UNEP

CBD

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/52*
UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/INF/40
5 April 2016

ENGLISH ONLY

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE
Twentieth meeting
Montreal, Canada, 25-30 April 2016
Item 13 of the provisional agenda**

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION
First meeting
Montreal, Canada, 2-6 May 2016
Item 7 of the provisional agenda***

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXPERT WORKSHOP ON BIODIVERSITY MAINSTREAMING

BACKGROUND

1. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) calls for Parties to "integrate, as far as possible and as appropriate, the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies" (Article 6 (b)). Parties have adopted numerous decisions and declarations since the Convention came into force to address mainstreaming. For instance in 2002 Parties underscored, as part of a high-level ministerial declaration made during the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, that "the most important lesson of the last ten years is that the objectives of the Convention will be impossible to meet until consideration of biodiversity is fully integrated into other sectors. The need to mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources across all sectors of the national economy, the society and the policy-making framework is a complex challenge at the heart of the Convention".

2. In its multi-year programme of work up to 2020 (decision XII/31), the Conference of the Parties decided to address, at its thirteenth meeting (COP 13), among other issues, strategic actions to enhance national implementation, in particular through mainstreaming and the integration of biodiversity across relevant sectors, including agriculture, forestry and fisheries, as well as the implications of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and of other relevant international processes for the future work of the Convention.

3. Mexico, as host of COP 13, in consultation with the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD), has decided to use the High-level Segment (HLS) of COP 13 to highlight the importance of biodiversity mainstreaming for the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and to contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. In preparation for COP 13 and with the financial support from the Government of Switzerland, the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity convened an International Expert Workshop on Mainstreaming Biodiversity, which was held from 17 to 19 November 2015 in Mexico City, with the following objectives:

* Also issued as UNEP/CBD/IMP/WS/2015/1/3.
** UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/1/Rev.1
*** UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/1/Rev.1.

(a) To facilitate a common understanding of "biodiversity mainstreaming" in the context of local, national and intergovernmental processes contributing to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and related Sustainable Development Goals;

(b) To highlight the importance of coherent policy frameworks, institutions, incentives and other tools in enhancing policy effectiveness and achieving desired policy outcomes;

(c) To identify good case examples of these, including institutional arrangements that have worked to help mainstream biodiversity at national and subnational levels;

(d) To identify challenges and opportunities for biodiversity mainstreaming within and across sectors, bearing in mind the different planning and production life cycles involved in specific sectors;

(e) To advance understanding of key technical and policy issues and possible opportunities related to biodiversity mainstreaming;

(f) To leverage the support of partner organizations;

(g) To brainstorm on how COP 13 and its preparatory processes can further contribute to the mainstreaming of biodiversity, secure the engagement of key actors in the broader CBD process and facilitate the presence in the HLS of Ministers responsible for agriculture, forests, fisheries and tourism as well as key actors in planning and finance.

4. The workshop was attended by experts from Belarus, Brazil, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, the European Commission, Germany, Guatemala, Guyana, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Switzerland, Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN Mexico), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the International Development Law Organization (IDLO), the United Nations Development Programme Regional Centre for Latin America and the Caribbean, the United Nations Development Programme in Mexico (UNDP Mexico), the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), the United Nations Environment Programme Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (UNEP-ROLAC), the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), Biodiversity International, BirdLife, Conservation International, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, GIZ Mexico, Inkaterra, the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Polytechnic University of Valencia, and Rainforest Alliance. The full list of workshop experts and participants is provided in annex II.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

5. The workshop was opened at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, 17 November 2015, by the Minister of Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico, Mr. Rafael Pacchiano Alamán. On behalf of the President of Mexico, he welcomed the participants and expressed his pleasure in hosting the workshop in preparation for the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD (COP 13). He emphasized that as a megadiverse country, Mexico was committed to doing everything possible to ensure biodiversity conservation, stating that there were important actions that had to be taken in order to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets by 2020, including the mainstreaming of biodiversity. To this end, the Minister expressed that Mexico would attempt to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 by 2018. He highlighted some advances in the national environment agenda and closed by reinforcing the country's commitment so that the outcomes of COP 13 would have a meaningful impact on biodiversity conservation efforts.

6. Mr. Jae C. Choe, on behalf of the Republic of Korea, which currently holds the COP Presidency, also welcomed the experts to the workshop. He thanked the Governments of Mexico and Switzerland for their initiative and support. He strongly highlighted the importance and links of biodiversity

mainstreaming and the sustainable development agenda, reminding participants that biodiversity was very present in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. He highlighted many results of the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 12), including those of resource mobilization, linking biodiversity and poverty and others, and emphasized that these outcomes provided common ground across different sectors. He concluded by mentioning some of the initiatives that had become part of the Korean legacy, including the Bio-Bridge Initiative and the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative, and offered to continue working with all of the participants for the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

7. Finally, the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, extended a warm welcome to the participants of the workshop and thanked the Governments of Mexico and Switzerland for their support. He began by emphasizing the good assessments and decisions adopted at COP 12 in Pyeongchang last year, and highlighted the main conclusion that although efforts to conserve biodiversity had increased, current efforts were not enough and more was needed. He reminded participants that communities and countries needed to be practical in order to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets; the involvement of the environment sector was not enough to reduce all the negative practices that needed to be changed, and other sectors had to be involved as well. The recognition of mainstreaming biodiversity was not only essential but also possible. He stated that for the negotiations that would take place at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 13) in Mexico, the Secretariat of the Convention needed to be well informed on how best to support countries to overcome this issue. He concluded by highlighting some good past cross-sectoral meetings that had taken place and which would contribute to the issue of mainstreaming.

ITEM 2. INTRODUCTION TO THE WORKSHOP

8. On behalf of the National Commission for the Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO), lead of the Steering Committee for COP 13, Mr. Hesiquio Benitez and Ms. Nelida Barajas provided a brief introduction and overview of the dynamics of the workshop. Ms Barajas reminded participants that the workshop did not aim to define biodiversity mainstreaming, but rather to look closely at specific productive sectors such as forestry, fisheries, agriculture and tourism sectors, as well as other cross-sectoral areas, to understand the best way to integrate biodiversity conservation. With regard to rules and procedures, she stated that the working language would be English and for the discussions, the workshop would follow the Chatham House Rule. She provided a brief overview of the structure of the workshop for each day and encouraged all participants to use the background documents and final version of the agenda provided on the meeting website, https://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=IMPWS-2015-01. The final agenda as completed is provided as annex III.

9. Ms. Amy Fraenkel, Principal Officer for Mainstreaming, Partnerships and Outreach for the CBD, offered an overview of the mandate of the CBD in regard to mainstreaming, including past decisions. She emphasized what participants needed to consider, including the fact that the need to mainstream biodiversity was not new but there was an important need to have Parties consider the incorporation of biodiversity conservation in the development of cross-sectoral plans and policies. She reminded participants of the ambitious agenda ahead of them and of the main objectives of the workshop, inviting to participate actively in order to obtain as many ideas and as much feedback as possible that could contribute to the CBD preparatory meetings prior to COP 13.

10. Finally, Mr. David Cooper, Deputy Executive Secretary of the CBD, presented the key findings of the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-4) regarding mainstreaming. After offering a brief overview of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, he emphasized that the key messages included that significant progress had been made but that additional action was required to keep the Strategic Plan on course; pressures on biodiversity were set to increase and the status of biodiversity to decline, despite increasing responses. He stated the meeting would contribute significantly to achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and that now was the opportunity to bring biodiversity mainstreaming into

decision-making. Plausible pathways existed to achieve the 2050 vision of the Strategic Plan, but they had to address climate change and other development goals, which required changes in the use of natural resources, including more efficient use of land, water, energy and other materials, rethinking consumption habits and transforming the food system. He concluded by highlighting that an analysis of the primary productive sectors had indicated that drivers linked to agriculture accounted for approximately 70 per cent of the projected loss of terrestrial biodiversity. Therefore, addressing trends in food systems was crucial in determining whether the Strategic Plan would succeed. Solutions for achieving sustainable farming and food systems included sustainable productivity increases by restoring ecosystem services in agricultural landscapes, reducing waste and losses in supply chains, and addressing shifts in consumption patterns.

ITEM 3. MAINSTREAMING IN PRODUCTIVE SECTORS AND COUNTRY EXPERIENCES

11. Experts in four sectoral panels addressed challenges, opportunities and enabling conditions needed to ensure biodiversity mainstreaming.

Forestry

12. The panel was moderated by Mr. Eduardo Rojas, who talked about the huge opportunities for biodiversity mainstreaming in forestry through different actions: landscape restoration, restoring degraded forests, integrated food security and non-wood forest products (NWFP), keeping mosaic structures (rural areas), accelerated maturing of young stands, integrated rural land use planning and payment for ecosystem services (PES).

13. Several examples of success stories were provided: Costa Rica had a broadly based forest fund, clear political will, strong relations between tourism and environment, and research capacity in tropical forests through CATIE; Chile and Uruguay were working on diversification of cattle-based agriculture and forest production, and marginal ownership changes; Brazil had strong capacities in remote sensing, new plantations and private estates in the Amazon, and strong efforts identifying and preserving public estates and especially indigenous forests; Dominican Republic had a strong political will which had resulted in forest restoration and expansion; Spain was succeeding in preservation of public forests and full coverage by public forest services and forestation; Turkey had achieved a full country coverage by the forest service and now forests were 100 per cent state owned; the Gambia had had early implementation of community based forestry; Rwanda had a strong law enforcement; in Gabon political will had been important for forests conservation; in Republic of Korea political and social will had contributed to revert deforestation, as well as use of native species; Bhutan had a strong legal framework and forest and soil protection were constitutional; China was working on forestation and there was political will to restore forest cover, as well as to promote the use of native species, and now 85 per cent of forests were part of long-term leases to local farmers; and India had been implementing joint management progressively, increasing efficiency in preserving remaining forests and the restoration of degraded ones.

14. In conclusion, scientific knowledge and technological capacities, along with high quality forest management were required to preserve forest biodiversity, soil conditions and their resilience capacity, as well as to combat climate change.

15. Brazil had implemented an action plan and developed a monitoring system with the capacities of a remote sensing centre, giving support for law enforcement actions and information for an early notice detection system (degraded or devastated), obtaining hot spots and priority areas. Brazil also has a conservation unit at the federal and state level, which contributed to the improvement of areas, mainly for protected areas, and indigenous lands. In addition, the Rural Environment Cadastre (CAR) had facilitated the control of the registration of property, preserved riparian areas, legal reserves, preserved hilltop areas, and native vegetation; the reports were voluntary and the government only verified the numbers reported. The Brazilian experience also demonstrated an example of the inclusion of private sector resulting in a larger extension of protected forests, as observed in the seven programmes that integrated the Brazilian

Coalition. They were currently developing the National Plan for Forest Recovery, which was an impressive example of reducing deforestation with coherent policies.

16. In the case of Mexico, the country was implementing the Biodiversity Conservation in Production Forests and Certified Markets project, for the production of timber in Natural Protected Areas. The project implemented actions in 11 states, containing 80 per cent of timber in Mexico, and was based on four action lines: strengthening scientific and technological capacities, developing capacities of forest producers, increasing competitiveness of forest communities, and monitoring and assessing impacts. The programme included a legal framework; participation of all relevant sectors (public, private, non-governmental organizations, etc.) to ensure the sustainability of the project; institutional arrangements; knowledge development; monitoring and impact assessment (what were the real impacts with regards to monitoring conservation of biodiversity). As a result, there had been an increase in forest certification: it doubled from 2012 to 2015. Although there was an impression that biodiversity conservation did not pay off, the project aimed to demonstrate that conservation under this scheme was profitable and convenient, indicating an impact on public policy instruments. These areas were of high value in terms of biodiversity. It was necessary to monitor the efficiency of resources, capacities, certification, and markets, in order to identify and evaluate the impacts of the project on biodiversity conservation.

Fisheries

17. The Panel was moderated by Mr. Jake Rice, who brought up the need to recognize a governance model where the conservation of biodiversity and the management of fisheries worked together. Managers of fisheries needed to pay special attention to biodiversity and not only to fish quotas. Concerning the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, Target 11 garnered great attention as it encouraged the conservation of terrestrial inland water as well as marine and coastal areas; however, Target 6 was very important for fisheries as it called for the sustainable management of aquatic living resources.

18. The Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) needed to include biodiversity issues more specifically in their plans. Almost all of them had policies to deal with bycatch and habitat impacts, but none had policies to keep detailed track of what was being caught or monitor their impacts on biodiversity. There was an urgent need for better practices to be set in place and to build bridges for common progress between all these agencies; there were relatively few examples of bridging. Practices should be environmentally and economically sound, and ensure livelihood sustainability; processes had to be self-sustaining on these three fronts. Environmental and financial resources were not unlimited, therefore there was an urgent need to find effective solutions.

19. A significant increase in nutrients and pollution in water was detrimental to fisheries (one of main drivers of biodiversity loss); this was an issue of governance as there was a lack of integration on policies. Although there were already mechanisms for collaboration, there was not enough information about what happened with these mechanisms at a national level. On the other hand, to meet human food requirements, the increased contribution needed from the ocean was around 35 per cent to 40 per cent. Furthermore, aquaculture played an important role, as in many cases people were fishing due lack of other options. Priority measures should be taken to deal with the current increase in population and demand.

20. It was estimated that the population of the Earth would increase from 7 to 9 billion people by 2050. In this context, the experience of Norway had focused on biodiversity and food security, bearing in mind that the increase in population critically affected food supply. From 1945 to 2014, trends had shown that due to a more restrictive management set in place, catches had increased while there had been a significant decrease in fishers. Back in 1970, priority was employment and rural settlement; profitability and ecological sustainability gradually emerged. By 2015, the priority was ecological sustainability, a prerequisite for achieving profitability and employment.

21. The main elements of fisheries management in the Norwegian experience included fishing capacity (structural policy measures), research, regulatory measures, control and sanctions; furthermore,

international cooperation and stakeholder participation were key pieces throughout the process. Fish stocks were also important, large stocks had increased, and although there were still endangered species and vulnerable habitats, things were considered to be going in the right direction. It was important to mention that political change came most easily through crisis. At times of crisis, all politicians recognized the emergency and took actions. There were important actions that contributed to reducing many biodiversity concerns: reduction of overcapacity, restoration of commercial stocks and improvement of profitability in fisheries. In addition, the strengthening of the economic capacity of the industry, and thus the political space, had been crucial to the ability to constructively meet remaining biodiversity challenges.

22. Peru presented two examples of biodiversity mainstreaming in the fisheries productive sector, at national and subnational levels. The first case related to fisheries management of the Peruvian anchovy stock, which was the world's biggest fishery resource with annual landings between 5 to 10 million metric tons. It generated up to one third of the world's fishmeal supply. The anchovy played a singular role in the biodiversity of the Peruvian upwelling marine ecosystem. The Fisheries Law and regulations for the anchovy fisheries were based on an adaptive strategy due to the highly productive ecosystem and its large climate variability, using mainly the principle of the ecosystem approach and adaptive management. This involved closed fishing grounds, closed seasons, minimum size of the anchovy, minimum mesh size, total allowable catch, minimum percentage of juveniles, individual vessel control systems, access to fishery now closed and biological reference point (BRP). The second Peruvian example was the case of the management of macroalgae through the engagement of local communities. Peru had a specific law focusing on the permanent monitoring of algae extraction where these were collected from the beach, not from the ocean, and management was driven by local communities. These communities were comprised by approximately 400 fishers in 16 associations that co-managed a coastal stretch of 27 kilometres. They decided the collection areas and the presence in the area of fishers should be controlled by the people that kept track of details, resulting in the restoration of most of the algae prairies in the area, along with the communities involved. Economic incentives were not always necessary, but in this case an incentive for using their own zone was recognized as an important aspect.

Agriculture

23. The panel was moderated by Ms. Barbara Herren, who presented an overview on agriculture, a sector which had traditionally been considered a threat to biodiversity; however, there was a need to recognize its relevant role in food security and human well-being. Aichi Biodiversity Targets 7 and 8, together with other international initiatives, such as the FAO sustainability initiative and the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA), provided great opportunities to support efforts for enhancing sustainable agriculture at the national level. However, there was still a need to integrate ecological approaches of biodiversity into agriculture. An example of this was the programme of work on agricultural biological diversity launched by the Conference of the Parties in 1996; it was very innovative, and included the topic of genetic resources, components of biodiversity that support ecosystem services, and also provided guidance to governments' synergies on chemical management and biodiversity.

24. The case of Switzerland was highlighted, where 35 per cent of the territory was agricultural area and 30 per cent forests. The country had a high diversity of natural habitats and diverse landscapes; however, the intensification of land use and expansion of urban areas were primarily responsible for habitat loss. Taking into consideration that biodiversity was a resource for agriculture, Switzerland published the Agriculture Policy 2014-2017. One pillar of the agricultural policy in Switzerland was based on a direct payment system—to receive direct payments, farmers had to adhere to certain ecological requirements. Other initiatives put into place by Switzerland were biodiversity priority areas (to protect and restore ecosystems close to their natural state) and the revision of the agricultural policy 2014-2017, which contained different instruments to strengthen the sustainability and conservation of biodiversity.

Tourism

25. The panel was moderated by Mr. Andrew Rhodes, who highlighted that tourism benefited greatly from biodiversity and that there were opportunities to mainstream biodiversity into the tourism sector according to economic growth, social inclusion and biodiversity awareness and protection. Worldwide, tourism represented 9 per cent of the global gross domestic product (GDP). It was expected that international tourism arrivals worldwide would increase by 3.3 per cent per year between 2010 and 2030. Tourism contributed to meeting Aichi Biodiversity Targets 12 and 20. Mainstreaming biodiversity had to go not only top-down, but also bottom-up; it meant the need to include participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, and for this reason it was important to have coordination between different governmental institutions.

26. The experience presented by Peru took place in the Amazon rainforest, and consisted of ecological research for profitable conservation developed by local populations and funded by tourism. Peru, a megadiverse country, was characterized by its biodiversity, geography, hospitality and history. In this context, Inkaterra had pioneered in ecotourism, developing biodiversity inventories (flora and fauna) since 1978, working in different areas and trying to become part of the community while seeking to ensure conservation and sustainability. Inkaterra projects, financed by private institutions, had among their outcomes different studies on the Amazon, including description of vascular plant species and work on important areas such as Machu Picchu and Cabo Blanco Marine Reserve (the first marine reserve in Peru). However, there was a need to broaden the biodiversity policy scope into more vertical and horizontal coherence and coordination among the touristic sector, integrating positive incentives for the engagement of local communities, private sector and local governments for conservation of biodiversity. The main challenge was enforcement of land use planning, as the touristic sector was permanently demanding land for tourism development, particularly land located in biodiversity-rich areas. Additionally, it had been identified that building a coherent framework towards better policy enhancing could result in a better distribution of revenues and benefits, and thus contribute to sustainable financing of biodiversity.

27. In Kenya, there had been great concern to mainstream biodiversity into different sections and work together with the indigenous peoples and local communities. Indigenous peoples have done this for years. In Kenya, tourism affairs concerned the Ministry of Tourism, Industry and Commerce; they worked with a strategic plan in protected areas with management plans. Due to the existence of local communities living around the areas, there was a component of inclusion and participation of communities; and also had a component of environmental conservation and many environmental laws. Nevertheless, this strategy faced many conflicts because the Ministries of Agriculture, of Environment and of Tourism had different policies. Experience had demonstrated that national parks and protected areas had benefits for the communities: they promoted tourism with attractive destinations and use of available resources in the area (having land management plans), and hotels looked at energy efficiency and sustainability and the involvement of the communities.

28. As Mexico was one of the countries with the highest natural and cultural diversity in the world, tourism was an important sector for the country, contributing with 8.7 per cent of the GDP and generating close to 3.7 million direct jobs. The fourth goal of the National Development Plan, known as Prosperous Mexico, included a call to take advantage of the country's tourism potential to generate greater economic benefits with sustainability criteria. The main policies for tourism in Mexico included sectoral planning and transformation, innovation and competitiveness, promotion of sustainability and social benefits. It had a legal framework: the General Law on Tourism. The policies also recognized touristic sustainable development areas, which were areas with natural and cultural characteristics that represented tourist attraction. Mexico had several projects on land use planning and energy efficiency and sustainability, such as the Special Programme for Climate Change, which contained six main actions for tourism. Mexico had elaborated the Guide of High Impact Actions for Climate Change Adaptation and Relief, as a result of research on vulnerability and adaptation to climate change in 25 strategic destinations. However, there was still need for implementation of sustainable tourism policies in subnational and local governments, local development in communities through sustainable tourism, legally binding instruments

to reinforce sustainability in touristic destinations, and design of monitoring and evaluation system for sustainable tourism.

ITEM 4. CROSS-SECTORAL MAINSTREAMING

29. Experts in three panels addressed enabling conditions, policies and tools and institutional arrangements that were needed to ensure biodiversity mainstreaming.

Enabling conditions

30. The first panel, moderated by Ms. Amy Fraenkel, addressed the importance of acknowledging the impact of harmful subsidies and of positives incentives, taking into consideration the relevance of designing and implementing instruments to achieve positive outcomes, considering positive and negative externalities, consumption and production. For instance, in agriculture there was a need to focus on the complete cycle from production to consumption, and not only focus on food production. There was a need to look at the different objectives of agriculture and identify which of them contributed to biodiversity loss and which to biodiversity conservation. Comprehensive valuation of the whole system demonstrated that the current economic environment was distorted by a number of externalities.

31. Since agriculture was based on natural resources, there was a need to raise awareness, starting with the positive elements of agriculture, the challenge to produce more food on the same amount of land, and not focusing only on what is wrong. On the one hand, agriculture provided a huge amount of jobs and food that should be supported; on the other hand, forest conversion to agriculture (land use change) and high water consumption and pollution had negative impacts on biodiversity.

32. The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) in agriculture had proved that it was in the best interests of farmers to invest in biodiversity. TEEB had gone beyond the traditional measure of gross domestic product (GDP), working on three levels of action: (a) recognizing value; (b) not monetizing or commodifying nature; and (c) demonstrating value, using economic tools and methods to make nature economically visible. This made it possible to make a link with goals 2 and 15 of the Sustainable Development Goals, highlighting the role of natural capital accounting, developing evidence based on health externalities and providing coherence and transparency in assessments. TEEB also provided guidance on instruments that might be applied to capture these values across the supply chain to find a way to analyse different production systems. However, the challenge remained: to achieve the SDGs without more resources and distinction between market and non-market values.

33. Furthermore, law and policymaking were key elements for mainstream biodiversity and needed to be considered as a national priority. A broader perspective was also required to provide enabling conditions to ensure coherence between international conventions and national legislation. Experts could provide scientific and technical inputs into regulatory frameworks and policies that affected communities, and which supported and motivated people to start changing values. However, mainstreaming had not been addressed as needed; in practice, not enough people understood the concept and implications of biodiversity mainstreaming; therefore, an extensive outreach work was required among practitioners and other stakeholders.

34. Among enabling conditions for biodiversity mainstreaming, financing had an important role to play. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) had a long experience in mainstreaming biodiversity through work in the Mesoamerican Corridor, connecting protected areas in the south-east of Mexico, where diverse tools such as spatial and land use planning, and policy and regulatory frameworks (subsidies and incentives) had been implemented demonstrating improvements and shifts to alternative biodiversity friendly productions systems. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN) was also highlighted as a key initiative and tool that provided key information and financing opportunities to support mainstreaming across sectors at the national level.

35. In project design, mainstreaming was perceived as a complex process due to the time frames (length of the project) and persistence, investments and costs, and stakeholder participation and

empowerment. Long-term engagements between stakeholders and non-environmental sectors should be encouraged. It seemed that countries that had invested in trade-off analyses seemed to have better results and successes.

Policies and tools

36. The panel was moderated by Mr. Robert Monroe, and it focused on identifying key policies and tools that could enable and facilitate biodiversity mainstreaming. One of the examples highlighted by the panelists was the NBSAP 2.0 Project, implemented by UNEP-WCMC and the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), which seemed to be an adequate framework for mainstreaming, by providing pathways that could be applied to multiple sectors under ten steps. The framework was based on inclusion of priorities (development and national) and sectoral development plans into national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs). As a result, embedding NBSAPs and national priorities would create long-term change through implementation.

37. Another example was the EU Biodiversity Strategy 2020, which had a 2050 vision with six targets, including mainstreaming. Implementation and policy integration were needed for more coherence. It was highlighted that strong partnerships (with key stakeholders) resulted in effective integration and was a proactive approach to protect and restore ecosystems (focus on financing, protected areas, ecosystem services). The "LIFE" instrument was a good example of this: it was a proactive instrument for integrated projects, offering seed money for projects that brought revenues. The 2016 draft EU budget foresaw to contribute to biodiversity mainstreaming, and was expected to become more accurate over time. The LIFE instrument was small in regard to agriculture related instruments, bringing up the discussion to evaluate if funding was effective and had an impact on the ground. It was still necessary to demonstrate the attractiveness of this practice to investors and the private sector. In order to reduce the risk perceptions of funds, the EU provided technical assistance to improve the projects. Resource mobilization might also be a tool for mainstreaming by understanding contributions to other sectors.

38. In the case of Costa Rica, it had been identified that in order to achieve biodiversity mainstreaming there was a need to embed nature conservation in the main social values and economics. In Costa Rica, the policy to promote biodiversity mainstreaming did not come from the President, but from Congress, embedding nature conservation in economic and educational policies. Between 1986 and 2012, Costa Rica managed to increase forest coverage and stop deforestation while doubling population and increasing GDP; it did this by addressing conservation and restoration with ecotourism as an element of mainstreaming. This allowed it to restore the landscape without competing with other sectors/activities, particularly agriculture.

39. The process was implemented through (a) forests incentives, (b) elimination of perverse incentives, (c) improved environmental governance, and (d) payment for ecosystem services programme launched in Costa Rica. In addition, a tax on fossil fuels of 3.5 per cent was established and there was an adjustment on water fees (August 2005). These two policies generated significant income, which exemplified mobilization of domestic resources.

40. The key elements for the implementation of these policies/programmes included understanding the direct drivers of deforestation with indicators to develop policies (land taxes, for instance); complex political process to decrease the rate of deforestation; awareness that effective implementation was impossible with the same institutional framework; stakeholder and government sensitivity to biodiversity mainstreaming; and development of agencies linked to natural capital. The challenges were to reduce the financial gap, to recognize the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and to achieve the objectives of all the Rio Conventions.

41. The main message that could be taken from this example was that one of the key elements that made these policies successful was the fact that they had started to think outside of the environmental sector when implementing the mentioned initiatives in Costa Rica.

Institutional arrangements.

42. The discussion for this panel, moderated by Mr. David Cooper, focused on institutional arrangements: inter-ministerial, stakeholder engagement, subnational, indigenous peoples and local communities. This discussion was necessary considering the whole range of institutions that helped mainstream biodiversity into different sectors. There was the need to create or strengthen mechanisms to enable biodiversity mainstreaming into different sectors, for example, an "inter-ministerial committee", which needed to work under a legal framework with a clear mandate for each of its parts. The responsibilities and "ownership" of biodiversity should be shared among different sectors, so it was important to have and create strong institutions responsible for biodiversity.

43. Mexico pioneered with the creation of CONABIO, an inter-ministerial commission created in 1992 in preparation for the Rio Summit; it promoted and coordinated actions towards the knowledge and sustainable use of the country's biological diversity; it obtained, organized and made accessible biodiversity information to all sectors of society; and acted as a bridging institution among academia, government and civil society. This commission worked as a demand-driven research institution to generate knowledge and intelligence at the national scale, and considered indigenous and local communities as owners of the natural capital of the country and as central actors in conservation and sustainable management. CONABIO was a world-class institution developing bioinformatics, owning a database of 9.6 million georeferenced museum and herbarium specimens, species information validated by specialists and remote sensing data. It had developed advanced work in geomatics: real-time forest fire detection at national level since 1988; ecosystem monitoring at various spatial and time scales; and standardized soil cover. CONABIO had launched the first national level biodiversity assessment, Natural Capital of Mexico, and led the state level Biodiversity Studies and Strategies Initiative (states engaged in the process and two state level "COESBIOs"). Additionally, CONABIO was applying knowledge to help rural communities; it led the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor and promoted citizen science. The government financed 40 per cent of the organization, and 60 per cent of the financing came from other sources (UNDP, GIZ, USGS, etc.). CONABIO had acted as a capacity-building provider for other institutions and had had several cooperation projects with other countries.

44. Another example provided was the Danish decision-making process, where government had set up a special committee for the environment: members were ministries, agencies and interest groups; the committee provided inputs and comments in writing prior to approval; the committee met 4 times a year to discuss and approve new laws and policies. Furthermore, there was a law regarding species conservation, implemented by guiding principles for forestry, action plans for species, leaflets to landowners, advisory committee, etc. The challenges experienced included lack of responsibility in regard to implementation; stakeholders each having their own agenda; addressing problems instead of solutions; and a perception that the Environmental Ministry needed to pay for the implementation. In a change of strategy, during the meetings, stakeholders provided specific proposals in order to appropriate the process. The lessons learned included that a legal framework was essential for biodiversity mainstreaming; organizational and institutional arrangements that allowed inter-ministerial cooperation and stakeholder consultation are indispensable; engagement of stakeholders at all stages was important (formulation of legal framework, implementation and development of actions); time was required to find appropriate solutions; dialogue and active engagement were crucial.

45. Japan shared the experience of its Committee for the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity. The United Nation had declared 2011-2020 the Decade on Biodiversity, and COP 10 had celebrated the International Year of Biodiversity to promote conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Japan established the Committee – UNDBJ – which aims to mainstream all stakeholder participation and collaboration (national government, local governments, non-governmental organizations, business and community, academics, agriculture, forestry and fisheries communities) with several activities (mainstreaming through members) including awarding best practice and sharing good practices. There was a strong process of communication and education for building capacity, sharing information and developing communication tools. The activities involved Japan's chamber of commerce and industry, forestry associations, national federation of forest unions, national federation of agriculture,

Japan association of travel agents, etc. The progress achieved included: Basic Biodiversity Act (2008); NBSAP 2011-2020 (fifth edition); MAFF (Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries) Biodiversity Strategy; National Land Use Plan (2015); local BSAPs: at 35 of 47 prefectures, and 49 municipalities; Japan Business and Biodiversity Partnership; and Local Government. There were several lessons learned, including the importance of inclusive strategies (all ministries, all sectors and media), the benefits of horizontal approach, the need for assistance (guidance, educational materials), incentives and appreciation to make possible biodiversity mainstreaming; but also acknowledgement of the challenges represented by the aging and declining population especially in primary industry and the international flow of commodities (many products imported to Japan but Japan didn't sacrifice their resources).

46. In relation to indigenous peoples and local communities' engagement, some countries gave strong relevance to the "Pachamama"- Mother Earth who gave life to humans, animals, plants and nature. It was the principal base for the development of life and culture. Indigenous epistemology based on this concept included entire systems of knowledge and relationships with the cosmos, with humans and the environment. Pachamama was community, indigenous authorities, customary law and well-being. Policies aimed at strengthening rights of communities, local communities and nationalities. Indigenous peoples had the right to the conservation and protection of the environment and the production capacity in their lands or territories. Some nations had mainstreamed this vision into their legislation: the National Constitution of Ecuador had a chapter (chapter 4) concerning rights of communities, peoples and nationalities, in line with articles on collective rights of the National Assembly and of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization, and the rights of nature (Mother Earth/Pachamama). Similar initiatives could be found in the legislation of Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia, related with traditional knowledge. Some of the main challenges were: land territories and water tenure, extractive industries; achieving sustainable development with identity; clarity of the roles of the involved social actors; the inclusion of customary law; the use of appropriate cultural tools, methodologies and time; intercultural teams and framework for biodiversity mainstreaming, disaggregated data and indicators for indigenous peoples; recognition under the CBD for IPLC inclusion (Working Group on Article 8(j), IFB Advisory Board); increased participation at meetings under the Convention; full and effective participation at local, national and regional levels, to achieve, in an intercultural way, the mainstreaming of biodiversity.

ITEM 5. OPPORTUNITIES FOR BIODIVERSITY MAINSTREAMING: THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

47. It was noted that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development – and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) – was holistic. It comprised social, economic and environmental global priorities, based on the global understanding that development must be sustainable (socioeconomic development and environment needed to be brought together for sustainability). It represented an opportunity to identify clear linkages and complementarities between biodiversity and the global development agenda through the SDGs and their targets. These targets aimed at nature-based water security, food security, health, sustainable livelihoods, disaster risk management, etc. Integration at national level could be the next step and challenge, where it would be crucial to accelerate the integration of SDGs promoting policy coherence through, inter alia, United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs), establishment of an inter-sectoral coordination mechanism, financial alignment, sectoral alignment, promotion of spatial planning and alignment of priorities (biodiversity priorities), fostering of catalytic investments, and identifying case studies and best practices.

48. The 2030 Agenda was also a driver for progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, considering that the Agenda was an excellent tool to raise awareness of its importance for human well-being as a strong argument to mainstream biodiversity into different sectors. It could be used to justify engagement in biodiversity and provide orientation for a potential new strategic plan for biodiversity in the near future. At the national level, the objective was the integration of biodiversity into national development planning, obtaining

broadened support for NBSAP implementation and revision processes, and the application of other tools relevant to biodiversity.

49. In this context, COP 13 could provide guidance to Parties and national and international organizations on how to mainstream biodiversity into national plans for the SDGs.

ITEM 6. CLOSURE OF THE WORKSHOP

50. During the discussions, participants identified key messages, challenges and opportunities for biodiversity mainstreaming across the four selected sectors. These findings are reflected in annex I below.

51. After the usual exchange of courtesies, the meeting was closed at 4 p.m. on Thursday, 19 November 2015.

Annex I

KEY FINDINGS, CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR BIODIVERSITY MAINSTREAMING

The workshop participants identified key elements, challenges and opportunities for biodiversity mainstreaming across productive sectors. They also considered and discussed relevant enabling conditions, policies and tools necessary to achieve progress towards biodiversity mainstreaming.

MAINSTREAMING IN PRODUCTIVE SECTORS: FORESTRY, FISHERIES, AGRICULTURE AND TOURISM

The workshop participants considered the following key elements for successful biodiversity mainstreaming as well as key challenges and opportunities for scaling up effective mainstreaming in productive sectors:

Forestry

***Elements**:*

(a) The existence of political will in the sector is essential.

(b) A legal and regulatory framework with proper law enforcement at national and local level is required.

(c) Access to scientific and technical information on natural capital and impacts of biodiversity loss between sectors.

(d) Identification and recognition of biodiversity ecosystem services for forestry development.

(e) Public outreach and communication of the value of biodiversity for forestry development.

(f) Forest certification linked to markets is positive for encouraging biodiversity conservation actions in forest management.

(g) Understanding the economic and ecological values of biodiversity and its ecosystem services is key for forestry planning and implementation.

(h) Financial contributions to promote good practices and biodiversity conservation actions have to be carefully planned in order to avoid perverse incentives.

(i) Monitoring the impact of forestry programmes on biodiversity.

(j) Clear land tenure rights offer more certainty to the land owners and the biodiversity within these lands.

(k) Biodiversity mainstreaming should result in benefits for the forestry sector and for conservation of biodiversity strategies, promoting win-win situations.

***Challenges**:*

(a) Different priorities (conservation of biodiversity and forestry development)

(b) Resource scarcity and lack of funding.

(c) Ensuring better communication among different sectors.

(d) Enhancing awareness of all stakeholders and their involvement in the construction of strategies.

(e) Appropriate safeguards in place.

(f) Improving information and data on biodiversity loss is important to set priorities of the actions needed.

(g) Segmentation of sectors: poor or no coordination among ministries; fear that new arrangements will not be profitable.

***Opportunities**:*

(a) The political will to address the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its SDGs.

(b) Existence of funds that could support related practices.

(c) Identifying different approaches to manage landscapes.

(d) Risk adaptation in the adoption and implementation of action plans.

(e) Proper and functional inter-ministerial coordination committees.

(f) Experience and lessons learned from good practices to replicate.

(g) Forestry management plans including biodiversity concerns.

Fisheries

***Elements**:*

(a) Communication is crucial for stakeholders with different perspectives (e.g. fishers, conservationist and government) to get a common understanding and reach an agreement of what the real problems are.

(b) Fisheries decisions have potential costs and benefits on all three dimensions of sustainability (ecological, economic and social). Given that triple wins will not always be possible, clear policy objectives are needed in advance of trade-offs.

(c) In order to avoid ecological or social collapses, explicit triggers for action need to be in place before true ecological crises are met.

(d) A strong legal framework for governance, including law enforcement, needs to be in place. A strong legal basis for both top-down actions by governments and bottom-up actions by communities are key components of successful mainstreaming.

(e) Scientific based knowledge to provide certainty.

(f) Political sectoral will is necessary in order to fix existing problems in the legal frameworks for fisheries management (from global to local scales).

(g) Need for financial sustainability, as subsidies will not be permanent.

***Challenges**:*

(a) Although in most fisheries the general nature of what needs to be done can be identified with existing knowledge (including both science, indigenous and local knowledge), fisheries decisions are fraught with different perspectives playing off uncertainties against each other.

(b) Knowledge deficits in elements such as actual maximum sustainable yield, true resilience of marine ecosystems to perturbation, among others, are a major challenge; more so when considering the high costs and difficulties of doing research in the ocean.

(c) Many of the costs of fishing (both economic costs and costs to ecosystems) are not internalized in the fisheries, so it is hard to address them in efforts to improve fishery performance on any dimension.

(d) Improve fishers' understanding that it is in their interest to make changes that primarily are intended to improve the biodiversity part of the ecosystem-scale outcomes.

(e) To find a common language within the fisheries sector represents a big challenge given its diversified nature.

(f) There is a need for significant capacity-building for the fisheries sector.

(g) A system of law enforcement in high seas, which will imply high costs, needs to be set in place.

(h) Highly selective fishing methods and gear needs to be developed and used.

(i) There is a need for a change of paradigm in fisheries economics; it is necessary to assess and provide information on the cost of no action.

***Opportunities**:*

(a) Better communication strategies and tools can be developed to tell the stories and reach a variety of audiences, as there are successes at all scales of fisheries in terms of addressing problems on any of the three dimensions of sustainability.

(b) Greater awareness of fisheries issues in many stakeholder communities, but particularly consumers, can build a much larger voice to call for action on the issues at both government and industry/civil society scales.

(c) Synergies all along the supply chains can be explored.

(d) Many inconsistencies and lack of coherence in laws and regulations across sectors and between fisheries and environmental governance can be fixed easily if there is the political will to do so.

(e) Interactions among international agencies (CBD with FAO, IMO, ISA, etc.) are typically very good at secretariat and expert levels to provide a common knowledge basis for action on mainstreaming fisheries. This in turn, is a great opportunity for progress on improved coherence in policies and practices of fisheries, if Parties to these agencies also act in coherent ways during meetings of these organizations.

(f) Diversified employment and incomes in coastal communities can reduce pressure to maintain or further increase fishing pressure on ecosystems. That will in turn allow transition plans for displaced fishers to be developed and lasting improvements can be realized.

(g) Reducing overcapacity, allocating user rights (including at the community scale), reducing wastage, and enhancing aquaculture.

(h) Ending harmful and costly subsidies and diverting financial resources could provide funding for transitioning plans for fisheries that need to reduce capacity.

Agriculture

***Elements**:*

(a) There is widespread consensus that our current food systems are unsustainable.

(b) There is a close relation between agriculture, biodiversity, and worrisome global nutritional trends (malnutrition, obesity); biodiverse forms of agriculture offer important pathways to health and sustainability.

(c) A key element is to internalize and recognize the contribution of biodiversity and ecosystem services in agricultural production. This has relevance in both small scale and large scale agriculture, and may need to be addressed in different ways, but with a common focus on agriculture as an ecological and social system.

(d) The role of traditional knowledge in agriculture has much to contribute to a biodiversity-based agriculture and needs to be recognized.

(e) It is important to further analyse the trend that only a few varieties of species are devoted to agriculture and to understand how to diversify production schemes and consumption patterns. It is necessary to monitor and create information mechanisms that evidence the impacts of agriculture to biodiversity, and the positive contributions of agriculture to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.

(f) The role of subsidies indicates that there is substantial funding flowing to the agriculture sector that may undermine biodiversity, suggesting a greater scope to bring biodiversity concerns into public policies in agriculture.

***Challenges**:*

(a) Some of the main challenges are how to evidence the environmental cost of cheap food taking into account externalities.

(b) Introduce more attention to biodiversity in supply chains, enlist the engagement of consumers through widely available information, ensure efficiency of agricultural production within the areas already devoted to agriculture (produce more on less land, yet produce differently and more sustainably through enhancing ecosystem services and reduce food waste).

(c) Monitor long-term impact of agriculture subsidies and its effects on biodiversity.

(d) Create a common ground within the agricultural sector; and redirect public funding for agriculture to integrate biodiversity elements.

Opportunities:

(a) Opportunity to advance the common agenda between the biodiversity, agriculture, food and climate change agenda within the SDGs, creating linkages between different sectors.

(b) Strengthen work with small scale and family farm producers and nutritional values across landscapes and communities (e.g. public procurement strategies, underutilized monitory crops, school feeding linking ecological farmers to schools).

(c) The importance of involving the business and private sector, and taking advantage of consumer patterns should be stressed; this includes working more closely with the organic and natural product markets, including Slow Food and heritage systems.

(d) The knowledge of indigenous communities, in particular women who often have a finely articulated relationship with local biodiversity, is an important resource that can be supported by community seed banks.

(e) The true cost of agricultural production should reflect the costs – but also possibilities for positive externalities and benefits – to the environment and biodiversity. A stronger evidence base is needed to document synergies and trade-offs in generating agricultural yields and ecosystem services.

(f) Innovative public policies should be proposed and developed to reorient the agricultural sector, recognizing its dependence on biodiversity for sustainability; a few possibilities mentioned include incorporating biodiversity concerns into credit schemes for farmers, and the possible window of opportunity that may open in the climate change agenda for decarbonation.

Tourism

***Elements**:*

(a) Ensure vertical and horizontal coherence among multiple institutions and policy tools in order to prevent conflicts among them.

(b) Develop a coherent regulatory framework towards better tourism, policy enhancing, sustainable financing and job creation.

(c) Improve coordination between tourism and other sectors.

***Challenges**:*

(d) Strengthen enforcement in land use planning at different scales (subnational and local) and tourism regulation as a mean to increase and articulate sectoral investments on landscapes.

(a) Consolidate responsible engagement of local communities and governments.

(b) Develop an expanding industry without more pressure on biodiversity.

(c) Make more affordable ecotourism.

(d) Promote models of sustainable tourism with financial aids.

(e) Tourism infrastructure development promoting the use of local facilities.

(f) Available information on biodiversity values of the regions.

*O**pportunities**:*

(a) Increase positive incentives to promote ecological or sustainable tourism enhancing public-private alliances.

(b) Provide a framework towards better policy coherence.

(c) Reinvest revenues of tourism sector on ecosystem conservation to increase public awareness.

(d) Dialogue among different sectors.

(e) Biodiversity awareness of local communities and others like private sector.

(f) Job creation in local communities.

(g) Good practices and lessons learned.

Common findings across sectors

Some of the mentioned key messages are very specific for each sector; however, it was identified that the following elements, challenges and opportunities for biodiversity mainstreaming are common across sectors:

Elements:

- A **strong legal framework** for governance, including law enforcement.
- **Scientific based knowledge** to provide certainty.
- **Political will** is necessary in order to fix existing problems in the legal frameworks.
- There is a need for **financial sustainability**, as subsidies will not be permanent.

Challenges:

- Sectoral decisions based on **different perspectives** of what needs to be done.
- Finding a **common language** between productive sectors and environmental governance, and even within each sector because of its diversified nature.
- There is a need for significant **capacity-building** for actors in each sector.

***Opportunities**:*

- **Greater awareness** of biodiversity not only among stakeholder communities but also among consumers, involving both government and industry/civil society to call for action.
- **Interactions among international agencies** provide a common knowledge basis for mainstreaming sectors. This allows to improve the coherence in policies and practices.
- There are several examples of **good practices and lessons learned** from each sector, with successful elements susceptible for being shared, replicated and disseminated.

CROSS-SECTORAL MAINSTREAMING: ENABLING CONDITIONS, POLICIES AND TOOLS AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

After the discussions about mainstreaming in productive sectors, workshop participants also considered cross-sectoral mainstreaming issue, identifying enabling conditions, policies and tools and institutional arrangements necessary for successful mainstreaming. The key elements, challenges and opportunities identified are described below:

Enabling conditions

Elements:

(a) A need for more ambitious action on biodiversity since there are declining biodiversity trends at the global level and the loss will have adverse impacts to environment and human well-being.

(b) There is a need to remove or reform environmentally harmful subsidies; private sector engagement; improve data, metrics, indicators, including economic valuation of biodiversity; mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into other policy areas and sectors.

(c) Approaches on national ecosystem valuation and accounting are being implemented in countries; however, there is a need to scale up these efforts.

(d) The design of instruments is key to ensure outcomes, baselines and monitoring as well as identifying winners and losers, must be taken into account in order to build compensatory measures.

(e) Law and policy is important since attainment of most of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets will require implementation, including legal and policy frameworks, socioeconomic incentives aligned to such frameworks, public and stakeholder engagement, monitoring and enforcement.

(f) Coherence of policies across sectors and the corresponding government ministers is necessary to deliver effective actions.

(g) Coherent institutional frameworks and coordinated policies.

(h) Tailored tools that take into consideration the scale of the problem, that use evidence-based information, and communication transmitted in a compelling and effective way to stakeholders and communities.

***Challenges**:*

(a) Governance must look beyond the CBD through an institutional framework and horizontal approach and by bringing effectiveness to policy through better coordination. Ensure that cross-cutting issues include all areas of expertise and increase efforts to coordinate in proper ways.

(b) Conflict resolution must have a win-win-win approach that considers economic, environmental and social benefits but also acknowledge that compromises have to be made.

(c) There is a lack of high-level political coordination mechanisms and political will must translate into power to implement.

(d) More collaboration and engagement of business in biodiversity and broad accessibility to economic instruments and incentives.

(e) It is important to recognize there is a number of mainstreaming issues which biodiversity is competing with.

***Opportunities**:*

(a) Integrating the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into sectoral areas, with a particular emphasis on promoting sustainable use.

(b) Raising awareness about cross-cultural values of biodiversity.

(c) Using clear messages for making the case of biodiversity.

(d) Developing instruments to foster traditional values and scaling them up into national public policy.

(e) Mainstreaming of biodiversity is believed to work; however, it is difficult to quantify the value of mainstreaming approaches. Moderators of projects/programme consistently contribute to success.

(f) Monitoring results and impact is extremely relevant in order to communicate in appropriate ways and make the case for biodiversity.

(g) Biodiversity must be positioned in other fora such as G20 or G7.

(h) There is also a need to identify champions in other sectors to assure integration.

(i) Biodiversity can benefit from job creation and should be highlighted.

(j) Further work is needed to link science and at the national level through well designed platforms.

Policies and tools

Elements:

(a) A plethora of tools to support mainstreaming biodiversity into cross-sectoral policies/processes, including budget tracking, positive incentives (payment for ecosystem services, PES), natural capital accounting/valuation, ecosystem assessments, sectoral biodiversity assessments, expenditure reviews, safeguards, reforming harmful subsidies, legislation, public procurement policies, economic assessments.

(b) Need to know more about uptake of tools and the success of their application to improve the evidence base for what works, where, when and why in order to help countries to choose between tools/methods/approaches/mechanisms.

(c) Characteristics of success include developing sectoral and cross-sectoral complementary legislation (e.g. fisheries and sustainable development laws).

(d) National assessments should be designed with the input of multiple sectors/ ministries/ departments so that there is ownership of the information, and the findings should use the language of the target audience.

Challenges:

(a) There are few global environmental assessments that have acceptance across multiple sectors – IPBES (Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services) assessments were supposed to address this but there was concern among the participants that

IPBES is becoming dominated by the "environment sector"; and how to incorporate indigenous and local knowledge.

(b) Application of expenditure reviews to support biodiversity mainstreaming include that such reviews are often narrowly focused on economic factors and need more environmental dimensions.

(c) When using legislation as a tool for mainstreaming, more insight is needed regarding how the case studies of legislation that are supportive of mainstreaming are working on the ground.

(d) There is not enough understanding of the enabling conditions necessary for reform of harmful subsidies; national assessments of harmful subsidies are not widespread, preventing transparency on the true costs/benefits of perceived "harmful" subsidies; and that the timing of costs incurred by reforming subsidies does not align with when the benefits will start to be realised – the latter challenge potentially being addressed by developing a transition plan of subsidy reform.

Opportunities:

(a) Include developing sectoral biodiversity assessments (e.g. FAO State of the World's Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture), and undertaking an study of assessments to identify which ones influence different sectors of key importance to biodiversity and then identify how biodiversity issues and the findings of planned environmental assessments could be incorporated into such assessments.

(b) The opportunities for scaling up the application of such a tool includes that there have been successful examples that can be built upon (e.g. such as BIOFIN).

(c) More opportunities for biodiversity mainstreaming that arose during the discussions on tools, but that did not directly relate to the application of specific tools included:

- Outcomes of COP21 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) forcing various sectors to consider their operations could be a window of opportunities for discussing the role of biodiversity/ecosystem services in climate change mitigation and adaptation actions in their sectors.
- Engaging with sectors that have a cross-sectoral influence, such as the insurance industry. Specific opportunities for engagement with the insurance industry include working on environmental degradation and what this means for risk and the implications of this for insurance policy issuance and on the impact of insurers investment portfolios on biodiversity.
- Demonstrate applicability of such tools to implementing the SDGs.

Institutional arrangements

Elements:

(a) Linkage of science and policy. Open data, transparency, and information sharing among sectors to support decision-making.

(b) Create and strengthen cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms to enable biodiversity mainstreaming across sectors.

(c) Interconnectivity. Need for a cross-cutting process for knowledge, financing, management (either different ministries involved, for instance inter-ministerial committees), sharing responsibilities with clear mandate. Clear legal framework in place, and ensure enforcement capacities.

Challenges:

(a) Identify common agendas and win-win situations between the biodiversity community and sectors; "*Sectors as part of the solution rather than the problem*".

(b) Effective communication across different audiences and sectors, acknowledging their various views and interests.

(c) Taking into account the economic dimension of the use of biodiversity in early stage planning among sectors.

Opportunities:

(a) Clarity of biodiversity objectives.

(b) Develop NBSAP with the participation, involvement and ownership of relevant sectors. Integrate biodiversity into national green growth planning.

(c) Refresh the message, "*Go beyond the extinction message*".

(d) SDGs provide a great opportunity – and are powerful tool – to position biodiversity at the highest national agenda.

THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS (SDGs)

The 2030 Agenda and the SDGs are themselves a tool for mainstreaming biodiversity into different sectors and a new driving force towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

Opportunities*:*

(a) They provide orientation to a potential next Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (post 2020).

(b) Make the case for integration of biodiversity into development planning, poverty eradication strategies.

(c) Broaden support for NBSAP implementation and revision processes, and make the link to other national strategies (such as poverty alleviation).

(d) Address biodiversity in a multidimensional way.

(e) Represent a unique opportunity to obtain non-traditional data on loss of biodiversity, scenarios and emerging scenarios.

(f) SDG implementation will promote, among other things:

- Understanding the role of biodiversity into other goals
- Policy coherence among the goals
- Integration and linkage of national strategies and planning
- Coordinated institutional mechanisms
- Sectoral alignment
- Financial alignment (e.g. BIOFIN)
- Spatial alignment of priorities
- Catalytic investments; entry points that bring multiple development benefits across the SDGs – and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets - as opposed to tackling SDGs individually.

*C**hallenges**:*

(a) Undertake coordinated action between developed and developing countries to achieve the SDGs, taking into account the three dimensions of sustainable development.

(b) There is a need for policy coherence: managing trade-offs and maximizing synergies across targets and across sectors with different priorities and perspectives (competing priorities need to be reconciled – risks that investments on particular targets can have on other yargets need to be balanced).

(c) Trade-offs will be necessary (e.g. to fish more would alleviate poverty, but will pose a threat to biodiversity).

(d) Investment in developing knowledge, baselines and monitoring systems are needed.

(e) We need to continuously overcome silo thinking (strengthen sectoral communication and coordination).

(f) In order to achieve both SDGs and Aichi Biodiversity Targets, it is necessary to change production and consumer patterns through a wide range of market and non-market mechanisms.

(g) There is a need to ensure means of implementation and resource allocation and mobilization (funds diversification, expenditure effectiveness, sector alignment, multiple target finance architecture and planning).

(h) The implementation of goals and targets on biodiversity relies on the revitalized global partnership to mobilize all available resources, in line with the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development.

(i) Alignment of SDG and CBD indicators.

(j) Find ways to bring a common approach from the international negotiations into integrated and coherent national policies.

(k) There is a need to humanize biodiversity to effectively achieve the 2030 Agenda and SDGs.

Some of the general recommendations that participants expressed in order to overcome the identified challenges are:

- Maintain and enhance partnerships and involve multidisciplinary teams to develop integrated solutions considering the challenges.
- Interact with – and integrate the work of – United Nations institutions, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and others (e.g., FAO, OECD, etc.).
- Involve civil society organizations, as they can play an important role in enhancing communication, visibility, relations with media and alliances with different sectors.
- Incorporate the private sector as a key stakeholder in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.
- Encourage information development and identify and exchange good practices and success case studies.
- Develop a strong monitoring process and standardize reporting; measurement is critical in order to replicate.
- Involve more cities and urban areas into the debate of biodiversity mainstreaming.
- Support and work with sectors to identify how they can contribute to biodiversity conservation and how biodiversity contributes to their economies and long-term goals.

- Mainstream biodiversity through a positive approach (e.g. sustainable use) rather than focusing on the negative (species loss, degraded land, etc.).
- Consider spatial and regional approaches into mainstream national and subnational planning.

Annex II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CBD PARTIES					
Mr.	Andreas Obrecht	Senior Policy Advisor for Biodiversity	International Affairs Division - FOEN	Switzerland	andreas.obrecht@bafu.admin.ch
Mr.	Andrew Bignell	Manager, Strategic Partnerships	Department of Conservation	New Zealand	abignell@doc.govt.nz
Mr.	Axel Benemann	Representative, International Cooperation on Biodiversity	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB)	Germany	axel.benemann@bmub.bund.de
Mr.	Cesar Azurdia	National Coordinator, Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol	National Council of Protected Areas	Guatemala	raxtul@yahoo.com
Ms.	Fumiko Nakao	Director, Global Biodiversity Strategy Office	Ministry of Environment	Japan	fumiko_nakao@env.go.jp
Mr.	Hayo Haanstra	Team Coordinator, Natura 2000	Ministry of Economic Affairs	Netherlands	h.j.haanstra@minez.nl
Mr.	Hector Soldi	Representative	Ministry of Environment	Peru	hsoldi@gmail.com
Mr.	Imole McDonald	Technical Officer	Department of Natural Resources & the Environment, Ministry of the Presidency	Guyana	imcdonald@nre.gov.gy
Mr.	Jae C. Choe	National Focal Representative	National Institute of Ecology	Republic of Korea	bomnamool@gmail.com
Ms.	Jeanine Volken	Head of International Sustainable Agriculture Unit	Federal Office for Agriculture	Switzerland	jeanine.volken@blw.admin.ch
Ms.	Laure Ledoux	Policy Officer for Biodiversity	Directorate-General Environment	European Commission	laure.ledoux@ec.europa.eu
Mr.	Marcel Kok	Programme Leader, Environment and Development	Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency	Netherlands	marcel.kok@pbl.nl
Ms.	Mette Gervin Damsgaard	Head of Section, Biodiversity and Species, Nature Agency	Ministry of Environment	Denmark	megda@nst.dk

Mr.	Mike Ipanga Mwaku	Director of Sustainable Development	Ministry of Environment, Conservation of Nature and Tourism	Democratic Republic of Congo	mikeipanga@yahoo.fr
Mr.	Mostafa Madbouhi	Head of Service of Natural Sites	Service of Natural Sites, Ministry of Energy, Mines, Water and Environment	Morocco	mostamad@yahoo.fr
Ms.	Natalya Minchenko	Head of Biodiversity and Landscape	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection	Belarus	minchenkonataly@gmail.com
Ms.	Norsham Latip	Undersecretary	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Malaysia	norsham@nre.gov.my; josephine@nre.gov.my; therese@nre.gov.my
Mr.	Peter Gullestad	Specialist Director	Ministry of Fisheries	Norway	peter.gullestad@fiskeridir.no
Mr.	Randolph Edmead	Director, Department of Physical Planning and Environment	Ministry of Sustainable Development	Saint Kitts and Nevis	raedmead@yahoo.com; phyplskb@sisterisles.kn
Mr.	Rastislav Rybanic	General Director for Nature and Landscape Planning	Ministry of Environment	Slovakia	rastislav.rybanic@enviro.gov.sk
Mr.	Rodrigo Martins Vieira	Project Manager	Ministry of Environment of Brazil	Brazil	rodrigo.vieira@mma.gov.br
Ms.	Rosemarie Avila	Legal Coordinator	General Biodiversity Division, Ministry of Environment of Peru	Peru	ravila@minam.gob.pe
Mr.	Taewoo Lee Yi	Representative	National Institute of Ecology	Republic of Korea	ytw117@gmail.com; ytw117@nie.re.kr
Ms.	Tone Solhaug	Senior Adviser	Department for Biodiversity Outdoor Recreation and Cultural Heritage Ministry of Climate and Environment	Norway	tone.solhaug@kld.dep.no
Mr.	Yousef Al-Hafedh	Director	Center of Excellence for Wildlife Research	Saudi Arabia	yhafedh@gmail.com
UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATIONS					
Mr.	Alberto Pacheco	Regional Seas Programme Coordinator	UNEP ROLAC	Panama	alberto.pacheco@unep.org

Ms.	Carina Van Weelden	Programme Officer	UNEP Mexico	Mexico	carina.vanweelden.affiliate@pnuma.org
Mr.	Dan Leskien	Senior Liaison Officer	FAO	Italy	dan.leskien@fao.org
Mr.	Dirk Glaesser	Director, Sustainable Development Programme	United Nations World Tourism Organization	Spain	dglaesser@unwto.org
Ms.	Dorothee Georg	Programme Officer	UNEP- Mexico	Mexico	dorothee.georg@pnuma.org
Mr.	Edgar R. Gonzalez	Director of the Sustainable Development Programme	UNDP- Mexico	Mexico	edgar.gonzalez@undp.org
Mr.	Gerardo Arroyo O'Grady	Director, Sustainable Development Programme	UNDP- Mexico	Mexico	gerardo.arroyo@undp.org
Mr.	Lyes Ferroukhi	Regional Technical Adviser Ecosystems and Adaptation to Climate Change	UNDP Regional Centre for Latin America and the Caribbean	Panama	lyes.ferroukhi@undp.org
Ms.	Mariana Bellot	National Coordinator	BIOFIN Mexico, UNDP	Mexico	mariana.bellot@undp.org
Mr.	Mark Zimsky	Senior Biodiversity Specialist, Regional Program Manager, Latin America and the Caribbean	GEF	United States of America	mzimsky@thegef.org
Mr.	Robert Munroe	Senior Programme Officer	UNEP - WCMC	United Kingdom	robert.monroe@unep-wcmc.org
Ms.	Yolanda Saito	Legal Specialist	IDLO	Italy	ysaito@idlo.int
INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES REPRESENTATIVES					
Ms.	Lucy Mulenkei	Executive Director	Indigenous Information Network of Kenya	Kenya	mulenkei@gmail.com
Ms.	Maria Yolanda Teran	Researcher	Andes Chinchasuyo	Ecuador	yolanda.teran7@gmail.com
ORGANIZATIONS					
Mr.	Alexander Mueller	TEEBAgFood Study Lead	IASS Potsdam	Germany	alexander.mueller@iass-potsdam.de
Mr.	Andreas Gettkant	Project Director, Biodiversity Governance	GIZ Mexico	Mexico	andreas.gettkant@giz.de

Ms	Barbara Herren	Agricultural Expert	Ex- FAO	United States of America	bg11@mac.com
Mr.	Carlos Manuel Rodríguez	Vice President, Conservation Policy	Conservation International	Costa Rica	cmrodriguez@conservation.org
Ms.	Carolina Hazin	Global Biodiversity Policy Coordinator	BirdLife International	United Kingdom	carolina.hazin@birdlife.org
Mr.	Eduardo Rojas	Professor	Polytechnic University of Valencia	Spain	eduardo.rojasbriales@gmail.com
Mr.	Jake Rice	Vice-chair	IUCN-Fisheries Expert Group (IUCN-FEG)	Canada	jake.rice@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
		Chief Scientist, Emeritus	Fisheries and Oceans Canada		
Ms.	Jeanine Ferreti	Chief, Environment and Social Safeguards Unit	Inter-American Development Bank (IADB)	United States of America	janinef@iadb.org
Mr.	Jose Koechlin	Chief Executive Officer	Inkaterra	Peru	jose.koechlin@inkaterra.com;
Ms.	Katia Karousakis	Administrator - Climate Change, Biodiversity and Development Division	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	France	katia.karousakis@oecd.org
Ms.	Marianne Alker	Advisor Environment and Climate Change	GIZ	Germany	marianne.alker@giz.de
Mr.	Mauricio Bellon	Principal Scientist	Bioversity International	Mexico	m.bellon@cgiar.org
Mr.	Peter Hazlewood	Director, Ecosystems and Development	World Resource Institute (WRI)	United States of America	phazlewood@wri.org
Mr.	Raul Benet	Senior Manager CLIMA	Rainforest Alliance	Mexico	rbenet@ra.org
Ms.	Sonia Moreno	Senior Policy Officer	International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	Switzerland	sonia.penamoreno@iucn.org
MEXICO DELEGATION					
Mr.	Andrew Rhodes	General Director of Institutional Development and Promotion, Directorate of International Affairs	National Commission of Protected Natural Areas (CONANP)	Mexico	andrew.rhodes@conanp.gob.mx

Mr.	Angel Osorio	Undersecretary of Public Works and Environmental Regulation	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	angel.osorio@semarnat.gob.mx
Mr.	Cesar Murillo	General Director of Integral Management of Hazardous Materials and Activities	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	cesar.murillo@semarnat.gob.mx
Mr.	Cesar Rafael Chávez	General Director of Environmental Policy and Regional Integration	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	cesar.chavez@semarnat.gob.mx
Mr.	Christopher Duifhuis	Deputy Director of Regulations and Aquaculture Health	National Commission for Aquaculture and Fisheries (CONAPESCA)	Mexico	cduifhuisr@conapesca.gob.mx
Mr.	Enrique Mejia	Manager of Water Quality	National Commission of Water (CONAGUA)	Mexico	enrique.mejia@conagua.gob.mx
Ms.	Felicitas Sosa	Representative	National Institute of Fisheries (INAPESCA)	Mexico	felicitas.sosa@semarnat.gob.mx
Mr.	Gustavo Gonzalez	Director of Forests Health and Conservation of Genetic Resources	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	gustavo.villalobos@semarnat.gob.mx
Mr.	Hesiquio Benítez	General Director of International Cooperation and Implementation	National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	Mexico	hbenitez@conabio.gob.mx; deai@conabio.gob.mx
Ms.	Hilda González	Manager of Forestry Environmental Services	National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR)	Mexico	hilda.gonzalez@conafor.gob.mx
Ms.	Isabel Lopez	Deputy Director of Georeferencing Tourist Offer	Ministry of Tourism (SECTUR)	Mexico	alopeze@sectur.gob.mx
Mr.	Jose Armando Alanis de la Rosa	Manager of Forest Environmental Services	National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR)	Mexico	jalanis@conafor.gob.mx
Mr.	José Fernando De la Torre Sánchez	Director of the National Center for Genetic Resources Preservation	National Institute of Forestry, Agriculture, and Livestock Research (INIFAP)	Mexico	delatrorre.fernando@inifap.gob.mx

Mr.	Jose Juan Hernandez	Deputy Director of Monitoring to the Ecological Zoning	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	juan.chavez@semarnat.gob.mx
Mr.	Jose Medina Mora de Leon	General Coordinator of Education and Technological Development	National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR)	Mexico	jose.medinamora@conafor.gob.mx
Mr.	Juan Antonio Mateos	National Coordinator of COP 13 of the CDB	Official of the Federal Government of Mexico	Mexico	juan.mateos@semarnat.gob.mx
Mr.	Juan Bernardo Orozco	Particular Secretary of the General Coordinator of International Affairs	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries and Food (SAGARPA)	Mexico	borozco.dgai@sagarpa.gob.mx
Mr.	Manuel Barclay	General Director of Sustainable Tourism Zoning	Ministry of Tourism (SECTUR)	Mexico	mbarclayg@sectur.gob.mx
Ms.	Marisol Velarde	Deputy Director of Communication	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	marisol.velarde@semarnat.gob.mx
Ms.	Martha Aurea	Representative, International Affairs	National Commission for Aquaculture and Fisheries (CONAPESCA)	Mexico	mestradaj@conapesca.gob.mx
Ms.	Norma Munguía	General Director of Primary sector and Renewable Natural Resources	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	norma.munguia@semarnat.gob.mx
Mr.	Omar Ayala	Department Chief, General Direction of Global Issues	Ministry of International Affairs (SRE)	Mexico	oayala@sre.gob.mx
Mr.	Oscar Manuel Ramirez	Director of Priority Species for Conservation	National Commission of Protected Natural Areas (CONANP)	Mexico	oramirez@conanp.gob.mx
Mr.	Oscar Sosa	Expert in Agriculture - Fisheries Science	Center for Scientific Research and Higher Education of Ensenada, Baja California	Mexico	ososa@cicese.mx
Mr.	Rafael Pacchiano	Minister of Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	rafael.pacchiano@semarnat.gob.mx

Mr.	Rafael Aaron Romero	Deputy Director of Genetically Modified Organism (GMO) Judgment	National Health Service Food Safety and Quality (SENASICA)	Mexico	rafael.romero@senasica.gob.mx
Mr.	Raul Urteaga	General Coordinator of International Affairs	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries and Food (SAGARPA)	Mexico	raul.urteaga@sagarpa.gob.mx
Mr.	Ricardo Villon	Representative, Engineering Management and Technical Standards	National Commission of Water (CONAGUA)	Mexico	ricardo.villon@conagua.gob.mx
Mr.	Roberto Dondisch	General Director of Global Issues	Ministry of International Affairs (SRE)	Mexico	rdondisch@sre.gob.mx
Ms.	Yolanda Aurora Alaniz	Undersecretary of Management for Environmental Protection	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	yolanda.alaniz@semarnat.gob.mx
MEXICO ORGANIZING TEAM					
Ms.	Aída Peña	Director of Blue Agenda, International Affairs Coordination Unit	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	aida.pj@semarnat.gob.mx
Mr.	Alonso Martinez	Deputy Director of International Affairs	National Commission of Protected Natural Areas (CONANP)	Mexico	alonso.martinez@conanp.gob.mx
Ms.	Andrea Cruz	Coordinator of Biodiversity Strategies and International Cooperation	National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	Mexico	acruz@conabio.gob.mx
Ms.	Diana López	Specialist in Biodiversity, COP 13 Organizing Team	National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	Mexico	diana.lopez@conabio.gob.mx
Ms.	Fernanda Montero	Advisor	BIOFIN Mexico, UNDP	Mexico	fernanda.montero@undp.com
Ms.	Jesica Ayala	Deputy coordinator of International Affairs, COP 13 Organizing Team	National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	Mexico	jayala@conabio.gob.mx

Ms.	Laura Rodríguez	Specialist in International Affairs, Directorate of International Cooperation and Implementation	National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	Mexico	laura.rodriguez@conabio.gob.mx
Ms.	Lucia Ruiz	Environmental Economics Adviser to the National Commission of Natural Protected Areas	National Commission of Protected Natural Areas (CONANP)	Mexico	lucia.ruiz@conanp.gob.mx
Ms.	Maria Antonieta Ricoy	Deputy Director, Blue Agenda, General Direction of Multilateral Environmental Agreements, International Affairs Coordination Unit	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	México	antonieta.ricoy@semarnat.gob.mx
Ms.	Mireille Linares	Deputy Director, General Direction of Multilateral Environmental Agreements, International Affairs Coordination Unit	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	mireille.linares@semarnat.gob.mx
Ms.	Nélida Barajas	Coordinator of International Affairs, COP 13 Organizing Team	National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	Mexico	nbarajas@conabio.gob.mx
Ms.	Paola Ivanova Diaz	Intern, General Direction of Multilateral Environmental Agreements, International Affairs Coordination Unit	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	asp.comerciales2@semarnat.gob.mx
Ms.	Paola Mosig	Coordinator of International Cooperation and Implementation	National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	Mexico	paola.mosig@conabio.gob.mx
Ms.	Ruth Rivas	Specialist in Biodiversity, COP 13 Organizing Team	National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	Mexico	ruth.rivas@conabio.gob.mx

Ms.	Paola de Maria y Campos	Assistant, COP 13 Organizing Team	National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	Mexico	paolademariaycampos@yahoo.com
Ms.	Sharon Macías	Liaison, International Environmental Forum, International Affairs Coordination Unit	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	sharon.macias@semarnat.gob.mx
Ms.	Sofía Treviño	Specialist in Cooperation and International Affairs, Directorate of International Cooperation and Implementation	National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	Mexico	sofia.trevino@conabio.gob.mx
Mr.	Tonatiuh Luna	Deputy General Director of Logistics Support, Administrative Office	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Mexico	tonatiuh.luna@semarnat.gob.mx
SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY					
Ms.	Amy Fraenkel	Principal Officer, Mainstreaming, Partnerships and Outreach	Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity	Canada	amy.fraenkel@cbd.int
Mr.	Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias	Executive Secretary	Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity	Canada	braulio.dias@cbd.int
Ms.	Christine Estrada	Programme Assistant, Science, Assessment and Monitoring	Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity	Canada	christine.estrada@cbd.int
Mr.	David Cooper	Deputy Executive Secretary	Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity	Canada	david.cooper@cbd.int

Annex III

WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

International Expert Workshop on Biodiversity Mainstreaming: Mexico City, 17-19 November 2015

Venue: Hotel Grand Fiesta Americana Chapultepec, Mariano Escobedo #756, Miguel Hidalgo, Col. Anzures, Cd. de México.

Time	Session
Day 0	**Monday November 16, 2015**
9 a.m. - 5 p.m.	*Arrivals*
5 - 6 p.m.	*Registration/ Team meeting*
Day 1	**Tuesday November 17, 2015**
7.30 - 8.30 a.m.	*Meeting of chairs, moderators, presenters and organizers*
8 - 9 a.m.	*Registration (continued)*
9 - 9.30 a.m.	**Opening – welcoming remarks** Minister of Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico, **H.E. Mr. Rafael Pacchiano Alamán** Representative of COP Presidency (Republic of Korea), **Mr. Jae C. Choe** National Coordinator for COP 13, **Mr. Juan Antonio Mateos** Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), **Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias**
9.30 - 10 a.m.	**A) Introduction to the workshop:** • Mexico's vision for COP 13, and aims of the workshop, **Ms. Nelida Barajas, CONABIO** *10 min* • Mainstreaming: key findings of GBO-4, **Mr. David Cooper, SCBD** *10 min* • Mainstreaming under the CBD, **Ms. Amy Fraenkel, SCBD** *10 min*
10 - 10.15 a.m.	*Q&A, discussion*
10.15 - 10.30 a.m.	*Coffee Break*
10.30 - 11 a.m.	**B) Mainstreaming in productive sectors and country experiences:** **I. Forests** (Moderator: **Mr. Eduardo Rojas, Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, Spain**) General overview: **Mr. Eduardo Rojas, Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, Spain** *10 min* The experience of Brazil: **Mr. Rodrigo Martins Vieira, Ministry of Environment of Brazil** *10 min* The experience of Mexico: **Mr. José Armando Alanís de la Rosa, CONAFOR** *10 min*
11 - 11.30 a.m.	*Q&A and discussion*
11.30 a.m.- 12 p.m.	**II. Fisheries** (Moderator: **Mr. Jake Rice, Fisheries and Oceans Canada**) General overview: **Mr. Jake Rice, Fisheries and Oceans Canada** *10 min* The experience of Norway: **Mr. Peter Gullestad, Norwegian Fisheries Directorate** *10 min* The experience of Peru: **Mr. Hector Soldi, Ministry of Environment of Peru** *10 min*
12 - 12.30 p.m.	*Q&A and discussion*
12.30 - 1.45 p.m.	*Lunch*
2 - 3 p.m.	**Discussion in two sectoral breakout groups: forests and fisheries**
3 - 3.30 p.m.	**III. Agriculture** (Moderator: **Ms. Barbara Herren, Agricultural Issues Expert (ex-FAO)**) General overview: **Ms. Barbara Herren, Agricultural Issues Expert (ex-FAO)** *10 min* The experience of Guyana: **Mr. Imole McDonald, Ministry of Environment of Guyana** *10 min* The experience of Switzerland: **Ms. Jeanine Volken, Federal Office for Agriculture of**

	Switzerland *10 min*
3.30 - 4 p.m.	*Q&A and discussion*
4 - 4.30 p.m.	**IV. Tourism** (Moderator: **Mr. Andrew Rhodes, CONANP, Mexico**) General overview: **Mr. Jose Koechlin, Inkaterra, Peru** *10 min* The experience of Mexico: **Mr. Manuel Barclay Galindo, SECTUR, Mexico** *10 min* The experience of Kenya: **Ms. Lucy Mulenkei, Indigenous Information Network of Kenya** *10 min*
4.30 - 5 p.m.	*Q&A and discussion*
5 - 6 p.m.	**Coffee and discussion in two sectoral breakout groups Agriculture and Tourism**
6 - 7 p.m.	**Report of discussion groups (**Moderator: **Mr. David Cooper, SCBD)** **Key messages and wrap-up**
7.30 - 10 p.m.	**Welcome Reception: Business and Biodiversity, W Hotel** Representative German Government: **Mr. Axel Benemann, BMUB** Natural Protected Areas Commissioner: **Mr. Alejandro del Mazo Maza** Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD): **Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias**
Day 2	**Wednesday November 18, 2015**
9 - 10.30 a.m.	**C) Cross-sectoral mainstreaming** **Panel 1. Enabling conditions** (Moderator: **Ms. Amy Fraenkel, SCBD**) *10 min for introduction* 1. Economic incentives and perverse subsidies: **Ms. Katia Karousakis, OECD** *10 min* 2. The Economics of Ecosystem Biodiversity: **Mr. Alexander Mueller, TEEBAg Food Study Lead, IASS Potsdam** *10 min* 3. Legal and Policy frameworks: **Ms. Yolanda Saito, IDLO** *10 min* 4. Financing for Biodiversity Mainstreaming: Key lessons from the GEF Portfolio: **Mr. Mark Zimsky, GEF** *10 min*
10.30 - 11 a.m.	*Q&A and discussion*
11 - 11.15 a.m.	*Coffee Break*
11.15 a.m. - 12 p.m.	**Panel 2. Policies and tools** (Moderator: **Mr. Robert Munroe, UNEP-WCMC**) *10 min for introduction* 1. New developments on biodiversity in MDB environmental and social safeguards: **Ms. Janine Ferreti, IADB** *10 min* 2. Tools and Approaches for mainstreaming biodiversity in the EU: **Ms. Laure Ledoux, General Directorate Environment- European Commission** *10 min* 3. Country case study, **Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez, Costa Rica** *10 min*
12 - 12.30 p.m.	*Q&A and discussion*
12.30 – 1.45 p.m.	*Lunch*
2 - 3 p.m.	**Panel 3. Institutional arrangements: Inter-ministerial, stakeholder engagement, subnational, and indigenous peoples and local communities (**Moderator: **Mr. David Cooper, SCBD)** *10 min for introduction* 1. **Mr. José Sarukhán,** CONABIO *10 min*s 2. **Ms. Mette Gervin Damsgaard**, Ministry of Environment of Denmark *10 min* 3. **Ms. Fumiko Nakao**, Ministry of Environment of Japan *10 min* 4. **Ms. Yolanda Teran**, Andes Chinchasuyo of Ecuador *10 min*
3 - 3.15 p.m.	*Q&A and discussion*
3.15 - 3.30 p.m.	*Coffee break*
3.30 - 5.30 p.m.	**Discussion in groups**

	Challenges, opportunities and actions for cross-sectoral mainstreaming issues in break-out groups: Panel 1: Enabling conditions (Moderator: Ms. Amy Fraenkel, SCBD) Panel 2: Policies and tools (Moderator: Mr. Robert Munroe, UNEP-WCMC) Panel 3: Institutional arrangements (Moderator: Mr. David Cooper, SCBD)
5.30 - 5.45 p.m.	**Break**
5.45 - 7 p.m.	**Report of breakout groups and discussion in plenary and Key Messages (**Moderator: **Ms. Amy Fraenkel, SCBD)**
7 - 8.30 p.m.	*Cocktail: Offered to all participants by SEMARNAT - Hotel Grand Fiesta Americana Chapultepec*
Day 3	**Thursday November 19, 2015**
9 - 10 a.m.	**Opportunities for biodiversity mainstreaming: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (**Moderator: **Mr. Hesiquio Benítez, CONABIO)** *10 min for introduction* • The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs: **Mr. Roberto Dondisch, Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs** *10 min* • The role of biodiversity in the SDGs: **Mr. Lyes Ferroukhi, UNDP** *10 min* • Implications for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and COP 13: **Mr. Andreas Obrecht, Federal Office for the Environment of Switzerland** *10 min*
10 – 10.30 a.m.	*Q&A and discussion*
10.30 - 10.45 a.m.	*Coffee Break*
10.45 - 12.45 p.m.	**Plenary Discussion on opportunities at COP 13 for strengthening biodiversity mainstreaming** (Moderator: **Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, Convention on Biological Diversity**) What can we do to turn this into results at COP? Elements for COP decisions Elements for Ministerial Declaration for High-level Segment at COP 13 Actions and pledges
12.45 - 1.45 p.m.	*Lunch*
3 - 4 p.m.	**Key messages (Mr. Hesiquio Benítez, CONABIO; Mr. David Cooper and Ms. Amy Fraenkel, SCBD)** main conclusions of the workshop Plenary Discussion
4 - 4.30 p.m.	**Closure of the workshop** SCBD, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico, CONABIO, Representative of Switzerland

_____