.85	\$ 405.00	\$ 338.96
<i>Academia</i>	\$ 126.37	\$ 134.44	\$ 145.18	\$ 143.82	\$ 141.50

**i. Non-governmental organizations, foundations:<sup>21</sup>**

There are several hundred, if not thousands of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and foundations in Canada dedicated to activities related to the objectives of the CBD. However, there is no one comprehensive source of data on their nature or their revenues and expenditures. As a result, information had to be gathered on a case-by-case basis, mainly by reviewing each NGO’s financial statements and/or annual reports. This obviously could not be completed for each and every organization, but the following list provides the main, largest biodiversity-related NGOs in Canada.

While many conservation authorities report exact expenditures data by program area, several do not. In these cases, the percentage breakdown provided by program area in the annual report was used to calculate biodiversity related expenditures.

	Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
<i>National NGOs</i>					
The Nature Conservancy of Canada	\$ 60.13	\$ 53.47	\$ 160.43	\$ 117.44	\$ 68.45
Ducks Unlimited Canada	\$ 71.83	\$ 71.53	\$ 79.71	\$ 92.25	\$ 75.84
Canadian Wildlife Federation			\$ 11.17	\$ 10.68	\$ 11.01
World Wildlife Fund Canada	\$ 17.33	\$ 18.80	\$ 22.23	\$ 24.09	\$ 21.33
David Suzuki Foundation	\$ 4.68	\$ 6.08	\$ 6.58	\$ 6.92	\$ 6.65
EcoTrust	\$ 1.81	\$ 1.88	\$ 1.99	\$ 3.06	\$ 3.01
Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society	\$ 4.87	\$ 3.27	\$ 4.19	\$ 3.90	\$ 3.33
Nature Canada	\$ 2.50	\$ 3.60	\$ 3.15	\$ 2.68	\$ 2.48
Wildlife Habitat Canada	\$ 3.55	\$ 2.37	\$ 2.37	\$ 2.01	\$ 2.08
Wildlife Preservation Canada		\$ 0.57	\$ 0.63	\$ 0.66	\$ 0.64
Forest Stewardship Council Canada	\$ 0.47	\$ 0.08	\$ 0.60	\$ 0.34	\$ 0.33
<i>British Columbia</i>					
Habitat Conservation Trust Foundation	\$ -	\$ 7.64	\$ 6.72	\$ 6.75	\$ 6.02
Pacific Salmon Foundation	\$ 3.27	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8.35	\$ 5.39
Land Conservancy of British Columbia	\$ 3.75	\$ 5.58	\$ 9.46	\$ 5.08	\$ 5.13
<i>Alberta</i>					
Alberta Conservation Association	\$ 10.38	\$ 5.25	\$ 9.36	\$ 12.54	\$ 12.52
<i>Saskatchewan</i>					
Wascana Centre Authority	\$ -	\$ 5.08	\$ 5.91	\$ 5.89	\$ 6.98
<i>Ontario</i>					
Nature Ontario	\$ -	\$ 2.08	\$ 2.68	\$ 2.42	\$ 2.49
<i>Conservation Authorities Expenditures less public funding</i>					
Ausable Bayfield	\$ 2.32	\$ 2.86	\$ 3.83	\$ 4.81	\$ 4.78
Central Lake Ontario	\$ -	\$ 2.71 (6.62*0.41)	\$ 7.45 (11.83*0.63)	\$ 5.19 (5.66*0.47)	\$ 2.73 (5.37*0.51)
Essex Region	\$ -	\$ 3.91	\$ 2.75	\$ 3.41	\$ 4.15
Grey Sauble	\$ 1.58	\$ 1.92	\$ 2.16	\$ 2.11	\$ 1.47
Lower Trent	\$ 2.35	\$ 1.99	\$ 2.64	\$ 2.79	\$ 3.65
Saugeen Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.87	\$ 1.09	\$ 1.13
St. Clair	\$ 1.76 (3.91*0.45)	\$ 1.98 (4.22*0.47)	\$ 2.09 (3.97*0.51)	\$ 3.02 (6.17*0.47)	\$ 2.26 (5.02*0.45)
Ganaraksa Region	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1.36 (2.83*0.48)	\$ 1.32 (2.87*0.46)	\$ 1.14 (2.78*0.41)
Halton	\$ 9.40 (17.1*0.65)	\$ 12.74 (20.23*0.63)	\$ 10.66 (18.57*0.58)	\$ 11.55 (20.26*0.57)	\$ 12.40 (20.67*0.6)
Kettle Creek	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.75 (1.73*0.43)	\$ 0.81 (1.79*0.45)
Long Point Region	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2.46	\$ 2.26
Niagara Peninsula	\$ 1.60	\$ 2.38	\$ 2.05	\$ 1.80	\$ 1.80
Nottawasaga Valley	\$ 1.13 (3.07*0.37)	\$ 1.01 (3.16*0.27)	\$ 0.97 (3.6*0.27)	\$ 0.94 (3.76*0.25)	\$ 1.10
Toronto and Region	\$ 48.84	\$ 35.13	\$ 33.48	\$ 40.04	\$ 40.16
Grand River	\$ 12.81	\$ 11.42	\$ 12.16	\$ 13.16	\$ 15.01
Lake Simcoe Region	\$ 3.65	\$ 2.53	\$ 2.18	\$ 2.16	\$ 2.29
Lower Thames Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.02
Nickel District	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1.04
Rideau Valley	\$ 2.50	\$ 1.90	\$ 2.18	\$ 2.15	\$ 2.92
South Nation	\$ 2.50	\$ -	\$ 2.82	\$ -	\$ 2.40
Upper Thames River	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.58
<i>Quebec</i>					
Nature Quebec	\$ 0.84	\$ 0.76	\$ 0.71	\$ 0.85	\$ 0.82
Ecology Action Centre	\$ -	\$ 0.28	\$ 0.31	\$ 0.35	\$ 0.37
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$ 275.85</b>	<b>\$ 270.79</b>	<b>\$ 417.85</b>	<b>\$ 405.00</b>	<b>\$ 338.96</b>

**ii. Academia:**<sup>22 23</sup>

Canada's universities and colleges also provide valuable resources that support the objectives of the CBD, both through research and through undergraduate and graduate education. Unfortunately, in regards to research limited data exists on amounts of expenditures specific to biodiversity and related sectors. As a result, no data has been included in this study for this area.

In regards to expenditures on biodiversity-related undergraduate and graduate education, Statistics Canada provides data for enrolment numbers in Canadian universities disaggregated by instructional programs. Two categories were identified that directly relate to the objectives of the CBD: "Agriculture, natural resources and conservation" and "Physical and life sciences and technologies". The number of students enrolled in each category was multiplied by the average tuition paid by Canadian students. Of note, this tuition does not include public funds provided by governments to support these programs, but come directly from private contributions of students and their families.

The category of "Physical and life sciences and technologies" would seem to encompass much more than biodiversity-related fields. As a result, only 25% of its value has been included. The category of "Agriculture, natural resources and conservation" would seem to mostly include biodiversity-related fields, with the exception of training in conventional agriculture. As a result, 90% of its value has been included.

*Agriculture, natural resources and conservation*

	Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
Undergraduate level	8823	8880	9378	8553	
Average Tuition	\$ 4,064.00	\$ 4,366.00	\$ 4,697.00	\$ 4,803.00	\$ 5,023.00
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 35,856,672.00</b>	<b>\$ 38,770,080.00</b>	<b>\$ 44,048,466.00</b>	<b>\$ 41,080,059.00</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
Graduate level	3087	3168	3222	3264	
Average Tuition	\$ 2,830.00	\$ 3,873.00	\$ 3,921.00	\$ 4,535.00	\$ 4,821.00
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 8,736,210.00</b>	<b>\$ 12,269,664.00</b>	<b>\$ 12,633,462.00</b>	<b>\$ 14,802,240.00</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>(90%)</b>	<b>\$ 40,133,593.80</b>	<b>\$ 45,935,769.60</b>	<b>\$ 51,013,735.20</b>	<b>\$ 50,294,069.10</b>	<b>\$ 47,602,028.02</b>

*Physical and life sciences and technologies*

	Millions of CAN\$ Annual (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
Undergraduate level	63666	63261	63939	60741	
Average Tuition	\$ 4,534.00	\$ 4,679.00	\$ 4,885.00	\$ 5,049.00	\$ 5,247.00
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 288,661,644.00</b>	<b>\$ 295,998,219.00</b>	<b>\$ 312,342,015.00</b>	<b>\$ 306,681,309.00</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
Graduate level	13719	14262	14493	14550	
Average Tuition	\$ 4,104.00	\$ 4,067.00	\$ 4,437.00	\$ 4,635.00	\$ 5,477.00
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 56,302,776.00</b>	<b>\$ 58,003,554.00</b>	<b>\$ 64,305,441.00</b>	<b>\$ 67,439,250.00</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>(25%)</b>	<b>\$ 86,241,105.00</b>	<b>\$ 88,500,443.25</b>	<b>\$ 94,161,864.00</b>	<b>\$ 93,530,139.75</b>	<b>\$ 93,896,881.81</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 126,374,698.80</b>	<b>\$ 134,436,212.85</b>	<b>\$ 145,175,599.20</b>	<b>\$ 143,824,208.85</b>	<b>\$ 141,498,909.83</b>

**(n) International financial institutions:**

All relevant Canadian contributions to international financial institutions have been included under (a) Official Development Assistance.

**(o) United Nations organizations, funds and programmes:**

All relevant Canadian contributions to United Nations organizations, funds and programmes have been included under (a) Official Development Assistance.

**(p) Non-ODA public funding:**

N/A

**(q) South-South cooperation initiatives:**

N/A

**(r) Technical cooperation.**

All relevant Canadian contributions to technical cooperation have either been included under (a) Official Development Assistance or (b) Domestic Budgets.

**Consolidated annual Canadian financial flows for achieving the CBD's three objectives**

	Millions of CAN\$ (current prices)				
	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
<b>Official Development Assistance (ODA)</b>	<b>\$ 53.35</b>	<b>\$ 66.70</b>	<b>\$ 73.80</b>	<b>\$ 85.06</b>	<b>\$ 136.93</b>
<b>Government of Canada</b>	<b>\$ 45.61</b>	<b>\$ 42.72</b>	<b>\$ 46.94</b>	<b>\$ 62.46</b>	<b>\$ 95.00</b>
<i>CIDA, IDRC, Environment Canada</i>	\$ 28.64	\$ 25.80	\$ 26.02	\$ 41.15	\$ 73.22
<i>Finance Canada</i>	\$ 16.97	\$ 16.92	\$ 20.43	\$ 20.90	\$ 21.28
<i>Parks Canada</i>	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0.49	\$ 0.41	\$ 0.50
<b>International Financial Institutions &amp; UN</b>	<b>\$ 7.74</b>	<b>\$ 23.98</b>	<b>\$ 26.85</b>	<b>\$ 22.59</b>	<b>\$ 41.94</b>
<i>Global Environment Facility</i>	\$ 0	\$ 13.42	\$ 18.12	\$ 15.49	\$ 22.35
<i>FAO</i>	\$ 4.53	\$ 7.13	\$ 5.38	\$ 3.92	\$ 16.61
<i>UNDP</i>	\$ 2.60	\$ 2.82	\$ 2.73	\$ 2.52	\$ 2.31
<i>UNESCO</i>	\$ 0.61	\$ 0.61	\$ 0.62	\$ 0.67	\$ 0.67
<b>Domestic public budgets at all levels</b>	<b>\$ 6,986.65</b>	<b>\$ 7,823.76</b>	<b>\$ 7,951.53</b>	<b>\$ 7,959.74</b>	<b>\$ 8,184.20</b>
<i>Federal</i>	\$ 2,149.67	\$ 2,447.47	\$ 2,442.05	\$ 2,036.29	\$ 2,220.74
<i>Provincial</i>	\$ 2,315.98	\$ 2,696.85	\$ 2,595.88	\$ 2,808.11	\$ 2,651.81
<i>Local governments</i>	\$ 2,521.00	\$ 2,679.45	\$ 2,913.60	\$ 3,115.35	\$ 3,311.65
<b>Private sector</b>	<b>\$ 1,012.94</b>	<b>\$ 914.10</b>	<b>\$ 810.23</b>	<b>\$ 736.50</b>	<b>\$ 677.88</b>
<i>Business expenditures</i>	\$ 437.75	\$ 339.95	\$ 242.15	\$ 182.71	\$ 135.89
<i>User fees (parks fees, licenses)</i>	\$ 575.19	\$ 574.15	\$ 568.08	\$ 553.79	\$ 541.99
<b>NGOs, foundations, and academia</b>	<b>\$ 402.22</b>	<b>\$ 405.23</b>	<b>\$ 563.02</b>	<b>\$ 548.83</b>	<b>\$ 480.45</b>
<i>Non-governmental organizations, foundations</i>	\$ 275.85	\$ 270.79	\$ 417.85	\$ 405.00	\$ 338.96
<i>Academia</i>	\$ 126.37	\$ 134.44	\$ 145.18	\$ 143.82	\$ 141.50
International financial institutions (non-ODA)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UN orgs., funds and programmes (non-ODA)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-ODA public funding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
South-South cooperation initiatives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Technical cooperation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 8,455.16</b>	<b>\$ 9,209.79</b>	<b>\$ 9,398.58</b>	<b>\$ 9,330.13</b>	<b>\$ 9,479.47</b>

**18. Number of countries that have: (a) Assessed values of biodiversity, in accordance with the Convention; (b) Identified and reported funding needs, gaps and priorities; (c) Developed national financial plans for biodiversity; (d) Been provided with the necessary funding and capacity-building to undertake the above activities:**

Not applicable – indicator intended for developing countries. However, the Value of Nature to Canadians Study is one of six priority initiatives being advanced through a Federal-Provincial-Territorial partnership, as part of Canada's participation in the 2010 International Year of Biodiversity. The study's purpose is to identify the social, cultural, and economic values of biodiversity and ecosystem services to Canada, in support of government policy and decision making, and public awareness initiatives. The Study considers benefits of wilderness, wildlife, rural landscapes and species and urban nature, among others. It is expected that this Study will be completed in 2013.

**19. Aggregated estimate of annual Canadian biodiversity-related financial flows:**

It is estimated that annual Canadian financial flows related to the objectives of the CBD are from \$8,455.16 million in FY 2006-2007 to \$9,479.47 in FY 2010-2011, with an annual average of \$9,174.63 million.

**20. Amount of domestic financial support, per annum, in respect of those domestic activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of this Convention:**

Canadian domestic sources contributed from \$8,401.81 in FY 2006-2007 to \$9,342.54 million in FY 2010-2011, with an annual average of \$9,091.46 million.

**21. Amount of funding provided through the Global Environment Facility and allocated to biodiversity focal area:**

As indicated above, Canada has provided from \$13.42 million in FY 2007-2008 to \$22.35 million in 2010-2011, with an annual average of \$17.35 million, to the GEF's biodiversity focal area.

**22. Level of CBD and Parties' support to other financial institutions that promote replication and scaling-up of relevant successful financial mechanisms and instruments:**

Not applicable

**23. Number of international financing institutions, United Nations organizations, funds and programmes, and the development agencies that report to the Development Assistance Committee of Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/DAC), with biodiversity and associated ecosystem services as a cross-cutting policy:**

Not applicable

**24. Number of Parties that integrate considerations on biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services in development plans, strategies and budgets:**

It is believed that this question is intended for developing country Parties. Not applicable. However, Canada can highlight that its recent Federal Sustainable Development Strategy has the objective of integrating government wide actions and results, linking sustainable

development planning and reporting to the Government's core expenditure planning reporting system, and providing effective measurement, monitoring and reporting tools to track and report on progress.

**25. Number of South-South cooperation initiatives conducted by developing country Parties and those that may be supported by other Parties and relevant partners, as a complement to necessary North-South cooperation:**

Not applicable

**26. Amount and number of South-South and North-South technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives that support biodiversity:**

Specific information was not available on the amount and number of North-South technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives supported by Canada. However, a portion of Canada's contribution to the GEF is used for these types of activities.

**27. Number of global initiatives that heighten awareness on the need for resource mobilization for biodiversity:**

Not applicable

**28. Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries to contribute to achieving the Convention's objectives:**

As indicated above, it can be estimated that Canada provides from \$53.35 in FY 2006-2007 to \$136.93 in FY 2010-2011, with an average of \$83.17 million annually to developing countries to achieve the Convention's objectives.

In addition to these estimates, which are directly applied to meeting the Convention's objectives, there are additional sources of financing that positively contribute to the Convention on Biological Diversity. These additional sources may have been allocated to an alternative primary initiative, such as climate change or health, and have biodiversity as a secondary or even tertiary goal. In an effort to avoid counting the same flows towards more than one initiative, we have not accounted for funds that do not have the objectives of the Convention as a primary objective. In effect, we have not accounted for co-benefits from other financial flows in reporting given the methodology supported within this document. While this approach helps to limit the risk of double counting, it also prevents a more accurate assessment of total funds contributed towards meeting the Convention's objectives from being realized.

**29. Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020:**

Not applicable – as Strategic Plan has just recently been negotiated.

**30. Resources mobilized from the removal, reform or phase-out of incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity, which could be used for the promotion of positive incentives, including but not limited to innovative financial mechanisms, that are consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations, taking into account national social and economic conditions:**

Canada does not currently monitor the amount of resources mobilized from the removal, reform or phase-out of incentives harmful to biodiversity. Information is not available.

**31. Number of initiatives, and respective amounts, supplementary to the financial mechanism established under Article 21, that engage Parties and relevant organizations in new and innovative financial mechanisms, which consider intrinsic values and all other values of biodiversity, in accordance with the objectives of the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization:**

Not known at present.

**32. Number of access and benefit-sharing initiatives and mechanisms, consistent with the Convention and, when in effect, with the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization, including awareness-raising, that enhance resource mobilization:**

Not applicable to Canada at present.

## Annex 1 – Official Development Assistance Supporting Biodiversity, by Sector

Recipient		Developing Countries, Total									
Flow		Official Development Assistance									
Amount type		Current prices (CAD millions)									
Flow type		Gross Disbursements									
Year		2006		2007		2008		2009		2010	
Donor	Sector		Biodiversity		Biodiversity		Biodiversity		Biodiversity		Biodiversity
Canada	<b>14015: Water resources protection</b>	0.3909	0.3909	-	-	0.1200	0.1200	2.2630	2.2630	3.6566	3.6566
	<b>310: III.1. Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Total</b>	116.1736	13.9300	143.0505	16.7440	161.7113	18.0600	178.4952	25.3948	575.4241	58.0101
	31110: Agricultural policy & admin. mgmt	39.0211	1.2561	45.2779	1.4575	56.3694	1.8146	30.8533	0.9932	66.8976	2.1535
	31120: Agricultural development	16.2368	0.6398	24.4586	0.9637	39.8949	1.5720	29.7361	1.1717	97.1650	3.8286
	31130: Agricultural land resources	1.1791	0.8459	1.7221	1.2355	0.7544	0.5412	13.2145	9.4805	22.7804	16.3434
	31140: Agricultural water resources	10.7647	1.5717	1.2489	0.1824	0.5992	0.0875	10.3787	1.5154	40.8904	5.9703
	31150: Agricultural inputs	2.8566	0.1721	6.5966	0.3974	4.8300	0.2909	8.6458	0.5208	27.1175	1.6335
	31161: Food crop production	5.5751	0.3279	10.6699	0.6276	9.3948	0.5526	15.7906	0.9287	67.8202	3.9889
	31162: Industrial crops/export crops	0.2113	-	0.2152	-	0.5377	-	1.0110	-	3.0228	-
	31163: Livestock	1.1692	0.0584	1.2703	0.0634	0.7718	0.0385	4.8695	0.2430	6.8251	0.3406
	31164: Agrarian reform	2.5784	2.5784	2.5471	2.5471	1.5311	1.5311	0.6339	0.6339	0.6177	0.6177
	31165: Agricultural alternative development	9.1794	0.6390	4.2801	0.2980	2.7454	0.1911	1.4748	0.1027	0.7172	0.0499
	31166: Agricultural extension	9.5165	0.9178	13.4753	1.2996	8.3423	0.8046	11.0454	1.0653	33.9180	3.2712
	31181: Agricultural education/training	3.2202	0.1889	11.8000	0.6922	14.0180	0.8223	7.8079	0.4580	13.2169	0.7753
	31182: Agricultural research	6.2076	0.5355	5.9090	0.5097	5.7165	0.4931	17.5273	1.5120	65.1587	5.6210
	31191: Agricultural services	2.4533	0.1541	3.1450	0.1975	2.9128	0.1829	5.1844	0.3256	30.6939	1.9277
	31192: Plant/post-harvest prot. & pest ctrl	0.0540	0.0062	0.2491	0.0286	0.3609	0.0415	0.3831	0.0440	3.3804	0.3886
	31193: Agricultural financial services	0.8460	0.0171	2.6737	0.0542	2.2510	0.0456	2.9979	0.0608	73.1300	0.4679
	31194: Agricultural co-operatives	0.2849	0.0098	0.6703	0.0230	0.9487	0.0326	4.7856	0.1644	6.8194	0.2343
	31195: Livestock/veterinary services	0.0350	-	0.1171	-	-	-	2.4759	-	1.5669	-
	31210: Forestry policy & admin. management	2.7346	2.0944	1.5701	1.2025	1.5480	1.1856	1.4177	1.0858	1.7915	1.3720
	31220: Forestry development	0.0540	0.0164	0.0690	0.0210	0.2460	0.0749	4.4101	1.3431	6.4300	1.9583
	31261: Fuelwood/charcoal	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0307	-	0.0011	-
	31281: Forestry education/training	0.1160	0.1071	1.1005	1.0158	0.5839	0.5390	0.6439	0.5944	0.9746	0.8996
	31282: Forestry research	0.7243	0.7627	0.6279	0.6403	1.4218	1.4056	0.6456	0.6446	0.6354	0.6354
	31291: Forestry services	0.1820	0.0056	0.1381	0.0043	0.0545	0.0017	0.0214	0.0007	..	-
	31310: Fishing policy and admin. management	0.5225	0.5502	1.9441	1.9827	0.4938	0.4881	0.5731	0.5722	0.5735	0.5735
	31320: Fishery development	0.4509	0.4748	1.2746	1.2999	5.0524	4.9946	1.2084	1.2065	2.1896	2.1896
	31381: Fishery education/training	-	-	-	-	0.3321	0.3283	0.5784	0.5775	0.6068	0.6068
	31382: Fishery research	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1236	0.1163
	31391: Fishery services	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1501	0.1499	0.3599	0.3599
	<b>41010: Environmental policy and admin. mgmt</b>	20.9396	5.7617	17.9284	4.9332	16.2338	4.4669	73.9095	6.6193	22.3591	6.1523
	<b>41020: Biosphere protection</b>	2.2483	2.2483	0.1170	0.1170	0.2708	0.2708	1.9256	1.9256	0.9252	0.9252
	<b>41030: Bio-diversity</b>	1.8586	1.8586	0.9936	0.9936	0.6506	0.6506	1.1105	1.1105	2.2004	2.2004
	<b>41040: Site preservation</b>	0.9394	0.9394	0.2326	0.2326	0.7746	0.7746	0.4435	0.4435	0.0158	0.0158
	<b>41050: Flood prevention/control</b>	0.5509	0.5509	0.7852	0.7852	0.2030	0.2030	0.6124	0.6124	0.2169	0.2169
	<b>41081: Environmental education/training</b>	9.2608	2.6338	5.8666	1.6684	4.0656	1.1562	7.5308	2.1418	5.6316	1.6016
	<b>41082: Environmental research</b>	1.2024	0.3262	1.2129	0.3291	1.1843	0.3213	2.3579	0.6397	1.6260	0.4411
		<b>153.5646</b>	<b>28.6399</b>	<b>170.1867</b>	<b>25.8030</b>	<b>185.2138</b>	<b>26.0233</b>	<b>268.6486</b>	<b>41.1506</b>	<b>612.0557</b>	<b>73.2201</b>

/...

In order to minimize the environmental impacts of the Secretariat's processes, and to contribute to the Secretary-General's initiative for a C-Neutral UN, this document is printed in limited numbers. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

UNITED KINGDOM, RECEIVED ON 26 JULY 2012

**UNITED KINGDOM**

**Submission to the CBD notification (2012-023) on Methodological and Implementation Guidance for the “Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Convention’s Strategy for Resources Mobilization”**

<b>Country:</b> United Kingdom	<b>Name of respondent:</b> Sarah Nelson
<b>Please Indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focal point for resource mobilisation <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify
<b>Title and Department of respondent:</b>	International Biodiversity Policy Unit
<b>Organisation of respondent:</b>	Department of Environment, Farming and Rural Affairs
<b>Email address:</b>	Sarah.Nelson@defra.gsi.gov.uk
<b>Telephone contact:</b>	+44 (0)2072386733
<b>Date of completion and submission of completed framework</b>	27/07/2012

**1. Information on International Flows of Financial resources**

Year 2006		Category A		Total		Currency and year used	
Type of Financial flows		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Currency	Year
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1 Bilateral			0			
	1.1.2 Multilateral			0			
1.2. Other public funds		52	Medium	52		GBP £m current	FY
1.3. Private/market		0		0			
1.4. Not for profit organisations				0			
<b>Total</b>		52		52			

Year 2007		Category A		Total		Currency and year used	
Type of Financial flows		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Currency	Year
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1 Bilateral						
	1.1.2 Multilateral	1	High	1		CBP £m current	CY
1.2. Other public funds		50	Medium	50		GBP £m current	FY
1.3. Private/market							
1.4. Not for profit organisations							
<b>Total</b>		51		51			
Year 2008		Category A		Total		Currency and year used	
Type of Financial flows		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Currency	Year
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1 Bilateral						
	1.1.2 Multilateral	5	High	5		GBP £m current	CY
1.2. Other public funds		54	Medium	54		GBP £m current	CY
1.3. Private/market							
1.4. Not for profit organisations							
<b>Total</b>		59		59		GBP £m current	

Year 2009		Category A		Total		Currency and year used	
Type of Financial flows		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Currency	Year
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1 Bilateral						
	1.1.2 Multilateral	165	High	165		GBP £m current	CY
1.2. Other public funds		54	Medium	54		GBP £m current	FY
1.3. Private/market							
1.4. Not for profit organisations							
<b>Total</b>		219		219		GBP £m current	



2.1 Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	409	Medium	9	Medium	418		GBP £m current	FY
	2.1.2 State/Provincial					0			
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	11	Low			11		GBP £m current	FY
2.2 Private / Market		50	Low			50		GBP £m current	CY
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)						0			
<b>TOTAL:</b>		470	0	9	0	479			

Year: 2007		Category A		Category B		Total		Currency and year used	
Source		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Currency	Year
2.1 Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	437	Medium	7	Medium	444		GBP £m current	FY
	2.1.2 State/Provincial					0			
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	11	Low			11		GBP £m current	FY
2.2 Private / Market		47	Low			47		GBP £m current	CY
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)						0			
<b>TOTAL:</b>		495	0	7	0	502			

Year: 2008		Category A		Category B		Total		Currency and year used	
Source		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Currency	Year
2.1 Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	457	Medium	7	Medium	464		GBP £m current	FY
	2.1.2 State/Provincial					0			
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	11	Low			11		GBP £m current	FY
2.2 Private / Market		157	Low			157		GBP £m	CY

							current	
<b>2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)</b>						0		
<b>TOTAL:</b>	625	0	7	0	632			

Year: 2009		Category A		Category B		Total		Currency and year used	
Source		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Currency	Year
<b>2.1 Government budgets</b>	<b>2.1.1 Central</b>	454	Medium	7	Medium	461		GBP £m current	FY
	<b>2.1.2 State/Provincial</b>					0			
	<b>2.1.3 Local/Municipal</b>	12	Low			12		GBP £m current	FY
<b>2.2 Private / Market</b>		172	Low			172		GBP £m current	CY
<b>2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)</b>						0			
<b>TOTAL:</b>		638	0	7	0	645			

Year: 2010		Category A		Category B		Total		Currency and year used	
Source		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Currency	Year
<b>2.1 Government budgets</b>	<b>2.1.1 Central</b>	443	Medium	4	Medium	447		GBP £m current	FY
	<b>2.1.2 State/Provincial</b>					0			
	<b>2.1.3 Local/Municipal</b>	12	Low			12		GBP £m current	FY
<b>2.2 Private / Market</b>		115	Low			115		GBP £m current	CY
<b>2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)</b>						0			
<b>TOTAL:</b>		570	0	4	0	574			

2.1. Central Government estimates based on data provided by Government Departments, but in some cases using expert judgement to identify share allocated to biodiversity. They are published as part of the UK Biodiversity Indicators: <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4251>

All central Government spend is allocated to Category A, apart from Defra research. Local Government spend, also allocated to Category A, is based on an early estimate, uprated for inflation, hence confidence is lower.

Administration costs are excluded from all categories, but could be estimated in some cases.

Category C amounts are not included within the definition of environmental expenditure on biodiversity, as they would be double-counted with other environmentally-related expenditures.

They could be estimated for some sectors, e.g. spending on agri-environment schemes not allocated to biodiversity could be assumed to be within this category.

Category D amounts could also be estimated but would require a new survey. It is doubtful how much of this spend could really be viewed as supporting biodiversity objectives.

2.2. Category A based on estimates of spending by mining, manufacturing and construction industries, but including spending on landscape. Source Defra UK Environment Protection Expenditure Survey 2006-2010. Table 2

<http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/environment/environmental-survey/survey-results/> total of operational and capital expenditure on “biodiversity”.

No split between domestic activities and overseas, is assumed to be wholly domestic. Confidence is low, as based on small sample.

No information on other sectors. It might be possible to estimate some household spending, e.g. on wild bird foods, nest boxes, for Category A. More research would be needed to identify spending on other categories.

2.3. No current estimate of NGO spending - a survey of Wildlife Trusts was carried out in 2005 but has not been updated.. Double counting would be problematic.

### **3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilisation**

Steps		Year Initiated/Completed	Description of support received for the step	Results achieved (if applicable)
<b>3.1 Assessment of Values of Biodiversity</b>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2009/2011		
<b>3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities</b>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>			
<b>3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity</b>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>			

<p><b>3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies</b></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>			
<p><b>3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets</b></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>			

**Comments:**

**3.1 The UK National Ecosystem Assessment (UK NEA) – Understanding nature’s value to society**

- Cost: £2 million
- Funded by the UK Department of Environment, Farming and Rural Affairs
- Objectives
  - *To produce an independent and peer-reviewed UK National Ecosystem Assessment for the whole of the UK.*
  - *To raise awareness of the importance of the natural environment to human well-being and economic prosperity.*
  - *To ensure full stakeholder participation and encourage different stakeholders and communities to interact and, in particular, to foster better inter-disciplinary cooperation between natural and social scientists, as well as economists.*
- Using an Ecosystem Assessment Process the UK NEA has:
  - **Assessed the status and trends** of the UK’s ecosystems and the services they provide at multiple spatial scales from country to catchment levels;
  - **Described the key factors (drivers of change)** affecting the UK’s ecosystems, including changes in land-use, infrastructure development, pollution and climate change;
  - **Included plausible futures (scenarios)** for the UK’s ecosystems and the services they provide;
  - **Outlined societal response options** to secure continued delivery of the UK’s ecosystem services, for all of society; and
  - **Valued the contribution of ecosystem services to human well-being** through economic and non-economic analyses.
- Results of the assessment can be found here: <http://uknea.unep-wcmc.org/Resources/tabid/82/Default.aspx>
- Provides a comprehensive overview of the state of the natural environment in the UK and a new way of estimating our national wealth. It shows how we have under-valued our natural resources. Valuing them properly will enable better decision making, more certain investment, new avenues to wealth creation and jobs, and greater human well-being in changing times ahead.

**3.2**

### 3.3

**3.4** The Natural Environment White Paper, published in June 2011 is a bold and ambitious statement outlining the UK Government's vision for the natural environment over the next 50 years, backed up with practical action to deliver that ambition.

It can be found here: <http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/natural/whitepaper/>

The White Paper sets out four ambitions:

- Protecting and improving our natural environment
- Growing a green economy
- Reconnecting people and nature
- International and EU leadership

Examples of actions being taken by the UK Government which consider biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies:

#### **Natural Capital Committee**

- We will establish an independent Natural Capital Committee to advise the Government on the state of natural capital in England and to place the value of England's natural capital at the heart of our economic thinking and how we measure economic progress nationally.
  - Firstly, it will provide advice on when, where and how natural assets are being used unsustainably.
  - Secondly, it will advise the Government on how it should prioritise action to protect and improve natural capital, so that public and private activity is focused where it will have greatest impact on improving wellbeing in our society.
  - Finally, it will advise the Government on research priorities to improve future advice and decisions on protecting and enhancing natural capital.

#### **Pilot Biodiversity Offsets**

- Establish a new and voluntary approach to biodiversity offsets and test the approach in pilot areas
- They are intended to make requirements to reduce the impacts of development on biodiversity simpler and more consistent
- They are defined as "conservation activities designed to deliver biodiversity benefits in compensation for losses in a measurable way.
- Good developments incorporate biodiversity considerations in their design but are still likely to result in some biodiversity loss. One way to compensate for this loss is by offsetting: the developer secures compensatory habitat expansion or restoration elsewhere."

#### **Ecosystem Market task force**

- Set up a business-led Ecosystem Markets Task Force to review the opportunities for UK business from expanding the trade in green goods and the market for sustainable natural services.
- It will then report back to the government in 2012/2013 through the Green Economy Council.

**Supplementary guidance to the HM Treasury’s Green Book**

- It will be used by all Government departments on valuing the natural environment in appraisals

Note - Following the establishment of devolved governments in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland in 1998, responsibility for environmental legislation and the implementation of Biodiversity Action Plans is now at the country level. The distinctive elements of biodiversity in each of the four countries of the UK are able to be considered both independently and in collaboration with neighbouring countries. This allows for conservation approaches to be tailored to the varying conditions within different areas of the UK. Similar strategies and approaches are being developed in the other component parts of the United Kingdom, links to which are available here:

<http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-5701>

**3.5 See the National White Paper**

The United Kingdom is willing to put natural capital at the heart of government accounting. We will work with the Office for National Statistics to fully include natural capital in the UK Environmental Accounts, with early changes by 2013. In 2012 we will publish a roadmap for further improvements up to 2020. It is committed to putting the value of natural capital at the heart of our economic thinking, and the way we measure economic progress nationally. Understanding that such action will be a catalyst for wider change, and put us on a course for a greener economy, with benefits for all.

The Natural Capital Committee will play a key role in advising the UK Government on the state of English natural capital.

**4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability**

**4.1 *Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation***

Type of Initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
<b>4.1.1 North-South Technical cooperation and capacity building provided</b>		Current amount of funding is £7 million per annum	High	<b>The Darwin Initiative</b> The Darwin Initiative assists countries that are rich in biodiversity but poor in financial resources to meet their objectives under one or more of the three major biodiversity Conventions: the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES); and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory

				<p>Species of Wild Animals (CMS), through the funding of collaborative projects which draw on UK biodiversity expertise</p> <p>Between 1993 and March 2010 – The Darwin Initiative invested over £79 million across 689 projects over 17 main funding rounds.</p>
				<p><b>The Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation Programme</b></p> <p>ESPA is a seven year, £40.5 million interdisciplinary research programme funded through a partnership between the Department for International Development (DFID), the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC).</p> <p>The Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation (ESPA) research programme aims to deliver high-quality, cutting-edge research that will improve our understanding of the way ecosystems function, the services they provide and their relationship with the political economy and sustainable growth. The research will provide the evidence and tools decision-makers need to manage ecosystems sustainably and in a way that contributes to poverty reduction.</p> <p>ESPA's goal is to ensure that, in developing countries, ecosystems are being managed in a way that contributes to poverty reduction and inclusive and sustainable growth.</p>
<b>4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation &amp; capacity building</b>				

<b>through triangular cooperation</b>				
<b>Comments:</b> <b>4.1.2</b> See <a href="http://darwin.defra.gov.uk/">http://darwin.defra.gov.uk/</a> for further information on the Darwin Initiative with specific case studies and the annual reports. See also <a href="http://www.espa.ac.uk/">http://www.espa.ac.uk/</a> for further information on the Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation Programme				

**4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies**

Year:

Currency: £GBP

Incentives	Value	Description
<b>4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased out</b>	-	The UK's work to address perverse incentives that adversely affect biodiversity includes initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At the <b>national level</b> – on issues such as water pricing and energy incentives                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ At the national level, the reform of the water abstraction licensing system has been identified as a major priority in England and Wales. The government is working to reform the system, while making short term changes designed to improve the efficiency of addressing its current adverse impacts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ At the <b>EU level</b> – where the UK continues to advocate further reform of major subsidy programmes such as the Common Agricultural and Common Fisheries Policy.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The UK has undertaken research into the impacts of the CAP and CFP on biodiversity and the environment, and on alternative future policy options.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>4.2.2. Positive incentives introduced</b>	<b>£560 million in 2009/10</b>	UK positive incentive measures for biodiversity include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The <b>agri-environment programme</b>, which provides resources for habitat management, restoration and re-creation on a large scale;</li> <li>▪ <b>Grants and incentives for woodland</b> creation, restoration and maintenance;</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Cross compliance measures</b>, requiring farmers to achieve basic environmental standards as a condition for receipt of direct payments under the CAP;</li> <li>▪ A series of <b>funding programmes focused on biodiversity</b>, such as Nature Improvement Areas (England), Biodiversity Action Grant Scheme and Natural Project Grants (Scotland), the Wildlife, Geology, Landscapes and Seascape Grant Pillar (Wales) and Natural Heritage Grants (Northern Ireland);</li> <li>▪ A range of grants and incentive measures designed to improve management of the <b>water environment</b> (see Case Study 1 Evidence 1);</li> <li>▪ Requirements to implement <b>action to compensate for biodiversity loss</b>, including compensatory measures required by the planning system, piloting of biodiversity offsets, and UK implementation of EU environmental liability legislation;</li> <li>▪ <b>International incentive programmes</b>, such as UK support for REDD+, the Overseas Territories Environment Programme, the Darwin Initiative, the Flagship Species Fund and the UK Implementation of Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing;</li> <li>▪ <b>National Lottery funding</b> for biodiversity projects, especially through the Heritage Lottery Fund;</li> <li>▪ Defra <b>research to inform the development of Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)</b> schemes and other positive incentives;</li> </ul>
<p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>The UK Department for Environment, Farming and Rural Affairs commissioned GHK Consulting Ltd (GHK) in collaboration with the Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP) to review the review current and planned policy in the UK that addresses Decision X/44 on Incentive Measures for Biodiversity of the Convention on Biological Diversity and to develop guidance and recommendations for future policy in this area.</p> <p>Please see <b>Incentive Measures and Biodiversity – A Rapid Review and Guidance Development (Volumes 1-3)</b>, for a more detailed breakdown of information and initiatives that are relevant.</p> <p>The reports can be found here:  <a href="http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&amp;Module=More&amp;Location=None&amp;Completed=0&amp;ProjectID=18003">http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&amp;Module=More&amp;Location=None&amp;Completed=0&amp;ProjectID=18003</a></p>		

#### 4.3 New and Innovative financial mechanism

Type of Initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and	Description
--------------------	--------	-----------------------	-------------

		all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	
<p><b>Payment for Ecosystem Services Pilots</b></p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>In recent years UK government has sought to recognise a greater number of mechanisms that can better recognise the value of ecosystem services, services which contribute to our well being and economic prosperity – Payment for ecosystem services (PES) represents one such approach.</p> <p>Payments for ecosystem services (PES) can be essentially defined as payments to compensate for actions undertaken to increase the levels of desired ecosystem services. PES is a market-based approach linking those involved in ‘supplying’ ecosystem services more closely to the ‘beneficiaries’ of ecosystem services, potentially in cost effective ways and making use of new streams of finance.</p> <p>At the current moment in time the UK government is exploring in more depth how PES can be used to achieve environmental objectives by reviewing existing theory and analysis in this area and considering its application to the domestic context in England. This will help develop our thinking, identify key opportunities and challenges, and consider the role of</p>

			government and other key stakeholders.
<b>Ecosystem Market Taskforce</b>	-	-	The Natural Environment White Paper announced that the Government would set up a business-led Ecosystem Markets Task Force to review the opportunities for UK business from expanding green goods, services, products, investment vehicles and markets which value and protect nature's services. It will report back to Government in 2012/13 through the Green Economy Council.
<b>Biodiversity offsetting pilots</b>	-	-	Biodiversity offsets are conservation activities designed to deliver biodiversity benefits in compensation for losses, in a measurable way. The UK Government thinks that biodiversity offsetting has the potential to deliver planning policy requirements for compensation for biodiversity loss in a more effective way. As of April 2012 the biodiversity offsetting pilots have started and will run for 2 years. The UK government will be working with 6 pilot areas to test the biodiversity offsetting approach. The pilots will develop a body of information and evidence that the Government will use to decide whether to support greater use of biodiversity in England, and if so, how

			to use it most effectively.
<p><b>Comments:</b>                  As of yet the initiatives listed above are still being explored and are in pilot phases or more information is being collected for them – hence why amounts are not listed as they negligible/</p> <p>On <b>Payment for ecosystem services (PES)</b> see the Department for Environment, Farming and Rural Affairs paper:  <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/publications/2011/10/13/eco-system-payment-pb13658/">http://www.defra.gov.uk/publications/2011/10/13/eco-system-payment-pb13658/</a>                  As well as other several reports providing an analytical background and evidence for PES schemes:  <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/natural/ecosystems-services/">http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/natural/ecosystems-services/</a></p> <p>On <b>Ecosystem Market Taskforce</b> see the website: <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/ecosystem-markets/">http://www.defra.gov.uk/ecosystem-markets/</a>                  On the 14<sup>th</sup> June a report ‘Opportunities for UK business that value and/or protect nature’s services’ was published, commissioned by the Valuing Nature Network for the Ecosystem Markets Taskforce. The report outlines the business case for valuing and protecting nature’s services. It highlights a series of drivers that are leading businesses to increasingly consider and manage impacts on ecosystems and to look for business opportunities while they do so. The findings will support the Task Force’s work on opportunities for UK businesses from valuing and protecting nature.  <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/ecosystem-markets/2012/06/27/vnn-report-published270612/">http://www.defra.gov.uk/ecosystem-markets/2012/06/27/vnn-report-published270612/</a></p> <p>On <b>Biodiversity Offsetting Pilots</b> and more information on the 6 pilot areas see:  <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/natural/biodiversity/uk/offsetting/pilots/">http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/natural/biodiversity/uk/offsetting/pilots/</a></p>			

**4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention**

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilisation is enhanced)
<p><b>1. The Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund (NPIF)</b></p> <p>The UK contributed US\$0.5M to the fund in 2012.</p>	<p>The Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund (NPIF) is a multi-donor trust fund that can receive voluntary contributions of multiple governments and the private sector. The NPIF supports signatory countries and those in the process of signing the Nagoya Protocol, and that intend to ratify the Protocol in order to accelerate the ratification and implementation of the Protocol. The Fund supports, among others, existing opportunities leading to development and implementation of concrete ABS agreements with involvement of the private sectors. The projects funded under the NPIF encourages the engagement with private sector entities interested in exploring the economic potential of genetic resources and facilitate the transfer of appropriate technologies. Through the implementation of this type of projects, countries should be generating additional information that can help to understand their capacities and needs on ABS, with focus on the provisions from existing policies, laws, and regulations affecting genetic resources.</p>
<p><b>2. Domestic preparations for implementation of the Nagoya Protocol</b></p>	<p>An initial study considering implementation approaches for the UK to be able to ratify the Nagoya Protocol has been undertaken.</p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>	

## 5. Activity Classification

	Activity Classification			
Default Description	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D
	<p>Activities where biodiversity protection is the main purpose, such as activities funded by environmental agencies that directly and intentionally impact biodiversity. Activities related to Articles 6-9</p>	<p>Activities related to policy development and administration carried out in part or entirely by Environmental agencies Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20</p>	<p>Activities related to sustainable use and sustainable management that have co-benefits for biodiversity. Activities under this category would generally be lead by agencies outside of the</p>	<p>Activities related to sustainable production and consumption where the responsibility lies with multiple government entities, the private sector and the general public. Activities related to Articles 11 and</p>

	and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan.	of the Strategic Plan.	environmental sector Activities related to Articles 8, 10 and 11 of the Convention as well Targets 5-8, 10, 14 and 15 of the Strategic Plan.	12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 1-4 of the Strategic Plan.
<b>Activities Considered</b>	<p><b>Safeguarding biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in situ/ex situ conservation</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protected areas</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maintaining genetic diversity</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats from invasive alien species</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats to specific ecosystems and/or species</li> </ul>	<p><b>Biodiversity Planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NBASP development</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CHM related activities</li> </ul> <p><b>Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ABS frameworks</li> </ul> <p><b>Biosafety</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biosafety frameworks</li> </ul>	<p><b>Sustainable management of ecosystems</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries, etc)</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to conserve water and prevent pollution</li> </ul> <p><b>Land use and climate related activities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Managing land use to protect biodiversity, mitigate climate change and increase resilience</li> </ul>	<p><b>Measures in the wider economy and society</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning, fiscal and regularity measures to promote sustainable consumption and production</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Broad scale public awareness and education measures.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional Activities</b>	-	-	-	-

**COSTA RICA, RECEIVED ON 27 AUGUST 2012**

Respecto al “Marco preliminar de presentación de informes” aportado por la Secretaría, me permito hacer las siguientes observaciones:

- a- Los fondos sobre corrientes internacionales se encuentran dispersos entre varios actores tales como instituciones gubernamentales, sector privado y organizaciones no gubernamentales. En el caso de información de recursos de sectores productivos y organizaciones no gubernamentales su acceso podría estar limitado ya que son recursos privados.

En el cuadro resumen de corrientes internacionales, solamente se esta incluyendo información del año 2011 del Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación. Sin embargo, se adjuntan digitalmente los siguientes documentos que pueden contextualizar las corrientes internacionales: Agenda Sectorial de Cooperación Internacional 2007-2010, Comportamiento de la cooperación internacional en Costa Rica 2006-2008, Resumen y caracterización de principales fuentes de cooperación internacional para Costa Rica 2010 y el Manual de Cooperación Técnica entre países en Desarrollo y Triangulación. Se continuara completando y detallando mas la información para hacerla llegar a la Secretaria.

- b- Los presupuestos nacionales de Costa Rica no coinciden directamente con las categorías de las actividades del marco propuesto por la Secretaría eso dificulta la integración de la información. Por ello, en el apartado sobre disponibilidad de recursos financieros del país, se incluyen solamente datos del Ministerio de Ambiente y Energía, sin embargo, es un hecho que otras instituciones

gubernamentales tienen en sus presupuestos recursos dirigidos hacia las categorías de actividades establecidas en el cuadro facilitado por la Secretaria, pero la integración de dicha información también requiere de recursos logísticos y humanos.

Vale la pena resaltar que solo se incluyen los presupuestos ordinarios, no los presupuestos extraordinarios lo que disminuye el nivel de confianza de la información del cuadro.

- c- No se presenta información en lo referente a los puntos 4.1 y 4.2 ya que las fuentes están dispersas, sin embargo Costa Rica continuara haciendo esfuerzos por hacer llegar información a la Secretaria en el mes de setiembre para que sea incorporada en Adendum. Así mismo, se iniciaran las gestiones pertinentes para el nombramiento del Punto Focal en Movilización de Recursos de acuerdo a lo dispuesto en la Decisión X/3.

INFORME PRELIMINAR DE PAIS  
MOVILIZACION DE RECURSOS  
CONVENIO SOBRE DIVERSIDAD BIOLOGICA

**1. Información sobre corrientes internacionales de recursos financieros (Sistema Nacional de Areas de Conservación)**

El Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación es un sistema de gestión y coordinación institucional, desconcentrado y participativo que integra las competencias del Estado costarricense en materia forestal, vida silvestre y áreas silvestres protegidas, así mismo vela por lo relativo al recurso hídrico, es un ente desconcentrado del MINAET. Por la premura de este informe y la disponibilidad de información, solamente se adjunta en el cuadro lo relativo a corrientes internacionales de recursos financieros del SINAC en el año 2011.

Año: 2011		Moneda: dólares						Total	
		Categoría de actividades							
		Categoría A: Protección de div. biológica		Categoría B: Elaboración de políticas y administración		Categoría C: Uso y gestión sostenibles		Categoría D: Producción y consumo sostenibles	
		Monto	Grado de confianza	Monto	Grado de confianza	Monto	Grado de confianza	Monto	Grado de confianza
Asistencia Oficial para el Desarrollo*	1.1.1. Bilateral	5,033,265.04	Alta						
	1.1.2. Multilateral		Alta						
Otros fondos públicos**		5,658,796.76	Alta						
Privado/ de mercado									
Organizaciones sin fines de lucro									
<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>6,067,104.19</b>							
Observaciones:									

\* el monto de la Asistencia Oficial para el Desarrollo incluye solamente el aporte de los cooperantes

\*\* se incluyen en otros fondos públicos dos Canjes de Deuda con los EEUU.

## 2. Información sobre la disponibilidad de recursos financieros en cada país.

En el cuadro adjunto se presenta información de Presupuestos Ordinarios Gubernamentales asignados al Ministerio de Ambiente, Energía y Telecomunicaciones (MINAET). En Costa Rica, el MINAET es la institución encargada de contribuir al mejoramiento de la calidad de vida de las y los habitantes del país mediante la promoción del manejo, conservación y desarrollo sostenible de los elementos, bienes, servicios y recursos ambientales y naturales del país, garantizando la necesaria y plena armonía entre las actividades de desarrollo nacional y el respeto por la naturaleza y la consolidación jurídica de los derechos ciudadanos en esta materia.

Es el rector en materia del ambiente, energía y telecomunicaciones, coordina la participación de las demás entidades públicas y privadas en la generación e implementación de políticas, estrategias y acciones orientadas al cumplimiento de los objetivos nacionales e internacionales, y propicia la participación amplia y responsable de los diferentes sectores de la sociedad civil.

En la Categoría A "Diversidad Biológica", se incorporan los presupuestos de: la Administración Central del MINAET y los presupuestos del Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, el Fondo Nacional de Financiamiento Forestal, la Secretaría Técnica Ambiental, el Instituto Meteorológico y el Tribunal Ambiental. El presupuesto de la Categoría C "Uso y gestión sostenibles" corresponde a la Dirección General de Geología y Minas; y la Categoría D "Producción y consumo sostenible" corresponde a la Dirección de Energía.

AÑO	Categoría A Diversidad Biológica		Categoría B Elaboración de políticas y administración		Categoría C Uso y gestión sostenibles		Categoría D Producción y consumo sostenibles		Total
	Monto +	Grado de confianza	Monto	Grado de confianza	Monto++	Grado de confianza	Monto +++	Grado de confianza	
	2012	120,697,773.56	Medio			1,565,467.32	Medio	139,960.39	
2011	138,623,840.05	Medio			1,620,913.32	Medio	182,815.02	Medio	
2010	92,729,166.28	Medio			1,426,516.6	Medio	96,320.93	Medio	
2009	86,291,547.41	Medio			1,149,145.5	Medio	197,808.69	Medio	
2008	52,086,108.53	Medio			619,261.19	Medio	54,928.82	Medio	
2007	75,282,642.92	Medio			623,460.15	Medio	50,960.15	Medio	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>565,711,078.75</b>				<b>7,004,764.08</b>		<b>722,794.00</b>		

+Presupuestos de las dependencias del MINAET que trabajan directamente en Conservación de la Diversidad biológica

++Presupuesto Anual de la Dirección de Geología y Minas

+++ Presupuesto Anual de la Dirección de Energía

### 3. Información sobre las medidas que se están tomando para aplicar la Estrategia para la movilización de recursos.

Medidas	NO	SI	Año de iniciación/terminación	Descripción del apoyo recibido para la medida	Resultados logrados
3.1 Evaluación de valores de la diversidad biológica	SI		2010/	Se han iniciado varios esfuerzos para la identificación, priorización y valoración de servicios ecosistémicos marinos.	
3.2 Identificación e información de necesidades, deficiencias y prioridades de financiamiento	NR/NS*				
3.3 Elaboración de planes financieros nacionales para la diversidad biológica	NR/NS				
3.4 Integración de la consideración de la diversidad biológica y servicios de los ecosistemas en la elaboración de planes y estrategias de desarrollo	SI			Los planes de desarrollo de Costa Rica integran la variable desarrollo sostenible y en algunos sectores el enfoque ecosistémico	
3.5 Integración de la consideración de la diversidad biológica y servicios de los ecosistemas en los presupuestos nacionales	NO			En Costa Rica las instituciones públicas elaboran los presupuestos apegados a la planificación por ello si existe una integración indirecta del desarrollo sostenible y conservación de la biodiversidad en los presupuestos.	

OBSERVACIONES: El MINAET ha realizado esfuerzos en las medidas identificadas en el cuadro, sin embargo, dichos esfuerzos, no necesariamente, responden al marco de la Estrategia para la Movilización de Recursos. Es posible que otras instituciones incluyan elementos relacionados con esta medidas.

\*No se cuenta con la información para contestar dicha pregunta

**BRAZIL, RECEIVED ON 24 SEPTEMBER 2012****PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK**

Country: BRAZIL	Name of respondent: DANIELA AMÉRICA SUAREZ DE OLIVEIRA
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<input type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input type="checkbox"/> Focal point for resource mobilization <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify: <b>Director of Department of Biodiversity Conservation</b>
Title and Department of respondent:	<b>Department of Biodiversity Conservation, Secretariat of Biodiversity and Forests</b>
Organization of respondent:	<b>Ministry of Environment of Brazil</b>
Email address:	<a href="mailto:daniela.oliveira@mma.gov.br">daniela.oliveira@mma.gov.br</a>
Telephone contact:	<b>+55 61 2028-2028</b>
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	<b>10<sup>th</sup> of September, 2012</b>

**1. Information on international flows of financial resources**

This section of the Framework relates to the flows of financial resources from all sources to developing countries.

For **developed countries** (members of OECD-DAC): Please indicate the amount of resources provided in support of biodiversity in developing countries through ODA, other public funds, private/market mechanisms and through not-for profit organizations. For **developing countries** (countries, not members of OECD -DAC): Please indicate the amount of resources received from external sources through ODA, other public funds, private/market mechanisms and through not-for profit organizations.

Year: 2006 - 2010		Currency: million of US\$ - US\$ 1.00 = R\$ 1.76, ref. 2010					
Type of financial flows		Activity categories				Total	
		Directly related		Indirectly related			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
1.1 Official Development Assistance	1.1.1 Bilateral	35.00	M			35.00	M
	1.1.2 Multilateral	15.00	M	10.00	M	25.00	M
1.2 Other public funds							
1.3 Private/ Market							
1.4 Not for profit organizations							
<b>Comments:</b> 1.1.1 – Resources donated (approximate yearly amounts) to Brazil on the Period, mainly cooperation through programs like PPG7, ARPA, Ecological Corridors and others 1.1.2 – Directly and indirectly related resources, approximate values presented as yearly amount perceived by Brazil through GEF Projects in this period.							

## 2. Information on the availability of financial resources in each country

This section of the Framework relates to the financial resources available to implement the Convention and its Strategic Plan in your country. It relates specifically to the end use of financial resources regardless of whether the source of the funds is domestic or external.

Year: 2006		Currency: million of US\$ - US\$ 1.00 = R\$ 1.76, ref. 2010					
Source		Activity categories				Total	
		Directly Related		Indirectly Related			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	931.45	H	172.41	H	1,103.86	H
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	209.86	M	839.45	M	1049.32	M
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal	132.03	M	528.15	M	660.17	M
2.2 Private/ Market		504.48	M	4,540.39	M	5044.88	M
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)							
<p><b>Comments:</b> Central Government values were estimated considering official reports generated by financial and administrative systems (SIAFI and SIGPLAN) from the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Planning – for direct related activities general budget and personnel payment were considered. For Indirect related activities, only general budget was considered. State and Municipal government budgets were estimated considering global expenditures for all environmental activities – indirect values surpass federal expenditures due in part to urban equipment, pollution control and mitigation managed by these levels of government. Note that a (not yet estimated) part of these resources controlled by state and municipalities have an origin on the federal budget.</p> <p>Resources allocated from private/market were estimated using reports from The Economic Commission for Latin America – ECLA (2005) – the percentage of environmental expenditures would amount to approximately 1% of industrial GDP per year, during the period of 2000 and 2001. Biodiversity expenditures are expected to be approximately 10% of this 1% of industrial GDP for directly related activities, and the remaining resources accounted for indirectly related activities.</p> <p>Resources from other sources have not yet been estimated.</p> <p>THIS COMMENT APPLIES TO ALL SUBSEQUENT YEARS</p>							

Year: 2007		Currency: million of US\$ - US\$ 1.00 = R\$ 1.76, ref. 2010					
Source		Activity categories				Total	
		Directly Related		Indirectly Related			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	885.85	H	136.60	H	1,022.44	H
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	201.24	M	804.95	M	1,006.19	M
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal	167.97	M	671.91	M	839.89	M
2.2 Private/ Market		490.51	M	4,414.63	M	4,905.14	M
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)							

Year: 2008		Currency: million of US\$ - US\$ 1.00 = R\$ 1.76, ref. 2010					
Source		Activity categories				Total	
		Directly Related		Indirectly Related			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	741.85	H	126.61	H	868.46	H
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	238.91	M	955.64	M	1,194.55	M
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal	212.24	M	848.95	M	1,061.19	M
2.2 Private/ Market		493.44	M	4,440.93	M	4,934.36	M

2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Year: 2009		Currency: million of US\$ - US\$ 1.00 = R\$ 1.76, ref. 2010					
Source		Activity categories				Total	
		Directly Related		Indirectly Related			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	814.46	H	67.37	H	881.83	H
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	254.44	M	1017.75	M	1,272.19	M
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal	250.65	M	1102.61	M	1,253.27	M
2.2 Private/ Market		467.41	M	4,206.71	M	4,674.12	M
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)							

Year: 2010		Currency: million of US\$ - US\$ 1.00 = R\$ 1.76, ref. 2010					
Source		Activity categories				Total	
		Directly Related		Indirectly Related			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	905.77	H	117.96	H	1,023.74	H
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	270.97	M	1083.90	M	1,354.88	M
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal	296.02	M	1184.09	M	1,480.11	M
2.2 Private/ Market		514.69	M	4,632.20	M	5,146.89	M
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)							

### **3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization**

This section of the Framework addresses initiatives which are important in enabling access to financial resources for biodiversity activities. The information sought in this section does not require response in monetary units.

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2011/?	Brazil has started to make an assessment about gap analysis of studies in assessment values of biodiversity (financing source: domestic budget)	
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2012/2014	Brief assessment that identified how much is necessary to promote conservation, sustainable use and benefit sharing of Brazilian biodiversity for 2011 to 2020 (financing source: domestic budget)	
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2012/2014	The Action Plan is being conducted by Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Planning, Budget and Management (financing source: domestic budget and resources from a recent approved GEF project "National Biodiversity Planning to Support the implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan in Brazil" - <i>fast track</i> )	

<p><b>3.3</b> Development of national financial plans for biodiversity</p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>2012/2014</p>	<p>The Action Plan is being conducted by Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Planning, Budget and Management (financing source: domestic budget and resources from a recent approved GEF project "National Biodiversity Planning to Support the implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan in Brazil"- <i>fast track</i>)</p>	
<p><b>3.4</b> Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies</p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>2012/?</p>	<p>National Institute for Geography and Statistics in cooperation with MMA began reviewing the methods for calculating GDP</p>	
<p><b>3.5</b> Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets</p>	<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>			
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>				

**4. Information on specific issues related to resource availability**

This section of the Framework contains questions related to several specific issues including: technical cooperation; South-South cooperation; innovative financial mechanisms; and access and benefit-sharing.

***4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity-building and South-South cooperation***

For **developing countries** (countries, not members of OECD -DAC): **please indicate if your country is participating in technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives that support biodiversity from which you have received resources as well as if initiatives have been financed by your country.** You may also provide a description of the types of initiatives.

Type of initiative		Description (including the value of initiatives)
4.1.3 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building received	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PPG7 + Norway donation for Climate Fund + Cooperation with GIZ for Mata Atlântica I and II – approximately US\$ 198 million
4.1.4 South-South technical cooperation & capacity building received from other developing countries	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
4.1.5 South-South technical cooperation and capacity building - Provided	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brazil has engaged cooperation with African, Caribbean and South American countries, but we are unable to provide value estimates for these efforts.
Comments:		

#### 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies

Please indicate if your country has removed, phased out or reformed incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity and if positive incentives have been introduced.

Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
Comments :		

#### 4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism

Please identify the new and innovative financial mechanisms that have been implemented by your country or in which your country has participated.

Please indicate the type of initiative and the amount of financial resources generated (where known; order of magnitude estimates are better than none). Please also indicate whether and how the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity were considered and provide a brief description of the initiative, including the year of its establishment and operation.

Type of Initiative	Resources generated (If known)	Description (including how the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected)
VAT transfer (Brazilian ICMS Ecológico)	US\$ 822.13 million (2006-2010 lump sum)	The amount of resources transferred to municipalities from state governments varies from state to state and are proportional (different rules apply for each state, 1 to 5% of total tax revenue) to conservation efforts such as area covered by protected areas.
Environmental Compensation	US\$ 100 million (2006-2010, resource allocated to federal government)	The environmental compensation is a mechanism modernized by the Law of the National System of Protected Areas and is an type of offset scheme. It states that every project (infrastructure, urban equipments, power plants) that passes through licensing with Impact Assessment Studies must contribute to the implementation of Protected Areas – as much as 0.5% of the global investment for the implementation of each project.
Comments: Brazil has developed a series of ecosystem payment schemes, but they only became operational and effective resources started flowing on late 2011, thus they were not presented in this preliminary report. There is a national law under discussion in the national congress.		

**4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention**

**Please indicate the number of access and benefit-sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms your country has undertaken that enhance resource mobilization:**

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
<b>Comments:</b>	

-----

**Endnotes:**

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.worldbank.org/IDA>

<sup>2</sup> The World Bank Annual Report 2010 Table 1, page 7

<sup>3</sup> World Bank. IDA at Work. Environment: Protecting National and Global Resources. P. 3. [siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/IDA-Environment.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/IDA-Environment.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> CIDA. Statistical Reports on International Assistance. 2006-07 to 2010-11.

<sup>5</sup> Statistical Report on International Assistance. Fiscal Year 2009-2010. Canadian International Development Agency. P. 14.

<sup>6</sup> FAO. Medium Term Plan 2010-13 and Programme of Work and Budget 2010-11. [www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/017/K5831E.pdf](http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/017/K5831E.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> CIDA. Statistical Reports on International Assistance. 2006-07 to 2010-11.

<sup>8</sup> [UNDP Annual Reports. 2007-2011.](#)

<sup>9</sup> UNDP (2010). UNDP’s Work on Biodiversity Management. P. 4.

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.undp.org/publications/fast-facts/FF-environment.pdf>

<sup>11</sup> [UNDP. \(2008\). Evaluation of Role and Contribution of UNDP in Environment and Energy. Chapter 2.](#)

<sup>12</sup> [UNESCO Report by the Director General on the Status of Contributions and Payment Plans. 2006-2010](#)

<sup>13</sup> <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001918/191870e.pdf>

<sup>14</sup> <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001918/191870e.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> Federal Departments:

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Departmental Performance Reports 2006-07 to 2010-11.

Environment Canada, Departmental Performance Reports 2006-07 to 2010-11. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/dpr-rmr/index-eng.asp>

Parks Canada, Departmental Performance Reports 2006-07 to 2010-11. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/dpr-rmr/index-eng.asp>

Natural Resources Canada, Departmental Performance Reports 2006-07 to 2010-11. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/dpr-rmr/index-eng.asp>

Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Departmental Performance Reports 2006-07 to 2010-11. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/dpr-rmr/index-eng.asp>

Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Departmental Performance Reports 2006-07 to 2010-11. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/dpr-rmr/2009-2010/inst/ian/iantb-eng.asp>

Canadian Museum of Nature, Annual Reports 2006-07 to 2010-11. <http://nature.ca/en/about-us/museum-corporation/annual-reports-corporate-publications>

CBD Secretariat Quarterly Reports <http://www.cbd.int/secretariat/qr/>

Disclosure of Grant and Contribution Awards Over \$25,000: Foreign Affairs. [http://w03.international.gc.ca/dg-do/index\\_fa-ae.aspx?lang=eng&p=2](http://w03.international.gc.ca/dg-do/index_fa-ae.aspx?lang=eng&p=2)

<sup>16</sup> Provincial Ministries and Departments:

- BC Ministry of Environment. Annual Service Plan Report. (2006-07 p. 60; 2007-08 p. 53; 2008-09 p. 31; 2009-10 p. 36; 2010-11 p. 39)
- BC Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resources. Annual Service Plan Report. (2006-07 p. 45; 2007-08 p. 49; 2008-09 p. 25; 2009-10 p. 25; 2010-11 p. 36)
- Alberta Ministry of Environment. Annual Report. (2006-07 p. 53; 2007-08 p. 55; 2008-09 p. 79; 2009-10 p. 77; 2010-11 p. 57)
- Alberta Ministry of Tourism, Parks and Recreation. Annual Report. (2006-07 p. 19; 2007-08 p. 19; 2008-09 p. 26; 2009-10 p. 30; 2010-11 p. 27)
- Alberta Ministry of Sustainable Resource Development. Annual Report. (2006-07 p. 28; 2007-08 p. 93; 2008-09 p. 83; 2009-10 p. 54; 2010-11 p. 64)
- Alberta Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development. Annual Report. (2006-07 p. 66; 2007-08 p. 81; 2008-09 p. 102; 2009-10 p. 59; 2010-11 p. 65)
- Saskatchewan Ministry of Environment. Annual Report. (2006-07 p. 51-52; 2007-08 p. 44-45; 2008-09 p. 35-36; 2009-10 p. 28-29; 2010-11 p. 29-30)
- Manitoba Ministry of Water Stewardship. Annual Reports. (2006-07 p. 80-82; 2007-08 p. 80-82; 2008-09 p. 86-88; 2009-10 p. 78-79; 2010-11 p. 76-78)
- Manitoba Ministry of Conservation. Annual Reports. (2006-07 p. 182; 2007-08 p. 176; 2008-09 p. 186; 2009-10 p. 169; 2010-11 p. 164)
- Manitoba Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives. Annual Report. (2007-08 p. 77,81,92; 2008-09 p. 83,88,99; 2009-10 p. 73,80,94; 2010-11 p. 70,77,93)
- Ontario Ministry of Finance. Public Accounts, Volume 1: Ministry Statements and Schedules. (2006-07 p. 2-24,175,306-307,309; 2007-08 p.2-24,173,311-312,314; 2008-09 p. 2-13,158,285-286,290; 2009-10 p. 2-13,172,307-308,311; 2010-11 p. 2-13,165,289-290,293)
- Ministère du Développement durable, de l'environnement et des parcs, Québec. Rapport annuel de gestion. (2006-07 p. 65; 2007-08 p. 67; 2008-09 p. 77; 2009-10 p. 44; 2010-11 p. 33)
- Ministère des Ressources Naturelles et de la Faune. Rapport annuel de gestion. (2006-07 p. 23; 2007-08 p. 24; 2008-09 p. 36; 2009-10 p. 31; 2010-11 p. 33)
- New Brunswick Office of the Comptroller. Public Accounts, Volume 2: Supplementary Information. (2006-07 p. 50,135,247-248; 2007-08 p. 49,75,132; 2008-09 p. 48,76,127; 2009-10 p. 49,77,131; 2010-11 p. 50,76,132)
- Nova Scotia Department of Environment (and Labour). Annual Accountability Report. (2006-07 p. 12; 2007-08 p. 22; 2008-09 p. 18; 2009-10 p. 27; 2010-11 p. 4)
- Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources. Annual Accountability Report. (2006-07 p. 14; 2007-08 p. 16; 2008-09 p. 20; 2009-10 p. 18; 2010-11 p. 4)
- PEI Department of Environment, Energy and Forestry. Annual Report. (2006-07 p. 14; 2007-08 p. 13; 2008-09 p. 14; 2009-10 p. 12)
- PEI Department of Finance. Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure. (2010-11 p. 135; 2011-12 p. 53,135)
- PEI Department of Tourism and Culture. Annual Report. (2006-07 p. 10; 2007-08 p. 10; 2008-09 p. 34)
- Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Environment and Conservation. Annual Report. (2006-07 p. 24-25; 2007-08 p. 21-22; 2008-09 p. 34-35; 2009-10 p. 28-29; 2010-11 p. 45-46)
- Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Natural Resources. Annual Report. (2006-07 p. 40-41; 2007-08 p. 58-59; 2008-09 p. 69-70; 2009-10 p. 95-96; 2010-11 p. 122-123)
- Nunavut Department of Finance. Main Estimates. (2008-09 p. I-3; 2009-10 p. I-3; 2010-11 p. I-3; 2011-12 p. I-3; 2012-13 p. I-3)
- Northwest Territories Department of Finance. Main Estimates. (2008-09 p. 10-1,11-1; 2009-10 p. 12-1,13-1; 2010-11 p. 12-1,13-1; 2011-12 p. 12-1,13-1; 2012-13 p. 12-1,13-1)
- Yukon Department of Finance. Operation and Maintenance Estimates. (2008-09 p. 8-1,9-1; 2009-10 p. 8-1,9-1; 2010-11 p. 9-1,10-1; 2011-12 p. 9-1,10-1; 2012-13 p. 9-1,10-1)

<sup>17</sup> Statistics Canada. Table 385-0001 - Consolidated federal, provincial, territorial and local government revenue and expenditures, annual (dollars x 1,000,000), CANSIM (database).

<sup>18</sup> [Statistics Canada. Environmental Protection Expenditures in the Business Sector. 2006,2008.](#)

<sup>19</sup> Park user fees references:

Parks Canada, Departmental Performance Reports 2006-07 to 2010-11. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/dpr-rmr/index-eng.asp>

BC Parks Annual Reports. [www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/research/year\\_end.../year\\_end\\_rep\\_2010.pdf](http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/research/year_end.../year_end_rep_2010.pdf)

Alberta Tourism, Parks and Recreation Business Plan 2011-2014. [www.finance.alberta.ca/publications/budget/.../tourism-parks-recreation.pdf](http://www.finance.alberta.ca/publications/budget/.../tourism-parks-recreation.pdf)

Ministry of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sports. Annual Report 09-10. Saskatchewan

2011 Manitoba Estimates of Expenditure and Revenue. [www.gov.mb.ca/finance/budget11/papers/r\\_and\\_e.pdf](http://www.gov.mb.ca/finance/budget11/papers/r_and_e.pdf)

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. Results-based plan 2010-2011

Sépaq • Rapport annuel 2008- 2009. Québec.

Department of Tourism and Parks. Annual Report. 2009-2010 Tourism and Parks. New Brunswick.

Department of Tourism and Culture – Provincial Parks. Annual Report 2008-2009. Prince Edward Island

Habitat Conservation Trust Fund. Press Release April 15, 2011. “Foundation gives back \$6 million to BC wildlife”.

Ministry of Sustainable Resource Development. Annual Report 2009-2010. Alberta. The Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management of Alberta outsourced the sale of recreational hunting and fishing licences through the Recreational Licencing Management (RELM) system to IBM. Under the agreement, IBM has full responsibility for the service and it is responsible for all costs associated with it. IBM receives a transaction fee for each licence sold with the balance of the revenue being forwarded to the Ministry or to a Delegated Authorized Organization. The Ministry reports revenue in Premiums, Fees and Licences on the Consolidated Statements of Operations net of IBM transaction fees of \$6.3 million.

Ministry of Environment Annual Report 09-10. Saskatchewan.

Ministry of Conservation. Annual Report 2009-2010. Manitoba.

This Fund was created to ensure that revenues generated from the sale of fish and wildlife licenses is re-channeled for specific sustainable fish and wildlife management initiatives.

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. Results-based plan 2010-2011.

Ministry of Natural Resources and Wildlife. Annual Report 2009 - 2010 Quebec.

Department of Natural Resources. Annual Report. 2009-2010. New Brunswick.

Nova Scotia Department of Finance. Estimates and Supplementary Detail for the fiscal year 2011–2012

<sup>20</sup> Statistics Canada. Table 379-00231,2 - Gross domestic product (GDP) at basic price in current dollars, System of National Accounts (SNA) benchmark values, by North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), annual (data in millions)

<sup>21</sup> NGO References:

The Nature Conservancy of Canada Financial Statement (2010 p. 3; 2009 p. 2; 2008 p. 3; 2007 p. 3;)  
<http://www.natureconservancy.ca/en/who-we-are/annual-reports/>

Ducks Unlimited Canada Annual Report (2010 p. 22; 2009 p. 14; 2008 p. 20; 2007 p. 20)  
[http://www.ducks.ca/aboutduc/news/annual\\_report/index.html](http://www.ducks.ca/aboutduc/news/annual_report/index.html)

Canadian Wildlife Federation Financial Statements (2010 p. 2; 2009 p. 3; 2008 p.2) <http://www.cwf-fcf.org/en/about-cwf/financial-reports/financial-audited-reports/>

World Wildlife Fund Annual Report ( 2010 p. 37; 2009 p. 66; 2008 p. 59; 2007 p. 58; 2006 p. 46)  
[http://www.wwf.ca/about\\_us/annual\\_report/ar\\_archive.cfm](http://www.wwf.ca/about_us/annual_report/ar_archive.cfm)

David Suzuki Foundation Annual Report (2006 p. 22; 2007 p. 22; 2008 p. 14; 2009. 2010 p. 26)  
<http://www.davidsuzuki.org/publications/annual-reports/2007/2007-annual-report>

Eco Trust Annual Report (2006 p. 12; 2007 p. 14; 2008 p. 23; 2009 p. 27; 2010 p. 27)  
[http://www.ecotrust.org/publications/annual\\_report2007.html](http://www.ecotrust.org/publications/annual_report2007.html)

Canadian Parks and Wilderness Financial Statements (2010 p. 6; 2009 p. 5; 2008 p. 4; 2006, 2007 p. 4)  
<http://cpaws.org/about/financial-picture>

Nature Annual Reports (2006 p. 23; 2006 p. 15; 2008 p. 19; 2009/2010 p. 12) [http://www.naturecanada.ca/about\\_annual\\_report.asp](http://www.naturecanada.ca/about_annual_report.asp)

Wildlife Habitat Canada (2006/07 p. 30; 2008 p. 23; 2009 p. 23; 2010 p. 26) <http://www.whc.org/en/about/publications/200-annual-reports>

Wildlife Preservation Canada Annual Report (2007 p. 11; 2008 p. 1; 2009 p. 3; 2010 p. 11) <http://wildlifepreservation.ca/about-us/publications/>

- 
- Forest Stewardship Council Canada Annual Report (2010 p. 8; 2009 p. 8; 2008, 2007 p. 6; 2006 p.6)  
<http://www.fsccanada.org/fscgovernance.htm>
- Habitat Conservation Trust Foundation Financial Statements (2010 p. 4; 2009 p. 4; 2008 p. 4; 2007 p. 4)  
<http://www.hctf.ca/News/Publications.html>
- Pacific Salmon Foundation Annual Report (2010 p. 23; 2009 p.4; 2006 p. 25)  
[http://www.psf.ca/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=101&Itemid=143](http://www.psf.ca/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=101&Itemid=143)
- The Land Conservancy of British Columbia Financial Statements (2010 p. 3; 2009 p. 15; 2008 p. 15; 2007 p. 2; 2006 p.2)  
<http://blog.conservancy.bc.ca/introduction/annual-reports/>
- Alberta Conservation Authority Annual Report (2010 p. 57; 2009 p. 61; 2008 p. 58; 2007 p. 58; 2006 p. 51) <http://www.ab-conservation.com/go/default/index.cfm/publications/business-reports/annual-reports/>
- Wascana Centre Authority Annual Report (2010 p. 10; 2009 p. 3; 2008 p. 6; 2007 p. 6) <http://www.wascana.sk.ca/index.php?id=20>
- Nature Ontario Annual report (2010 p. 15; 2009 p. 14; 2008 p. 14; 2007 p. 15) [http://ontarionature.org/discover/annual\\_report.php](http://ontarionature.org/discover/annual_report.php)
- Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority Annual Report ( 2010 p. 27; 2009 p.30, 2008 p. 40; 2007 p. 40; 2006 p. 42)  
[http://www.abca.on.ca/publications\\_section.php?Category=2](http://www.abca.on.ca/publications_section.php?Category=2)
- Essex Region Conservation Authority Financial Statement (2010 p. 2; 2009 p. 2; 2008 p. 2)  
<http://www.erca.org/aboutus/corporate.cfm>
- Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Financial Statement (2010, 2009 p. 5; 2008 p. 4; 2007 p. 5; 2006 p. 5)  
<http://www.greysauble.on.ca/publications/minutes.html>
- Lower Trent Conservation Authority Financial Statement (2010 p.4; 2009 p. 4; 2008 p. 4; 2007/2006 p. 4)  
<http://www.ltc.on.ca/about/ar/>
- Saugeen Conservation Authority Financial Statement (2010 p. 6; 2009 p. 5; 2008 p. 6)  
<http://www.svca.on.ca/page.php?page=administration>
- St Clair Conservation Authority Annual Report (2010 p.25; 2009 p. 25; 2008 p. 25; 2007 p. 25; 2006 p. 25)  
<http://www.scrca.on.ca/Publications.htm>
- Ganaraska Conservation Authority Annual Report ( 2010 p. 10; 2009 p. 10; 2008 p. 3) <http://www.grca.on.ca/resources.html>
- Halton Conservation Authority Public Accountability Report (2010, 2009, 2008 p. 1; 2007, 2006 p. 1)  
<http://www.conservationhalton.on.ca/ShowCategory.cfm?subCatId=1011>
- Kettle Creek Conservation Authority Annual Report (2010 p. 4; 2009 p. 2;  
<http://www.kettlecreekconservation.on.ca/content.php?doc=46>
- Long Point Region Conservation Authority Annual Report ( 2010 p. 20; 2009 p. 7) <http://www.lprca.on.ca/newsrel.htm>
- Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority Annual Report ( 2010 p. 9; 2009 p. 8; 2008 p. 2; 2007 p. 8; 2006 p. 2)  
<http://www.npca.ca/corporate-services/annual-reports/>
- Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority Annual Report (2010 p. 7; 2009 p. 8; 2008 p. 12; 2007 p.10; 2006 p. 6)  
<http://nvca.on.ca/LatestNews/Publications/>
- Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Annual Report (2010 p. 79; 2009 p. 62; 2008 p. 70; 2007 p. 8; 2006 p. 80)  
<http://www.trca.on.ca/about/annual-reports/http://www.trca.on.ca/about/annual-reports/>
- Grand River Conservation Authority Financial Statement ( 2010 p. 4; 2009 p. 4; 2008 p. 4; 2007 p. 4; 2006 p. 4)  
<http://www.grandriver.ca/index/document.cfm?Sec=12&Sub1=52&Sub2=3>
- Lake Simcoe Conservation Authority Annual Report ( 2010 p. 17; 2009 p. 18; 2008 p. 14; 2007 p. 7; 2006 p. 7)  
[http://www.lsrca.on.ca/about/annual\\_report.php](http://www.lsrca.on.ca/about/annual_report.php)
- Lower Thames Valley Conservation Authority Annual Report (2010 p. 3) <http://www.lowerthames-conservation.on.ca/publications.html>
- Nickel District Conservation Authority Financial Statement (2010 p. 4)  
[http://www.nickeldistrict.ca/ndca/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=26&Itemid=35](http://www.nickeldistrict.ca/ndca/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=26&Itemid=35)
- Rideau Valley Conservation Authority Annual Report (2010 p. 6; 2009 p.6; 2008 p. 6; 2007 p. 6; 2006 p. 6)  
<http://www.rvca.ca/news/index.html>
- South Nation Conservation Authority Annual Report (2010 p. 1; 2008 p. 3; 2006 p. 1) <http://www.nation.on.ca/en/publications/>
- Upper Thames River Budget Projections [http://www.thamesriver.on.ca/Downloads/images/Budget\\_2012.pdf](http://www.thamesriver.on.ca/Downloads/images/Budget_2012.pdf)

---

Nature Quebec Annual Report (2010, 2009 p. 26; 2008 p. 24; 2007 p. 24; 2007 p. 23)

[http://www.naturequebec.org/publications/?id=12&tx\\_qmpublication\\_pi1\[mots\\_cles\]=&tx\\_qmpublication\\_pi1\[comission\]=&tx\\_qmpublication\\_pi1\[type\\_document\]=12&tx\\_qmpublication\\_pi1\[langue\]=&tx\\_qmpublication\\_pi1\[coalition\]=&tx\\_qmpublication\\_pi1\[projet\]=&tx\\_qmpublication\\_pi1\[sujet\]=&tx\\_qmpublication\\_pi1\[date\\_min\]=&tx\\_qmpublication\\_pi1\[date\\_max\]=&submit=Rechercher](http://www.naturequebec.org/publications/?id=12&tx_qmpublication_pi1[mots_cles]=&tx_qmpublication_pi1[comission]=&tx_qmpublication_pi1[type_document]=12&tx_qmpublication_pi1[langue]=&tx_qmpublication_pi1[coalition]=&tx_qmpublication_pi1[projet]=&tx_qmpublication_pi1[sujet]=&tx_qmpublication_pi1[date_min]=&tx_qmpublication_pi1[date_max]=&submit=Rechercher)

Ecology Action Centre Annual Report (2010 p. 17; 2009 p.10; 2008 p. 11; 2007 p. 10) <http://www.ecologyaction.ca/content/annual-report>

<sup>22</sup> Statistics Canada. Table 477-0019 - Public postsecondary enrolments, by registration status, PCSCE, Classification of Instructional Programs, Primary Grouping (CIP\_PG), sex and immigration status, annual (number), CANSIM

<sup>23</sup> [Statistics Canada. Undergraduate tuition fees for full time Canadian students, by discipline, by province.](#)