



**Convention on
Biological Diversity**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/INF/14
14 May 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP
ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE CONVENTION

Third meeting

Nairobi, 24-28 May 2010

Item 5.1 of the provisional agenda*

REVISING AND UPDATING OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN BEYOND 2010

***Report of the of the informal expert workshop on the updating of the Strategic Plan of the Convention
for the post-2010 period***

Note by the Executive Secretary

1. The Executive Secretary is circulating herewith, for the information of participants in the third meeting of the Ad Hoc Opened-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, the report of the informal expert workshop on the updating of the Strategic Plan of the Convention for the post-2010 period, which was held in London from 18 to 20 January 2010. The report is being submitted by the Governments of Brazil and the United Kingdom, Co-Chairs of the meeting.
2. The report is being circulated in the form and language in which it was received.

* UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/1.

/...



Convention on
Biological Diversity

Ministério do
Meio Ambiente



**REPORT OF THE INFORMAL EXPERT WORKSHOP ON THE
UPDATING OF THE
STRATEGIC PLAN OF THE CONVENTION FOR THE POST-2010
PERIOD**

LONDON, JANUARY 2010

Hosted by

- UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)
- Ministry of the Environment, Brazil

In collaboration with

- Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

Co-chaired by

- Huw Irranca-Davies, *UK Minister for Marine and Natural Environment*, and;
- Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito, *Brazil Secretary for Biodiversity and Forests*.

Session Chairs

- Peter Unwin, *Director General, Environment & Rural Group, Defra*
- Peter Schei, *Director of Fridtjof Nansen Institute and Co-Chair of Trondheim Biodiversity Conference*

Organising Committee

- John Robbs, *Director of Wildlife and Countryside Group; Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK*
- Braulio Dias, *Director of Biodiversity Conservation, Ministry of the Environment, Brazil*
- David Cooper, *CBD Senior Programme Officer, UNEP – Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity*
- Martin Brasher, *Deputy Director of Wildlife and Countryside Group; Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK*
- Kathrina Mannion, *Team Leader, International Biodiversity Policy; Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK*
- Tony Gross, *Ministry of the Environment, Brazil*
- Maximiliano Arienzo, *Department of the Environment, Ministry of External Relations, Brazil*
- Sharon McAuslan, *International Biodiversity Policy; Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK*
- Robert Hoft, *Environmental Affairs Officer, UNEP – Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity*
- David Oren, *Biodiversity Coordinator, Ministry of Science and Technology, Brazil*
- Natasha Walker, *Workshop Facilitator*
- Andrew Stott, *Science Director; Joint Nature Conservation Committee, UK*
- Jerry Harrison, *Head of Development; UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre*
- Matt Walpole, *Head, Ecosystem Assessment Programme, UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre*
- Anna Pierides, *International Biodiversity Policy; Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK*

INTRODUCTION

1. The Workshop was an informal expert consultation co hosted by the Governments of Brazil and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and organised in cooperation with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD). The Workshop took place from 18 to 20 January 2010 in London, UK. This is the full report of the meeting. It captures the range of views expressed during the workshop but does not represent a consensus agreed by all participants
2. The regionally balanced workshop brought together Government nominated experts from 52 countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Comoros, Cook Islands, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, EU Commission, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Indonesia, Japan, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Palau, Palestine, Poland, Saint Lucia, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, UK, USA, Vietnam, Zambia.
3. The workshop also included representatives of a number of international, inter-governmental, and non-governmental organisations: Trondheim Biodiversity Conference, TEEB, IUCN, Peoples Forest Programme, Inter-Academy Panel of the Royal Society, UNEP WCMC, IEEP, Birdlife International, WWF, IFAP and Globe International.
4. A list of participants is provided at Annex 1

Aims and objectives

5. The purpose of the workshop was to provide an informal setting where participants, in an open and consultative manner, could discuss ideas, expectations, proposals and suggestions associated with the review of the new CBD Strategic Plan and consider the needs and priorities to support its implementation. It also aimed to stimulate thinking about national biodiversity strategic planning beyond 2010 in the light of the possible outcomes of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in October 2010.
6. The Workshop provided a key opportunity to help inform participants and facilitate engagement in advance of Nagoya in October 2010. The outcomes from the workshop will be used to contribute to more discussions in the run-up to Nagoya, including the preparation of the revised Strategic Plan for the Convention by the SCBD.

Workshop agenda

7. The meeting followed the provisional agenda as set out in UNEP/CBD/SP/EW/1/Add.1 and provided at Annex 2.
8. The workshop included a number of presentations from keynote speakers, followed by a number of working sessions on different topics. The topics included 'lessons learned from working towards the 2010 target and opportunities and challenges for the post-2010 period', 'developing a post-2010 framework of goals and targets' and 'implementation needs and mechanisms'.
9. The working sessions included table activities and discussions and plenary feedback sessions. 'Speakers' Corner' exercises also took place, in which representatives from different countries provided their personal perspectives on the various topics under discussion, each time based on their national experience. The working sessions also consisted of fishbowl discussions, with various country representatives participating in summary discussions at the close of each day. The working sessions and overall facilitation of the workshop was guided by an external facilitator (Natasha Walker).

I. OUTCOMES OF THE WORKSHOP

Views indicated in this summary from the workshop are not necessarily representative of, or agreed by all participants.

A: General themes that emerged from the workshop:

- Urgent action is especially needed to avoid reaching tipping points/critical thresholds leading to irreversible loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services, with dangerous consequences for human well-being. Already coral reefs are in crisis.
- It is essential to address the underlying causes and drivers (both direct and indirect) of biodiversity loss and unsustainable use. The mainstreaming of biodiversity into all policies and sectors needs to be promoted.
- The value of biodiversity, as part of natural capital, should be integrated into national and international accounting systems and into decision-making and policy at all levels taking into consideration the findings of TEEB (The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity).
- The science base is becoming more robust and we have a better understanding than we did before of the relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem services, and that biodiversity is needed to maintain resilience and provide multiple services for a range of beneficiaries. However, work on the science base needs to continue and to be built on, and we need to strengthen the science/policy links, through for example, the establishment of an international science policy platform. The full range of knowledge at different scales, including all disciplines and traditional knowledge needs to be harnessed.
- The pressing issues of biodiversity and climate change are inextricably linked and there needs to be convergence at international and national levels in efforts to address both sets of issues in a mutually reinforcing manner. There are opportunities for achieving this that cannot be missed in 2010 with CBD COP10 and UNFCCC COP16 and with the preparations for RIO+20.
- The CBD needs to shift its focus towards emphasis on supporting and facilitating implementation, especially at national and local levels. COP should use the Strategic Plan to set the agenda and then COP should review progress, share experience and address the obstacles to implementation.
- The objectives of the Convention can only be met through effective national action, including at the local level, and the NBSAPs need to be revised and adopted as a policy instrument, with strengthened implementation mechanisms and institutions, to achieve the mission and targets of the post-2010 Strategic Plan. This will also require enhanced capacity building.
- Mechanisms to enable Parties to comply with commitments within the Convention, including implementation of the Strategic Plan, need to be further developed.
- There is a need for increased financial resources for effective implementation of the Convention.
- There is a need to achieve greater alignment of GEF with the Strategic Plan and enable it to provide adequate, predictable and timely support to the implementation needs of the Parties.
- It is important to effectively meet the third objective of the Convention and ensure its benefit-sharing objectives are realised and implemented.

- Communication to many different audiences is crucial to success. There is a need for specific communication plans for the Strategic Plan and NBSAPs.
- More concrete action is needed urgently. COP10 provides an opportunity for Parties to demonstrate examples of their actions to share with other Parties.

B: Key points that emerged from discussion of the Strategic Plan:

- The Strategic Plan should enable quicker and more effective implementation of the CBD and facilitate a more focussed and targeted approach. It should build on the previous plan and the lessons learnt from its implementation. It should also provide a short and simple focus for the Convention.
- The Strategic Plan should set out the global aspiration and provide a flexible framework for the national commitments by Parties which are collectively necessary to achieve this aspiration.

Vision

The vision should be motivational, inspirational, relate to everyone and be convincing to political leaders and citizens. It needs to be short and easily translatable to different levels, languages and groups; it should be inspirational, specific and strong; and it should provide a strategic horizon to be underpinned by measurable targets in the Strategic Plan. It should apply to the 3 objectives of the CBD. A slogan could also be helpful. Suggested elements in the vision include:

- halting biodiversity loss
- respecting ecological limits
- sustainable use and positive change in behaviour
- restoring biodiversity
- relating to people – human well-being, ecosystem services
- link to Millennium Development Goals
- portraying values in a broader sense, including intrinsic values and economic values
- living in harmony with nature

Mission

Key elements suggested:

- timescale to 2020
- halting biodiversity loss *or* taking the actions necessary to halt biodiversity loss *or* reducing *or* where possible halting biodiversity loss
- restoring biodiversity
- links to human well-being
- equitable sharing of benefits

Targets

- Targets should be based on science and experience. They should be realistic but also ambitious enough to achieve the mission and put us on the path to achieving the long-term vision. They need also to be sufficiently ambitious to keep us within safe ecological limits and avoid passing tipping points.
- Targets need to be SMART and no more than 20 in total.
- Targets should cover the following issues:
 - direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss - for example targets on mainstreaming, targets on integrating the value of biodiversity into national accounting systems and sustainability plans, and targets on sustainable consumption
 - conservation of priority areas for biodiversity including areas outside protected areas
 - provision of ecosystem services
 - restoration
 - adaptation to climate change
 - resources

- capacity building
- access and benefit sharing
- public awareness and participation
- improving the knowledge base and making sure it is widely available and used
- adopting and revising NBSAPs as national policy instruments
- ecological footprint

Implementation Needs and Mechanisms

- Innovative financing and resource mobilisation, for example: linking biodiversity to REDD financing, polluter pays and/or user pays for the benefits received, subsidy reform, positive incentives, and certification.
- More efficient and innovative sharing of best practice, tools, methods and experience, technology transfer.
- Better mainstreaming, such as integrating biodiversity into sectors of policy making including national planning systems, educational systems, linking biodiversity to MDGs.
- Increased capacity building.
- Better engage international and regional organisations whose mandates cover sectors that use or impact on biodiversity issues in order to address the drivers of biodiversity loss.
- Increase and enhance public awareness and understanding of biodiversity through, for example, campaigns for public awareness, understanding public opinion, engaging the media.
- Ensure involvement of all stakeholders from the beginning of programmes and projects.
- Better measures or metrics to communicate trends in biodiversity and ecosystem services, including their values.
- Strengthen monitoring, auditing and review at country and global level and effectively communicate the results to decision-makers and the public. Clearing House Mechanisms or biodiversity centres at national and international levels could facilitate sharing of information.
- Encourage partnerships at local level to improve implementation.

Improving the function of CBD Bodies & Mechanisms

- The Strategic Plan sets the framework and agenda for all elements of the Convention.
- Parties need to report on their commitments and progress towards achieving them.
- COP needs to focus on keeping under review and improving implementation of the Convention using the Strategic Plan to set the agenda. COP should review progress, share experiences and address the obstacles to implementation including the possible consideration of an implementation protocol.
- Enhance the role of the Ministerial segment of the COP to support implementation of the Convention, leading to significant agreed outcomes.
- Other bodies and mechanisms of the Convention may need to be adjusted. Suggestions included: a subsidiary body on implementation to replace WGRI; using the proposed IPBES to support SBSTTA work; using SBSTTA to advise COP, identify tools to support implementation, and define needs for work by the proposed IPBES; strengthening Clearing House Mechanisms to facilitate exchange of information and expertise; reviewing financial mechanisms; developing mechanisms to improve compliance.
- Consider support for national implementation including the role of the Secretariat, UN agencies and regional bodies.
- Facilitate greater regional interaction, cooperation and sharing of expertise and experience.
- Consider how to strengthen the synergies among the various biodiversity Conventions.
- Simplify communications within the Convention including, for example, making available existing guidance in a more usable form in supporting implementation.

II. REPORT OF THE WORKING SESSIONS

Session 1 – Opening of the workshop:

Chaired by Peter Unwin, Director General, Environment & Rural Group, Defra.

10. Peter Unwin welcomed participants to the meeting and introduced the representatives of the Governments of the UK and Brazil, Hilary Benn, UK Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito, Brazilian Secretary for Biodiversity and Forests, who also co-chaired the workshop.
11. Hilary Benn spoke of the need for a post 2010 target that gains political commitment and makes things happen, and the need to get economics, policy, science and politics to work in one direction. Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito spoke of possible targets to ensure enhanced implementation of the three objectives of the Convention, including supporting mechanisms such as an IPBES and improved technology transfer. By video address, Carlos Minc, Brazilian Minister of Environment, spoke of some of the successes at the national level, and the hope that the International Year of Biodiversity would serve as a wake-up call for the whole planet. The formal opening session was concluded with a welcome from Ahmed Djoghlaif, Executive Secretary of CBD who outlined the process for revising the CBD Strategic Plan.

Session 2 – Scene Setting: Overview of the Programme and background presentations:

Chaired by Peter Unwin, Director General, Environment & Rural Group, Defra.

12. Natasha Walker, the workshop facilitator, provided an introduction to the workshop, outlining the objectives of the conference, the workshop design and the content of the three days. This introduction was followed by presentations from Professor Alastair Fitter, Matt Walpole and Pavan Sukhdev. The session ended with a panel discussion.
13. The first presentation was by Professor Alastair Fitter, representing the Royal Society Inter-Academy Panel, who outlined the Communiqué from the recent Inter-Academy Panel Biodiversity Conference held in London the previous week. He noted that biodiversity loss, climate change, ecosystem change and food security are linked problems; therefore, solutions are closely related and must be addressed jointly and coherently. He further underlined that new and inter-disciplinary research is urgently needed to provide solutions and that solving biodiversity loss must be achieved at all scales. He also stated that the most important and vulnerable ecosystems need to be prioritised and addressed through clear biodiversity and ecosystem management.
14. Matt Walpole, from UNEP-WCMC, continued with his presentation outlining a summary of biodiversity status, trends and future scenarios based on the findings of the Third Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO3). This concluded that although the 2010 biodiversity target has helped to stimulate important action to safeguard biodiversity, actions taken to implement the CBD have not been on a sufficient scale to address the pressures on biodiversity. The presentation continued by outlining the multiple indications of continuing decline in biodiversity. Furthermore, Mr. Walpole summarised the main messages from GBO, which included the importance of addressing underlying drivers, of considering risks of tipping points and the opportunities for future action.
15. Pavan Sukhdev, leader of the global study on The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity study (TEEB), spoke about the TEEB work and gave views on the opportunities for examining and increasing knowledge of biodiversity loss beyond 2010. Through illustrative case studies, he explained the true economic costs and benefits of biodiversity and how this needs to be better taken into account in policy and decision-making. Mr. Sukhdev suggested that it was

essential to agree measurable targets for biodiversity that include ecosystem services and recognise economic benefits of biodiversity.

16. The first morning session ended with a panel discussion, which covered the objectives of the workshop alongside the reactions of the participants to the morning's sessions. Views were sought on the current international biodiversity landscape and the state of biodiversity. Discussion focussed on the challenge of incorporating biodiversity in national accounting, and the challenges of ensuring effective implementation, including through Protected Areas.

Session 3 – Lessons learned from working towards the 2010 target and opportunities and challenges for the post 2010 period:

Co-chaired by Huw Irranca-Davies, UK Minister for Marine and Natural Environment and Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito, Brazil Secretary for Biodiversity and Forests.

17. Session 3 began with an introduction from the co-chairs and a brief summary of the morning sessions' work. A presentation followed by David Cooper from the CBD Secretariat, who spoke of the implementation of the Convention; including lessons learned from experience and implications for the future. He addressed the latest progress and challenges relating to the development of the revised Strategic Plan.
18. This was followed by an in-depth working session on 'Lessons learned – successes and challenges of working towards the 2010 target and opportunities for post-2010 period'. The working session began with a Speakers' Corner exercise, with speakers representing the Cook Islands, Ghana, Mexico, Norway and Egypt. Each representative stood and gave their personal perspective on what they viewed as their national successes and challenges.
19. After the Speakers' Corner exercise, the workshop moved to table discussions on '**Experiences**'. Delegates discussed in detail their views on what they regarded as having been a success, what they would prefer to 'quit', and what to change about the current Strategic Plan and experiences of working towards the 2010 target. For the outputs from this first table discussion on experiences see Annex 3.
20. The second table discussion of Session 3 built on the challenges and opportunities previously identified, by focussing on the rationale/issues behind the Strategic Plan, the scope of the Strategic Plan and the overall Vision. Discussion on the rationale/issues underpinning the Strategic Plan included the opportunity to mainstream biodiversity and support intersectoral coordination as well as providing a mechanism to address biodiversity loss. Discussion on the scope of the Strategic Plan included thoughts on the Plan establishing a baseline and the need for a clear goal. Opinions of participants on the overall vision of the Strategic Plan included the need for more understanding of the value of biodiversity, including its intrinsic value. The outputs from the table discussions are attached at Annex 4.
21. The first day ended with a fishbowl session in which one participant from each of the 10 groups joined a central table for further discussions about the issues relating to the Strategic Plan that had been discussed at the tables. The other participants of the workshop observed the proceedings, and were given the opportunity to add their comments from time to time. The debate focussed on the need to act strategically with regard to the Strategic Plan and the need to focus on priorities in order to maximise limited resources. Elements that were considered missing included the need to inspire people, the fact that drivers still need to be discussed, the issue of compliance and the need for links to economic sectors and to other conventions.
22. This first day of the workshop was followed by a reception held at the Natural History Museum, with addresses from : Peter Unwin, Defra; Dr. Mike Dixon, the Natural History Museum's Chief Executive; Nicola Breier from the COP Presidency and Masayoshi Mizuno from the forthcoming COP Presidency.

Session 4 – Developing a post 2010 framework of goals and targets:

Chaired by Peter Schei, Director of Fridtjof Nansen Institute and Co-Chair of Trondheim Biodiversity Conference.

23. The second day of the workshop began with a recap of the previous day's discussions. Key messages, 'the catch of the day' included:
 - The importance of valuing national capital in economic terms;
 - The importance of working smarter beyond 2010;
 - The need for enhanced implementation
24. The Facilitator outlined the two objectives of the second day as 'working out the mission and 2010 targets (the strategic "what")', and 'plotting out how to get there (the strategic "how")'.
25. Robert Hoft, CBD Secretariat, began the fourth session with a presentation on the development of a post 2010 framework of goals and targets. He described a possible outline for the new plan and the elements included in it, including the vision, the mission and mechanisms to support the implementation of the new Strategic Plan.
26. Participants from Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, St Lucia and the UK spoke in another Speakers' Corner exercise. These participants gave their personal perspective on developing a post 2010 framework of goals and targets based on their experience in their own countries.
27. Table discussions followed on the strategic 'what': developing a post 2010 framework. This included discussions on a possible mission, possible targets (both elements to be included and views of potential sub targets), and the key sub targets with the most impact.
28. Criteria for the mission were discussed, with some of the table results concluding that the mission should address pressures and key drivers, demonstrate urgency and priorities and pave the way for action. Furthermore, it was stated that it should be science-based, contain the CBD objectives and be ambitious but support realistic targets. As a communication tool it should know its audience.
29. Target suggestions included having a target on building capacity, a target with global/local relevance and addressing the mechanisms for effective achievement. The full list of suggestions from this discussion is provided at Annex 5.
30. Based on the discussion, four possible Mission Statements were suggested:
 - To reduce or where possible halt the loss of biodiversity, restore valuable habitats to favourable conservation status, to improve the resilience of ecosystem services supplies (against human threats) and to ensure the equitable sharing of benefits generated.
 - To take the necessary, urgent actions to halt loss and restore biodiversity, enhance capacity of ecosystems to provide services, and equitably share benefits as a contribution to human wellbeing and poverty reduction.
 - Sustain life on earth: safeguard and restore biodiversity and reduce the threats it faces, staying within ecological limits, in order to improve its status, prevent extinctions and enhance ecosystem services, while equitably sharing the benefits, thus contributing to human wellbeing and poverty eradication. To ensure that all countries have the means to achieve this.
 - By 2020, to have taken the necessary, urgent and concerted efforts/actions to halt biodiversity loss, restore it and enhance the capacity of ecosystems to provide sustainable services, contributing to human wellbeing and poverty reduction.

Session 5 – Implementation needs and mechanisms

Chaired by Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito, Brazil Secretary for Biodiversity and Forests.

31. The fifth session considered 'how' it will be possible to ensure enhanced implementation beyond 2010.
32. Braulio Dias, Director of Biodiversity and Conservation, Brazil Ministry of the Environment gave a presentation on implementation mechanisms and needs, supported by examples from Brazilian experience, highlighting the need for good information, clear targets and priorities, an adequate legal framework, effective governance, stakeholder participation, effective policy control and incentive instruments, responsible consumption patterns and business environmental responsibility.
33. A final Speakers' Corner followed, with representatives from Belize, China, Netherlands, Poland and South Africa giving their personal perspective on implementation.
34. Table discussions followed on the topic of implementation needs and mechanisms; the strategic "How". There were five topic areas discussed, and under each one participants considered what can be done at national, regional and international level, what is needed, and what the top two success factors would be. The areas discussed were:
 - **Improving functioning of CBD bodies and mechanisms;**
 - **Involving stakeholders;**
 - **Mainstreaming biodiversity;**
 - **Monitoring and review;**
 - **Tackling resource and capacity building.**
35. Themes emerging included the issue of compliance, the need for stronger synergies amongst Conventions and the need to strengthen support for Parties to meet national implementation. For the extended results from the table discussions see Annex 6.
36. A fishbowl session followed related to the five topics, with participants discussing what can be done at national and international level and what needs to be anchored in the Strategic Plan. With regard to tackling resource and capacity building the fishbowl discussions concluded, amongst other things, the opportunity for biodiversity arising from climate change adaptation financing.
37. With regard to mainstreaming, discussions concluded that the strategic plan should provide guidance to parties on tools and techniques to mainstream biodiversity frameworks into national planning and policy, as well as introducing Green GDP accounting systems.
38. On the issue of stakeholders, participants highlighted the need to enhance ownership and increase transparency as well as communication of TEEB to the private sector and the need to increase involvement of local communities by providing more incentives to participate.
39. In terms of monitoring, auditing and reviewing, fishbowl discussions suggested adopting smart targets and clear baselines and effective cooperation/coordination between countries.
40. Finally on CBD bodies and Implementation, participants in the fishbowl discussions spoke of the potential for a subsidiary body to replace the ad hoc open ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (WG-RI), the need for diversification of funding agencies and the need to avoid 'doubling up' and maximising support at regional levels.
41. The sessions on the second day ended with a summary discussion to reflect upon participants' thoughts on the relevance of the discussions and on how results will play a role in the

development of the Strategic Plan. Many of the points raised were mutually supportive and/or reinforced by more than one group. In particular the issue of how to use the Strategic Plan to make the links, for instance between improving effectiveness of CBD processes and also on monitoring/review. Compliance was another common theme, but the need for firstly strengthening support for Parties to meet national implementation was emphasised. Stronger synergies among Conventions were also welcomed, both at the national and MEA level.

Session 6 – Conclusions (Synthesis and Recommendations):

Co-Chaired by Huw Irranca-Davies and Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito.

42. This sixth session on the third and final day of the workshop asked the participants:

- ‘Are we strategic enough in our advice on improving the Strategic Plan’; and
- ‘What do we need to clarify before we leave’?

The facilitator introduced the day’s agenda and presented reflections from the first two days of the discussion. A plenary discussion followed, with the discussion focussing on the Vision of the Strategic Plan, the function and audience for the new plan, CBD and related processes, and implementation.

43. Participants were asked to identify any outstanding issues not covered or concluded in the discussion to date and asked to convene mini-workshops to explore these issues. Ten workshops were held to further consider:

- i. New actions declared in COP10 and the post 2010 Strategic Plan
- ii. CBD Housekeeping / streamlining process
- iii. Communicating the message of biodiversity
- iv. A post 2010 Vision
- v. Implementation now! Local level action
- vi. Genetic resources – world/local level
- vii. Role of Science
- viii. Sustainable land use management – a tool for biodiversity-conservation
- ix. How to influence/what to offer to UNFCCC
- x. Urban biodiversity conservation and conservation outside protected areas

The extended results from the mini-workshops are provided at Annex 7.

Session 7: Close

44. The summary report was presented and discussed in a Plenary session, chaired by Huw Irranca Davies and Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito. This summary report is presented below.

II. Annexes

Annex 1: List of participants

<p>M. Hugues Akpona Chef, Division Planification, Suivi et Evaluation Direction Générale des Forêts et des Ressources Naturelles Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Protection de la Nature Cotonou Benin Email: hadak01avr@yahoo.fr akpona@gmail.com bmbc1957@yahoo.fr</p>	<p>Mr. Eric Amaning Okoree Assistant Director Biodiversity/Biosafety Desk Ministry of Environment, Science Accra Ghana Email: eriokor@yahoo.com eric.okoree@gmail.com</p>
<p>Mr. Maximiliano da Cunha Henrique Arienzo Department of the Environment, Ministry of External Relations Brazil Email: maximiliano.arienzo@itamaraty.gov.br</p>	<p>Mr. Neville Ash, Head, Ecosystem Management Programme IUCN 28 rue Mauverney, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland Email: Neville.Ash@iucn.org</p>
<p>Mr. Boukar Attari Conseiller Conseil National del 'Environnement pour un Développement Durable Niamey Niger Email: biocnedd@intnet.ne attariboukar@yahoo.fr</p>	<p>Mikako Awano CBD Senior Officer WWF Japan Email: mikakoa@wwf.or.jp</p>
	<p>Hilary Benn MP Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) United Kingdom</p>
<p>Leon Bennon Birdlife Email: leon.bennun@birdlife.org</p>	<p>Dr. Lars Berg Division for Natural Resources Ministry of the Environment Stockholm Sweden Email: lars.berg@environment.ministry.se</p>
<p>Ambassador Diann Black-Layne Ministry of Foreign Affairs Queen Elizabeth Hwy St. John's Antigua and Barbuda Email: dcblack11@gmail.com or dcblack11@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Eric Blencowe Head of Branch International Biodiversity Policy Unit Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Room 1/10, 2 The Square, Temple Quay Bristol, UK Email: eric.blencowe@defra.gsi.gov.uk</p>

<p>Peter Bos Ministry of Agriculture, nature and Food Quality The Netherlands Email: p.w.bos@minlnv.nl</p>	<p>Martin Brasher Deputy Director of Wildlife and Countryside Group Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Zone 1/10B, 2 The Square, Temple Quay Bristol, UK Email: martin.brasher@defra.gsi.gov.uk</p>
<p>Mrs. Nicola Breier Head of Division N I 4 International Nature Conservation Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety Bonn Germany Email: Nicola.Breier@bmu.bund.de</p>	<p>Patrick ten Brink Senior Fellow and Head of Brussels Office Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP) Quai au Foin 55 / Hooikaai 55 1000 Brussels, Belgium Email: PTenbrink@ieep.eu</p>
<p>Ms. Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito Secretary for Biodiversity and Forests Ministry of the Environment 70.730-542 Brasil</p>	<p>Dr. Sirikul Bunpapong Director Biological Diversity Division Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning Bangkok Thailand Email: sirikb@yahoo.com sirikul@onep.go.th</p>
<p>Mme Abdou Chakour Chadhouliati Biologiste et Chef du laboratoire de phytopathologie Ministère de l'Agriculture, de la Pêche, de l'Environnement, de l'Énergie, de l'industrie et de l'Artisanat Moroni Comoros Email: chadhouliati5@yahoo.fr chadhouliati@comorestelecom.km</p>	<p>Dr. Lena Chan Deputy Director (Biodiversity Centre) National Parks Board Singapore Botanic Gardens Singapore Singapore Email: Lena_CHAN@nparks.gov.sg</p>
<p>Ms. Somaly Chan Director, Dept. of International Conventions and Biodiversity Ministry of Environment Phnom Penh Cambodia Email: somalychan@hotmail.com icbd@moe-gdancp.org</p>	<p>Counselor Carolina Perez Colman Argentine Embassy 65 Brook St London W1K 4AH Email: carolinaperezcolman@argentine-embassy-uk.org</p>
<p>David Cooper CBD Senior Programme Officer, Interagency and Programme Coordination CBD Secretariat 413, Saint Jacques Street, suite 800 Montreal QC H2Y 1N9 Canada Email: David.cooper@cbd.int</p>	<p>Huw Irranca Davies Minister for Marine and Natural Environment Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) United Kingdom</p>

<p>Dr. Bráulio Ferreira de Souza Dias Director of Biodiversity Conservation, Ministry of the Environment 70.730-542 Brasil Email: braulio.dias@mma.gov.br</p>	<p>Biol. Hesiquio Benitez Diaz Director Enlace y Asuntos Internacionales National Biodiversity Commission (CONABIO) Mexico D.F. Mexico Email: hbenitez@conabio.gob.mx</p>
<p>Ahmed Djoghlaif CBD Executive Secretary 413, Saint Jacques Street, suite 800 Montreal QC H2Y 1N9 Canada Email: Ahmed.Djoghlaif@cbd.int</p>	<p>Dr. Kassahun Embaye Deputy Director General Institute of Biodiversity Conservation and Research Addis Ababa Ethiopia Email: ddg-ibc@ethionet.et ddg@ibc-et.org</p>
<p>Dr. Dalia Maria Salabarría Fernández Head of Environmental Management Department, Centre for Environmental Information Management and Education. Ministry for Science Technology and Environment Cuba Email: dalias@ama.cu</p>	<p>Alistair Fitter Department of Biology (Area 2) University of York PO Box 373 York, YO10 5YW UK Email: ahf1@york.ac.uk</p>
	<p>Dr. Moustafa Fouda Director Nature Conservation Sector Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency Cairo Egypt Email: foudamos@link.net</p>
<p>Lic. Carlos Hernán García Director General de Biodiversidad Dirección de Biodiversidad Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente (SERNA) Tegucigalpa Honduras Email: Carlosga2004@yahoo.es</p>	<p>Stephanie Godliman Darwin Initiative Secretariat Room 3D Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) 17 Smith Square Nobel House London Email: stephanie.godliman@defra.gsi.gov.uk</p>
<p>Tony Gross Ministry of the Environment 70.730-542 Brasil Email: anthony.gross@mma.gov.br</p>	<p>Dr. Bożena Haczek Minister's Councillor Department of Nature Protection Ministry of the Environment Warsaw Poland Email: bozena.haczek@mos.gov.pl</p>
<p>Dr. Xu Haigen Professor and Deputy General Director Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences Ministry of Environment Protection China Email: xhg@nies.org or xuhgs@sina.com</p>	<p>Jerry Harrison Head of Development UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre 219 Huntingdon Road Cambridge CB3 0DL United Kingdom Email: Jerry.Harrison@unep-wcmc.org</p>

<p>Sra. Dolores Hedo Consultora Ministerio de Medio Ambiente, y Medio Rural y Marino Subdireccion General de Biodiversidad Madrid Espana Email: dhc@tragsa.es</p>	<p>Dr Geoff Hicks Department of Conservation New Zealand Email: ghicks@doc.govt.nz</p>
<p>Robert Hoft CBD Environmental Affairs Officer, Scientific Assessment CBD Secretariat 413, Saint Jacques Street, suite 800 Montreal QC H2Y 1N9 Canada Email: robert.hoft@cbd.int</p>	<p>Julian Jackson Genetic Resources policy advisor International Biodiversity Policy Unit Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Room 3B, Nobel House 17 Smith Square London, UK Email: julian.jackson@defra.gsi.gov.uk</p>
<p>Ms. Anita James Biosafety/Biodiversity Coordinator Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Fisheries and Forestry Castries Saint Lucia Email: biodivproject@slubiodiv.org anitavja@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Mr. Surya Prasad Joshi Chief of Foreign Aid Division Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation Kathmandu Nepal Email: mfsced@wlink.com.np joshi_spj@yahoo.com</p>
<p>S.M. Munjurul Hannan Khan Deputy Secretary Ministry of Environment and Forest Dhaka Bangladesh Email: munjurulkhan@gmail.com munjurulkhan@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Ms. Nona Khelaia Main Specialist, Biodiversity Protection Division Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources Tbilisi Georgia Email: nona_khelaia@yahoo.com</p>
<p>Wilma Lutsch Director of Biodiversity Conservation Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism South Africa E-mail: wlutsch@deat.gov.za</p>	<p>Mr. U Sann Lwin Secretary National Commission for Environmental Affairs Ministry of Forestry Nay Pyi Taw Myanmar Email: env.myan@mptmail.net.mm dqpsmof@mptmail.net.mm</p>
<p>Mr. Mohammed Mahassneh Director, Biodiversity Department Environmental Resources G.D. Environmental Quality Authority Palestinian National Authority Email: mahassneh2000@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Kathrina Mannion International Biodiversity Policy Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Zone 1/10, 2 The Square, Temple Quay Bristol UK Email: kathrina.mannion@defra.gsi.gov.uk</p>

<p>Sharon McAuslan Policy Advisor International Biodiversity Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Room 3B, 17 Smith Square, Nobel House London Email: sharon.mcauslan@defra.gsi.gov.uk</p>	<p>Badarch Mendbayar Director of Mongolian Nature and Environment Consortium Mongolia Email: mnec8@yahoo.com mnec@magicnet.mn</p>
<p>Kelly Milton State Department USA</p>	<p>Mr. Masayoshi Mizuno Director Global Environment Division, International Cooperation Bureau Ministry of Foreign Affairs Tokyo Japan Email: masayoshi.mizuno@mofa.go.jp</p>
<p>Sarah Moon Environment Advisor Climate and Environment Group DfID 1 Palace Street London SW1E 5HE Email: S-Moon@dfid.gov.uk</p>	<p>Elizabeth Munro Biodiversity Officer National Environment Service Islands Futures Division National Environment Service Rarotonga Cook Islands Email: liz@environment.org.ck</p>
<p>Mr. Duncan Mumba Musama , Senior Natural Resources Management Officer Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources Zambia Email: dmusama@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Ms. Naoko Nakajima Assistant Director Global Biodiversity Office Ministry of the Environment Tokyo Japan Email: NAOKO_NAKAJIMA@env.go.jp</p>
<p>Ms. Vidya Sari Nalang Head, Division for Biodiversity Conservation Biodiversity Unit Ministry of Environment Jakarta Indonesia Email: vnalang@yahoo.com vnalang@menlh.go.id</p>	<p>Sarah Nelson Policy Advisor, European and International Co- ordination Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Room 1B, 17 Smith Square Nobel House London Email: sarah.nelson@defra.gsi.gov.uk</p>
<p>Mr. Jeff Ngirarsaol Grant Coordinator Grants Office Office of the President of the Republic of Palau Koror Republic of Palau Email: purepalau09@gmail.com ropgrant@palaugov.net</p>	<p>Mr. Francis Meri Sabino Ogwal Natural Resources Management Specialist (Biodiversity and Rangelands) National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) Kampala Uganda Email: fogwal@nemaug.org</p>

<p>Dr. David Oren Biodiversity Coordinator Ministry of Science and Technology Brasília, DF Brazil Email: doren@mct.gov.br</p>	<p>Natalie Pauwels DG Environment European Commission Email: Natalie.PAUWELS@ec.europa.eu</p>
<p>Helena Pavese Regional Coordinator Latin America and the Caribbean UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre EQSW 103/104, Lote 01, Bloco C, 1 Andar 70670-350, Brasília, Brazil Email: Helena.Pavese@unep-wcmc.org</p>	<p>Lic. Edgar Selvin Pérez Pérez Director Oficina Técnica de Biodiversidad Consejo Nacional de Areas Protegidas 5a. Avenida 6-06, Zona 1, Edif. IPM, 7o. Nivel Guatemala Email: otecbio@conap.gob.gt chijunil@hotmail.com</p>
<p>Ms. Malta Qwathekana Senior Policy Advisor International Biodiversity and Heritage Cooperation Department of Environmental Affairs Pretoria South Africa Email: MQwathekana@deat.gov.za</p>	<p>John Robbs Director of Wildlife and Countryside Group Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Area 3C, 17 Smith Square Nobel House London Email: john.robbs@defra.gsi.gov.uk</p>
<p>Peter Schei CEO Fridtjof Nansen Institute P.b. 326, hysaker 1326 Norway Email: pjs@fni.no</p>	<p>Dr. Mohamed Shareef Deputy Minister Ministry of Housing, Transport and Environment Male Maldives Email: mohamed.shareef@mhte.gov.mv</p>
<p>M. Pierre Sigaud Chargé de mission au Service des Affaires Internationales Ministère de l'écologie, de l'énergie, du développement durable et de la mer Paris France Email: pierre.sigaud@developpement-durable.gouv.fr</p>	<p>M. Ahmed Skim Chef de la Division des Projets Pilotes et des Etudes d'Impact Pilotes et des Etudes d'Impact et Département de l'Environnement Secrétariat d'État Chargé de l'Eau et de l'Environnement Agdal Rabat Morocco Email: skim@environnement.gov.ma</p>
<p>Malek Smaoui Director Ecology and Natural Areas Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development Tunis Tunisia Email: dgeqv@mineat.gov.tn malek.smaoui@voila.fr</p>	<p>Tone Solhaug Senior Adviser Ministry of Environment Myntgaten 2 P.O. Box 8013 Dep. N-0030 Oslo Norway Email: Tone.Solhaug@md.dep.no</p>
<p>Mark Stevenson Senior Science Programme Officer Biodiversity and Landscapes Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Victoria House London Square, Guildford Surrey, UK Email: mark.j.stevenson@defra.gsi.gov.uk</p>	<p>Andrew Stott Science Director Joint Nature Conservation Committee Monkstone House City Road Peterborough PE1 1JY Email: Andrew.Stott@jncc.gov.uk</p>

<p>Simon Stuart Chair IUCN Species Survival Commission The Innovation Centre, University of Bath, Carpenter House, First Floor Broad Quay, Bath, BA1 1UD, UK Email: simon.stuart@iucn.org</p>	<p>Pavan Sukhdev The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) Study Leader 219 Huntingdon Road Cambridge CB3 0DL Email: pavan@unep-wcmc.org</p>
<p>Mrs. Prudence Tangham Galega Technical Adviser No. 1 Cabinet of the Minister Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection Yaoundé Cameroon Email: galegapru@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Dr. Spencer Thomas Biodiversity Coordinator Ministry of Finance, Planning, Economy, Energy, Foreign Trade and Co-operatives St. George's Grenada Email: stthomas@ectel.int</p>
<p>Ms. Cuc Nguyen Dang Thu Government official Biodiversity Conservation Agency – Vietnam Environment Administration Hanoi Vietnam Email: nguyendt.cuc@gmail.com</p>	<p>Peter Unwin Director General Environment and Rural Group Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Area 3E, 17 Smith Square, Nobel House London, UK Email: peter.unwin@defra.gsi.gov.uk</p>
<p>Ajay Vashee IFAP President Email: president@ifap.org</p>	<p>James Vause Economic Advisor Natural Environment Economics Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Room 3D, 17 Smith Square, Nobel House London, UK Email: James.vause@defra.gsi.gov.uk</p>
<p>Mrs. Ines Verleye Biodiversity Expert Federal Public Service Health, Food Chain Security and Environment - DG Environment Brussels Belgium Email: ines.verleye@health.fgov.be iverleye@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Ould Abdel Vetah Directeur de la protection de la Nature Ministere de l'environnement Mauritania Email: aabdefettah@yahoo.com</p>
<p>Matt Walpole, Head, Ecosystem Assessment Programme UNEP-WCMC 219 Huntingdon Road Cambridge CB3 0DL UK Email: Matt.Walpole@unep-wcmc.org</p>	
<p>Ms. Marina von Weissenberg Senior Adviser Land Use Department Ministry of the Environment Helsinki Finland Email: marina.weissenberg@ymparisto.fi</p>	<p>Marcelo Windsor Forest Department, Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment Belize Email: windsorbelize@yahoo.com</p>

Annex 2: Provisional agenda (as set out at UNEP/CBD/SP/EW/1/Add.1)

Monday, January 18, 2010

9.30 – 10.05 a.m.	<p>Opening of the workshop (Chair: Peter Unwin, Defra)</p> <p>Opening statements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hilary Benn, Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK • Carlos Minc, Minister of State of the Environment, Brazil (by video link, introduced by Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito, Secretary for Biodiversity and Forests, Brazil) • Ahmed Djoghlaif, Executive Secretary, Convention on Biological Diversity
10.05 – 11 a.m.	<p>Scene Setting (Chair: Chair: Peter Unwin, Defra)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to the workshop (Natasha Walker, lead facilitator and a representative of the CBD Secretariat) • Introductions by participants • Background presentations. • Biodiversity status, trends and future scenarios – findings from GBO-3 (Matt Walpole, UNEP-WCMC) • Challenges, opportunities and needs for global biodiversity – outcome of the biodiversity conference of the InterAcademy Panel (Georgina Mace, Royal Society)
11 – 11.30 a.m.	<i>Coffee/tea break</i>
11.30 – 12.45 a.m.	<p>Scene Setting (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background presentations (continued). • The Economic of Ecosystems and Biodiversity – the TEEB study (Pavan Sukhdev, UNEP) <p>Panel-led Plenary Discussion</p>
12.45 – 2 p.m.	<i>Lunch break</i>
2 – 3.30 p.m.	<p>Lessons learned – success and challenges of working toward the 2010 target and opportunities for the post 2010 period (Chair Huw Irranca-Davies)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction by the Chair and lead facilitator • Introductory Presentation on lessons from experience and implications for the future (David Cooper, CBD Secretariat) • Diverse perspectives: short statements by participants • Discussions in small groups, focussing on identification of challenges and opportunities and implications for the new Strategic Plan
3.30 – 4 p.m.	<i>Coffee/tea break</i>
4 – 6 p.m.	<p>Lessons learned (<i>continued</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interim report-back on group discussions and plenary discussion • Second round of discussions in small groups, focussing on overall rationale and vision for the new Strategic Plan • Report back to plenary by means of a discussion among participants representing the small groups and the facilitator (“fishbowl discussion”) • Concluding remarks by the Chair
6.30 p.m.	<i>Depart for evening reception</i>
7 p.m. – 9.30 p.m.	<p>Evening Reception at the Natural History Museum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome (Defra) • Address by COP-9 presidency (Jochen Flasbarth, Germany) • Address by COP-10 presidency, (Mr. Masayoshi Mizuno, Japan) • Evening Meal

Tuesday, 19 January 2010

9 – 11 a.m.	<p>Developing a post-2010 framework of Goals and Targets (the strategic “what”) (Chair: Peter Schei, Chair of the Trondheim Conference)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief recap of day one and overview of plans for day two led by the Chair and lead facilitator • Introductory Presentation on options for the framework of goals and targets (Robert Hoft, CBD Secretariat) • Diverse Perspectives: short statements by participants • Discussions in small groups to identify overall mission & “SMART” targets
11 – 11.30 a.m.	<i>Coffee/tea break</i>
11.30 a.m.– 1 p.m.	<p>Developing a post-2010 framework of Goals and Targets (continued) Plenary & inter-group discussions to identify overall mission and “SMART” targets</p>
1 – 2 p.m.	<i>Lunch break</i>
2 – 4 p.m.	<p>Implementation mechanisms and needs (the strategic “how”) (Chair: Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief introduction and recap of morning’s work by the Chair and lead facilitator, questions and comments. • Introductory Presentation on implementation needs (Braulio Dias, Brazil) • Diverse Perspectives: short statements by participants • Discussions in small groups on how to improve implementation, post-2010.
4 – 4.30 p.m.	<i>Coffee/tea break</i>
4.30 – 6 p.m.	<p>Implementation mechanisms and needs (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report back to plenary by means of a discussion among participants representing the small groups and the facilitator (“fishbowl discussion”) • Second round of discussions in small groups, identifying priorities to support implementation • Presentation of key mechanisms • Concluding remarks by the Chair

Wednesday, 20 January 2009

9 – 10.30 a.m.	<p>Synthesis & recommendations (Co-Chairs: Huw Irranca-Davies, Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief recap of day two and overview of plans for day three led by the Chair and lead facilitator, identification of any outstanding issues. • Perspectives of participants: Are we strategic enough? Is the “how” sufficient to achieve the “what”? Do we have a balance among the three objectives of the Convention? • Discussions in small groups, to ensure we have the strategic elements and necessary coherence in the new strategic plan. • Interim report back to plenary
10.30- 11 a.m.	<i>Coffee/tea break</i>
11 a.m. – 12 p.m.	<p>Synthesis and recommendations (continued) “Open space agenda”: Discussions in small groups to address outstanding issues Feedback to plenary</p>
12 – 1 p.m.	<p>Conclusions (Co-chairs: Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito and Chair Huw Irranca-Davies) Plenary Discussion on overall findings</p>
1 – 2 p.m.	<i>Lunch break</i>
2 – 3 p.m.	<p>Conclusions (continued) Presentation by Co-Chairs of overall findings and plenary discussion</p>
3 – 3.30 p.m.	<p>Closing of the workshop Concluding remarks by the Co-Chairs</p>

Annex 3: Session 3 – Current Strategic Plan/2010 target ‘Love it, Quit it, Hate it’: Flipchart outputs

Love it

- Constitutional/political commitment and momentum
- Adoption of target at highest political level (WSSD)
- We know more and are doing more
- Helped stimulate development of policies and provided clear policy direction
- Biodiversity problem more widely recognised and owned
- Stimulated more communication/awareness of biodiversity (e.g. IYB) NBSAPs and mainstreaming
- NBSAP – foundation for every action/rationale and useful to guide implementation/tool for mainstreaming biodiversity by relevant stakeholders
- NBSAPs are a driver as need to be translated into policy
- Stimulated revision of national strategies
- Adoption of national legislation
- Mainstreaming and increased awareness of environmental lingo/understanding
- Sector integration
- Use as element to drive internal cooperation
- Use as element to drive international coordination on implementation
- Paradigm for local planning
- Enhance mainstreaming
- Wide stakeholder involvement in NBSAP/ development of partnerships
- Has led to partnerships and geographical priorities
- Helped collaboration with other conventions (e.g. CITES, CMS)
- Capitalising on existing political agreements to promote biodiversity conservation
- Enhanced access to funding and helped to carry out projects
- Support to developing countries
- Transboundary approach to shared resources
- SP useful to recognise, revitalise traditional knowledge
- Increased capacity building
- Increased science base for policies & investment in science (policy relevant)
- Framework useful, including common target and sub targets - need to retain good elements
- Short Strategic Plan is good
- Managing for outcomes (envisaging the end goal)
- Target and indicators are good focus for advocacy
- Having a policy/legal framework
- Targets and indicators good; biodiversity definition too vague
- Easy to develop national targets etc from it
- SP helped to address threats for biodiversity in line with strategic plan
- Willingness to measure and monitor leading to better data for monitoring
- Has stimulated ideas and work on indicators, including developing and implementing national indicators
- Increased protected areas (global, regional)
- Valuation concept introduced
- Good links between biodiversity and people
- Co-operation with regards to transboundary biodiversity issues Move from species to ecosystem management
- Existing populations taken into account by protected area legislation
- Coral Triangle Initiative – regional approach
- Biodiversity and climate change linkages established through the AHTEG process

Quit it

- Lack of political will/not strong enough
- Lack of clarity between what are CBD commitments and what is in the Strategic Plan
- Failure to address underlying drivers (e.g. patterns of consumption, production and disposal)
- Stop preaching to the converted and get SP out to all actors/sectors
- Talking too much amongst ourselves/ single sector approaches
- Sectoral silos – political fissioning/impossible indicators
- Non integrated sectoral strategies
- Bureaucratic red tape – too many meetings/meeting papers/notifications
- Smarter meetings: reduce plethora of intersessionals
- Too many talking without action
- Too technical talk in discussions (jargon)
- Too many initiatives (e.g. G8)
- Overcomplicated strategy framework
- Unquantifiable targets
- Lack of financial, technical and technological resources
- Lack of link with GEF
- NBSAP seen as means to get international funding – didn't work
- Bad practice (negative incentive/short term incentive)
- No in-depth review of PoW
- Perverse incentives/subsidies
- SBSTTA – quit the politics; or decide on IPBES
- Need to be more positive
- Needing all information before acting
- Duplications
- Not following recommendations through effectively
- Consensus needed for everything

Change it

- Increase level of commitment
- National governments should be responsible for the protection of the environment within their territory
- Update of NBSAPs – include more realism
- Greater focus on local implementation -involve local communities (input/management plan)
- More action - strengthen natural, regional, global coordination
- Address drivers of biodiversity loss and analyse bottlenecks identified in GBO3
- Take more regional approach to implementation
- Link to climate change mitigation/adaptation strategies
- Discussion of an implementation mechanism
- Strengthen capacities
- Increase bottom up approach to decision making and implementation
- Explore different ways of approaching public awareness - translate into real change
- Focus on practical tools – such as key biodiversity areas
- Government mechanisms for revising strategies
- Prohibition does not work (sustainability is key/balanced approach)
- Promote mainstreaming -integrate biodiversity into other agendas
- Strengthen sectoral integration – bring in socio-economics
- Mainstreaming, awareness raising, understanding on linkages
- More MEA interactions (getting UNFCCC, CBD, RAMSAR, UNCCD etc working together)
- Managing versus expanding protected areas
- Broaden biodiversity focus – Ecosystem based approach rather than PAs/forests/CMF

Change it (continued)

- Room for improvement in current structure – need simpler, better, framework
- Outcomes should be measurable - adopt realistic targets, and celebrate getting there
- Stronger link between targets and means of implementation (possible target for parties linking national planning with SP)
- Early agreement on reporting regarding targets in order to integrate into NBSAPs
- Development of cross-sectoral /government targets
- Global targets need to learn from regional national and local realities (and available mechanisms) i.e. what should be at global?
- More consistent and standardized measurements of status, trends and progress
- More assistance given for monitoring and implementation and less assessment and grass root activities
- Indicators at international level need to be more realistic. Need baseline data.
- Better developed indicators & more quantitative indicators
- Change nature of CBD agreement?
- More user friendly language in CBD documents
- Meetings every three/four years, instead of two, to allow for proper implementation of decisions
- COP needs to focus on one or two issues; too much work to cover everything – need to prioritise
- Modify scope of CBD meetings
- Better use of international experts/improved international cooperation
- Decide key audience for strategic plan - is it to guide internal CBD processes or to give guidance to government/stakeholders?
- SP to be understandable at all levels (including public)
- SP is policy doc to be developed nationally for public, industry, etc
- Better 'how to' guidance
- Action-oriented plan
- Establish an IPBES (We need more policy interface)
- Adopt an ABS regime
- Interpret value of biodiversity into the SP target setting
- Increase awareness on the values of biodiversity
- Need for more marine protection
- Following up on projects
- Add performance evaluations of financial mechanisms
- Monitoring and evaluation mechanism
- Focus on incentive measures
- Simplify GEF procedures/fast track application process - Make funding easier and more predictable
- Link NBSAP to finance – clear implementation plan
- Stronger focus on incentive measures
- Integrate research and assessment better - more scientific advice/research for decision-making
- Regulation legislation consultation with all stakeholders
- Political (local involvement) linkages between the development plan
- Clearer information/communication of value of biodiversity
- Education (mind set of consumer)
- Expansion of technology and knowledge transfer
- Regional focus - tackle leakage
- Better enforcement of poaching controls etc
- More sharing of information with policy makers
- NBSAP – conflicts between federal and state
- Implementation is uneven, some areas developed and some left behind
- Enhance 'love its'
- Better communication with stakeholders, and more participation by stakeholders

Annex 4: Session 3 - Rationale behind Strategic Plan: Flipchart outputs

Rationale/Issues behind the SP:

- Consensus document 'can be adopted by all countries' - to adopt a new contract and issues
- We are failing on current objectives. Raise awareness of BD crisis and inter-linkages/relevance to other challenges (e.g. food sec, climate change)
- Inspire behavioural change to address the crisis.
- Reduce complexity - provide a framework for targets that is flexible and achievable (yet ambitious) AND helps implementation
- Help provide guidance on getting legal framework and incentives right
- Cannot just be an internal document. 1) Highlight synergies with other conventions/economic aims. 2) Needs to be a communication document to persuade non-biodiversity world
- Relationship between programs of work and SP needs to be clear
- Common approach to implementation
- Provides mechanism to address biodiversity loss
- To mainstream biodiversity and support intersectoral coordination
- Is the framework and provides what the key issues/priorities are
- To set common priorities and targets - a clear vision and purpose
- To help communicate and leverage support
- To guide the implementation of the convention
- To bring parties together for a common purpose
- It 'operationalises' the objectives of the CBD
- It is a mechanism that drives Coherence between global, regional, national and local issues
- It is an international framework that enables action at a global, regional national and local levels
- Linking BD with development and climate
- Stakeholder involvement
- Need for coordinated actions between MEAs
- Need to achieve sustainable development If don't address biodiversity wont address other things e.g. climate change, development etc.
- Inequity
- Ability to build on the previous plan to keep it consistent
- Convey clear and strong message on the importance of biodiversity and human well-being
- Strategic direction to programs of work
- Structural strategic approach taking into account new and emerging issues
- Plan should be translatable to a regional, national and community level.
- Achievable SP with clear milestone
- Must be appealing across sectors
- Ability of SP to be marketable to give value to biodiversity
- Ability to be linked to the overall vision and vice versa
- Specific quantifiable targets
- Resources for implementation
- Strengthening monitoring and assessments of biodiversity as well as the implementation of the convention assessments at the local, national, regional level
- More speeding up implementation of CBD
- Focused – develop right mechanism
- More political and operational
- Identify and overcome key obstacles
- Increasing ownership of stakeholders
- Shared vision
- Based on sound science
- Achievable within existing funding
- New and innovative funding mechanisms
- Biodiversity not well understood so need a SP to move this forward

Scope of the SP:

- Prioritise activities at all levels - international, regional, national and local.
- Adjustable to particular circumstances – flexible
- Establish a baseline and determine gaps in order to set out a roadmap
- Provide examples of what works, promote sharing of best practices/innovative solutions
- Clear defined timescale - Periodic review: mid-term
- Think globally and act locally
- Needs to address all drivers and potential drivers of loss AT ALL LEVELS international through to local. integration
- Provide implementation mechanism – monitoring, assessment/evaluation, enforcement and compliance. Links between targets and implementation
- Sustainability of implementation?
- Needs to covers all aspects of biodiversity and its benefits, inc ABS
- Harmonisation of reporting (process needs to be less onerous)
- Are we targeting groups outside current CBD i.e. guidance to those not signed up
- Needs to address ALL 3 objectives in a balanced cross sectoral approach
- Build on current SO, but focus on implementation and means (NBSAPS)
- Relevant to all countries
- Ambitious yet achievable /realistic
- Provide a common framework / guidance for NBSAPs
- Speak to/involve outer sectors and NEAs (synergy)
- Should be clear and simple
- Should have SMART targets
- Should emphasise the importance of biodiversity to human well-being and possibility for sustainable development
- Should be forward looking
- Long term vision(2050) but targets to be set for 2015, 2020 etc (shorter timeframes)
- Action Plan where specific deliverables are identified based on capacity/capability
- Set global targets, (CBD), parties to interpret and implement according to their own circumstances
- Address tensions between targets set globally and nationally (potential compliance issue)
- Need for capacity
- Financial mechanism
- Link between targets and implementation (mechanism)
- Clear and specific targets for mainstreaming (other obstacles as well)
- Globally defined and translatable to different scales (including local communities)
- Relevant to the MDG's and poverty alleviations and economic sections
- Ability to strive to build synergies of conventions beyond? Biodiversity
- Ability to stimulate? and improve implementation of biodiversity from the grass root level to national, regional, international level
- Emphasis of CEPA to reach out to other sectors e.g. finance ministries
- Means of collaboration
- Include targets, means, monitoring and evaluation tools
- The ways and means to address drivers be covered
- Link to other major stakeholders
- Recognition of social, economic, ethical value
- Something that can be tailored to all audiences - applicable to people who are going to sign it
- Starting from the bottom up
- Some reference to other related conventions – basis for partnerships with other agreements
- Build on lessons learnt
- How can innovatively bring in other sectors to mainstream
- Tailored approaches to address drivers
- Way to get consistency with all levels of government

Overall Vision:

- Long term – 2050
- Utopian and visionary
- Aspire to change for the better
- Capture new emerging issues
- Where we want to go based on where we are and what we know – realistic
- Restore ecosystems so they can provide essential services/life support services
- Catchy! – simple words that people at all levels can understand
- Also put in things like ‘resources’ to capture political imagination
- Use of the word biodiversity!*
- Something people can relate to and connect with
- Having concept of reversed decline i.e. improvement articulated
- Addressing all 3 objectives (including human well being and ABS) with clear reference to access
- Needs more on understanding of value including intrinsic values
- Does it need a specific date? It is really to help thinking about the long term
- What is the role of the vision? To unify aims/interests, to convey aim to different people, does it need to say who should act?
- Inspirational, long-term (2050), inspirational, achievable, positive
- Supported by measured milestones
- A key communication tool/slogan
- Should be a statement that is a marketing/credible device intelligible to the uniformed
- Securing the plant’s variety of life
- Biodiversity – we depend on it
- The elements of a vision statement should be the following:
 - Should work in multiple languages – tangible to all
 - Should reinforce understanding of services provided by biodiversity and why/how we depend on it.
 - Should be backed up by scientifically defensible rationale
- Halt biodiversity loss and enhance/restore biodiversity
- Improved sustainable within ecological limits/a new relationship livelihoods/ human well-being
- Sustainable within ecological limits. A new relationship/ ‘restoring’ the balance with nature
- Some elements to be considered
 - Restoration
 - Ecosystem services
 - Human well-being
 - Sustainable use
 - Mainstreaming
- Vision to be clear, simple, short and realistic
- Part of objective to look at ‘HALT biodiversity loss’
- Living in harmony with nature
- Halt loss of and restore biodiversity and ecosystem services
- Need to be linked to ambitious meaningful target

Annex 5: Session 4 - Target discussions

A possible mission

- Needs to:
 - Be ambitious/realistic
 - Be science-based (with IPBES advice and non-political)
 - Follow climate change example
 - Consider who is it for/who are we trying to convince? Initiate concerted and urgent action by 2015
 - Comprehensively be underway by 2020
 - Stop biodiversity loss, start restoration of biodiversity ecosystems services, sustainably manage biodiversity, equitable sharing of benefits, human well-being
 - Focus on objective 1 (=strategic) or balance? Urgency = stop loss
- A milestone towards achieving the convention's vision with measurable progress in:
 - Reducing the loss of biodiversity
 - Restoration
 - The sustainable use for human well-being
 - Mainstreaming
- Change behaviour towards biodiversity. Reduce ecological footprint or reduce negative impacts on biodiversity or secure sustainable production and consumption
- Must be a good communication tool (simple, clear and objective).
- Take necessary urgent actions to halt loss and restore biodiversity, enhance, capacity of ecosystems, to provide services to equitably share benefits as contribution to human well-being and poverty reduction
- Elements:
 - Consistent with vision of SP, time bound
 - Sustainable use
 - Ecosystem restoration
 - Awareness and stakeholder engagement, outcome oriented
- Components:
 - Address pressures, define desired state (positive component of biodiversity), say why (poverty reduction, human well being)

Targets - full list (Tables were asked to identify targets that should be included in a new framework. The CBD document 'Possible outline and elements of the new Strategic Plan (Prep2)' was available as an input but participants were not bound by its contents. As well as proposals on specific targets, a number of issues and principles were also identified).

Issues related to targets

- Should it be stronger than 2010 target?
- Is there a danger of going to lowest common denominator?
- Need to consider whether there should be variable or same timetable dates?
- Do we need all these layers (vision/target/sub targets)?
- Targets are not achievable for all parties. Conflict with poverty reduction

Principles

- Get a strap line (*CBD – just do it/we love it*)
- Should have global/local relevance
- Each country should develop its own targets?
- Don't 'set up to fail'
- Need to recognise time lag for achievement but still reduce threats as soon as possible
- Follow Japan's proposed structure
- Follow climate change example – make the scientific and political case and influence public opinion. Use the Pavan material (Stern for biodiversity)
- Use powerful stories (e.g. climate change – hurricane Katrina)
- Need more clarity on what the indirect drivers of biodiversity loss are – only some of them discussed in document
- Need some flexibility/prioritisation – Parties need to target their action to where biodiversity loss is having the biggest impact on human well being and the poor at national level
- Do not lose what is already being done? (closer links with existing framework etc)
- Link work programme (structure and content) with strategic plan
- Targets and existing – must be at least as concrete/strong. Don't let PoW get in the way of a strategic plan
- Is SP redirecting effort or expanding and intensifying it? Should be latter
- Key relevant sectors aware of SP must resonate with them – across sectors
- Propose clear and concrete targets
- Propose reduction of targets
- Measurable (qualitative, quantitative)
- By 2020 based on 2010 baselines and clear understanding
- State – reduce loss, halt, restore for each relevant target

Targets

- No net loss in areas where it is feasible
- Have a target to build capacity
- Why valuation is important (not luxury for rich, necessity for poor?)
- Incentives to encourage positive action for biodiversity
- Reduce bureaucratic process of CBD
- Address the mechanisms for effective achievement
- All stakeholders to read CBD handbook by 2020
- Target on awareness (of most important sectors – not realistic to target everybody)
- Mainstreaming – to achieve clear signs of improvement in the way biodiversity is mainstreamed
- Proposed target 3 (subsidies) – 'eliminated' isn't realistic - needs to be more nuanced e.g. overcoming threats posed by subsidies
- Resources used within safe ecological limits
- Direct drivers – should be measurable therefore specific % reductions should be included wherever possible
- Add desertification under strategic goal B
- Should be focused in particular on most critical/vulnerable ecosystems and should be realistic target. Need something on effective management
- ABS

- Local livelihoods/poor
- NBSAPs
- Harmful actions on environment eliminated
- Genetic diversity
- Proposed target 18 (Traditional Knowledge) is not smart and needs development
- Communication and sharing of best practices
- Legislation in place to address the direct drivers of biodiversity loss
- Encourage more trans-boundary agreements
- MDGs
- Sustainable management
- Awareness/education
- Eliminate harmful subsidies
- Transfer funds from developed to developing Countries (linked to urgency and priority)
- Partnerships with certified businesses
- Land and sea sustainably managed
- Explore implications of valuing biodiversity
- Extinction of known threatened SP avoided
- Engage private and public agencies at local level
- Eco-efficiency
- Terrestrial ecosystem degradation
- Marine ecosystem sustainable use
- Sustainable management (certification)
- Pollution reduction
- Management/control of IAS
- Climate change and its mitigation
- Proposed target 1 (everyone aware of the value of biodiversity) should be SMARTER
- Biodiversity included in all school curricula – should be two staged:

By 2015 – Policy makers in key relevant sectors recognising/acknowledge value of biodiversity, consumers recognise biodiversity conservation/sustainability issues in their choices. Then also by 2020 biodiversity incorporated in all countries' school curricula (indicator – biodiversity covered daily by mass media)

- Recognise the role of biodiversity in maintaining sustainable livelihoods
- Application of sustainability criteria for biodiversity conservation and ecosystem management
- Create better communication strategy to ensure that the public and the private sector understand the importance of biodiversity per se and for human well being
- National strategies should involve/engage the private sector to enable effective implementation
- Better international coordination between the biodiversity – related conventions, programmes and initiatives
- Promote role of local communities and indigenous people in conserving biodiversity through the sustainable use of natural resources
- Understand different values of biodiversity and its relevance for human beings
- Promote positive incentive
- Implement the ABS regime
- Promote green economy, including public procurement, sustainable production and consumption
- Biodiversity/climate change target
- Ecosystem service target
- By 2015 adopt a revised or new NBSAP as national policy instrument INCC implementation mechanisms
- Establish by 2012 science/policy interface mechanisms at global, regional and national level
- By 2015 integrate biodiversity into the main sustainable development strategies at global

- Species extinctions; should also be trying to reverse trends in threatened species etc
- Need target focused on private sector (there is nothing in current Prep2 proposal)
- By 2020 integrate values of biodiversity in national accounting systems and strategies
- Change behaviour towards biodiversity. Reduce ecological footprint to sustainable levels
- Proposed target 1 (everyone aware of the value of biodiversity) – not SMART, agree with intent but needs to be more specific
- Proposed target 19 (TK) needs to be more explicit about necessity of world biodiversity inventory
- Proposed target 7 (agriculture, aquaculture and forestry) should only refer to commercial areas
- New target under strategic goal B: Impact assessment and regulation of new technologies and innovations (e.g. geo-engineering, GMPs, wind turbines etc)
- Proposed target 2 (integrating value) needs re-phrasing; it is too long
- Proposed targets 7 (agriculture, aquaculture and forestry) and 6 (sustainable fishing) - fisheries are critical to increase food security. But de-couple from impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems services
- Target 15 (ecosystem services & resilience) is the most important but very broad. Need to reformulate and make more specific.
- Each country to define restoration targets and address them
- All relevant public laws/policies incorporate appropriate elements of all three CBD objective, compliments with and enforced (mainstreaming biodiversity)
Include targets on all drivers/pressures – habitat loss, invasive species, pollution, over exploitation, with exception of climate where target could possibly be on adaptation and mainstreaming). Same for actions/response – resources, mainstreaming, capacity building, communication, legislating.

Proposal to re-cluster targets:

- Education/knowledge/ understanding
- Governance planning resource
- Conservation and restoration

Most important targets (Tables were asked to identify the top 3 'targets' that should be included in a new framework. The CBD document 'Possible outline and elements of the new Strategic Plan (Prep2)' was available as an input but participants were not bound by its contents).

- Targets for direct drivers with specific %s
- Proposed target 4 (sustainability plans) – Should be specific for sectors, use ecological footprint concept and set targets
- Proposed target 2 (integrating value of biodiversity) – but needs to be smarter)
- Comprehensive discussion and reflection of all indirect drivers
- Proposed target 4 (sustainability plans) - Governments, sectoral development plans and private sector strategies promote sustainable development to achieve a net contribution to the reduction of the global ecological footprint
- What is missing?
 - Link with sustainable use in relevant places such as goal B (add 'and sustainable use' in the end)
 - Add 'desertification' after 'climate change' in goal B
 - Add 'technology transfer' in strategic goal D
- In target 7 (All areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed according to sustainability criteria) – should say 'all area under commercial agriculture'

- Awareness methodology on value of biodiversity
- Integration into national policies
- Capacity biodiversity – smart baseline

- Biodiversity should be mainstreamed across and between sectors and across other conventions. – look at other targets set in other for a that we would also like and aim to meet these too
- Assess and monitor changes in the economic value of biodiversity and ecosystem services (and who benefits) multinational companies to report on ecological biodiversity footprint
- Make sure have smart target for EACH direct driver. This should be appropriate to individual countries 'nationally appropriate'

- An ABS target – should also be mentioned in the mission
- By 2020 key monitoring for biodiversity status and trends is in use (e.g. an IPBES) including baseline inventory and monitoring programmes in place
- Key biodiversity areas are protected
- Habitat loss and degradation are halved against baseline (e.g. in 4NR?)

- Ecosystem and biodiversity restoration
- Coordination across all relevant sectors both nationally and internationally
- All countries have the means to implement their national plans through a financed mechanism, technical transfer capacity building and institutional strengthening

- Enhance the value of biodiversity. Focused action on critically threatened biodiversity components
- Mainstreaming – partnership? (both national and international)
- Make NBSAP a national policy instrument (beyond environment)
- Science base for policy decisions (national and international) established and national priorities reported

- Identify all relevant stakeholders in other sectors and develop and implement (make it measurable) strategies for reaching out to each
- Sufficient resources (not just financial) and capacity in place to implement and monitor actions (outcome oriented /process oriented target)
- Each country to define targets for addressing/halting biodiversity loss based on globally adopted guidance/target (e.g. 10% of each biome)

- All countries have biodiversity monitoring progress
- X% citizens understand how biodiversity contributes to human well being and Y% act
- Climate change adaptation integrated in NBSAP and implemented
- Resources available for full implementation of NBSAPs
- Mainstream biodiversity

Annex 6: Session 5 - Results of the implementation needs discussions

Tackling Resource and Capacity Building (Tables 1&2)

What can we do?

- Collect money, International payment for ecosystems services (polluter pays principle/beneficiary pays principle):
 - Departure taxes;
 - Exploitation levy;
 - Licence fees.
- Make sure these funds (from above) can be used for biodiversity (need political commitment to establish this and people need to understand the benefits of we are trying to achieve)
- Reduce resource needs through cooperation i.e. find mutual research aims and pool resources (such as exchange programmes) and regional monitoring
- Provide evidence to support needs for funds
- Subsidiary reform e.g. underlining how unhelpful some subsidiaries are for biodiversity
- Need to prioritise which areas/issues need funding the most – restoration
- Payment for environmental services – taxes and charges
- Building in biodiversity into money for climate change mitigation and adaptation
- GEF increase and reform – GEF is not easily accessible
- Increase public procurement
- Certification
- Private sector involvement – shares and bonds

What do we need?

- Financial resources
- Human resources
- Institution strengthening; governance capacity to manage
- Global capacity development fund that is easier to access
- Encouraging technological transfer
- Identification of specific way of spending money
- To show trade offs
- Education
- Fir for purpose
- Payments for ecosystem services
- Research into how to build biodiversity into climate change mitigation and adaptation
- Make GEF more accessible
- Certification
- Get extra cash by relating to issues which are politically attractive, such as climate, poverty, jobs and income

2 Key success factors for implementation

- Exploiting new sources of (private sector) funding
- Sharing aims, knowledge and infrastructure to meet mutually beneficial outcomes i.e. bringing in resource from elsewhere again
- Institutions working to enable policies to be put in place
- Indicator of success – determine baseline for this additionality
- How do you capture peoples' changing opinion on biodiversity?
- Adequate resources for implementation of CBD
- Clear objectives for what to spend money on
- Clear mechanisms for being able to spend money
- Has biodiversity stopped declining?
- Clear indicators which we can measure against
- Have we met our targets?
- Ongoing/increased provision of ecosystem services
- All Parties agree and are able to contribute to implementation of CBD in a fair and equal way
- More equitable sharing of resources

- Internal resource mobilisation e.g. value for money for using natural capital instead of human capital – different to PES
- Government/human/resources – facilities etc
- Internal government
- Developing aid
- Synergies across biodiversity MEAs
- Technology transfer – sharing of knowledge/methodologies/technologies
- Monitoring technologies
- Support ABS – local capacity for ABS
- Taxonomy
- Scientific knowledge
- South-South cooperation on technology transfer

Session 5 – Mainstreaming Biodiversity (Tables 3&4):

What can we do?

- Integrate biodiversity into national development
- Integrate biodiversity into productive sectors (policies)
- Integrate biodiversity consideration into education curriculum
- Campaign systems – public awareness, in order to mobilise participation and enhance understanding of biodiversity
- Develop and encourage application of sustainable criteria
- Introduce green GDP accounting system
- Public opinion survey
- Targeting/addressing key actors for biodiversity loss
- Influence ministers of finance, world bank etc
- Involve national development planning committees and others
- Identify target groups and means to deliver proper messages
- Include monetary and non-monetary, cultural and spiritual values of biodiversity
- Keep political figures in biodiversity issues
- Include biodiversity into politicians' agenda
- Enable biodiversity off-jets
- Search for credible public figures/ambassadors
- Require more cross-on agencies

What do we need?

- Legislation (Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment)
- Political will
- Inter-Ministerial coordination
- Improve availability of information
- Capacity building and institutional strengthening
- Financing
- Sharing best practices
- Technology transfer
- Guideline(s)
- Cooperation and partnership
- Media facilitation
- Identifying responsibility for each sector
- Green GDP and social GDP to balance economically
- Including biodiversity into national and local planning/policies
- Including biodiversity into curriculum
- Sector based prioritisation
- Multi stakeholder ownership
- Talking more than about intrinsic values of biodiversity
- Political, business and media engagement, as well as mass communication
- Popular champions inside and outside sectors
- More cross-cutting sectoral programmes
- Green tax and incentives
- Delete harmful subsidies

2 Key success factors for implementation

- Political will and awareness
- Partnership
- Financing
- Political support at national and local levels
- Compelling stories underpinned by robust scientific information
- Easily understood simple tools/metrics for status and trends of biodiversity
- An inconvenient truth – the sequel
- Analytical tool – what is working and what not (the efficacy of our interventions)

Session 5 – Involving Stakeholders (Tables 5&6)

What can we do?

- Improve stakeholder involvement at national level e.g. in drafting national reports
- CDB sec providing space for stakeholders to comment on national reports
- Instil a gentle ownership and demonstrate to the 'unconverted' why it matters to them
- Recognising the need to provide more incentives to local and indigenous communities in sustainably managing biodiversity and ecosystem services
- Communicate TEEB results widely
- Targeting training of young potential future leaders
- Integrating biodiversity/ecosystem services into education programmes
- Public-private partnerships
- Grassroots initiatives
- Manage conflict of interest
- Voluntary private initiatives
- Public consultations/hearings for planning and policy processes
- Community based management and protected areas
- Use ecosystem approach
- Sustainable consumption and production patterns
- Payment for ecosystem services
- Multipurpose management
- Communication Education and Public Awareness (CEPA)

What do we need?

- Establish national multi-stakeholder consultative groups and involve in implementation
- Clear, simple and easy to understand language in SP – relevant to different stakeholders
- Establishing and securing land and resource tenure (rights) for local and indigenous communities
- Showcase success stories and demonstrate concrete results
- Celebrities/champions representing different stakeholder groups
- A 'big shock movie'
- More engagement of the development community
- Stakeholders reflect the mission
- To use innovative communication tools to get the messages out
- Lots of media attention – front page news
- Using the right medium to target different stakeholders
- Participation of stakeholders in decision-making
- Creating positive incentives (e.g. enabling tax environment)
- Stakeholder forum roundtables
- Level playing field; access to information and capacity building (language)
- Use both modern science and traditional science knowledge for management
- Off-setting biodiversity
- Benefit sharing and access
- North-south and South-South cooperation and solidarity
- Ownership

2 Key success factors for implementation

- Involvement of broad range of stakeholders in preparation of SP at global and national level
- Establish national multi-stakeholder consultation groups and involve them in all implementation processes
- Transparency and access to information/
- Ownership
- Good monitoring
- Incentives
- Communication Education and Public Awareness (CEPA)

Session 5 – Monitoring & Review (Tables 7&8):

What can we do?

- Local, national, regional and global reports on:
- Actions taken;
- Biodiversity status;
- Achievements;
- Constraints;
- Challenges
- Peer Review – share experience
- Greater usage of existing indicators, baseline data and biodiversity indicators partnership
- Communicate existing works and process experiences
- Establish targets (SMART) and indicators at all scales
- Monitoring plan (and who will do it):
- Collect data, establish baselines, identify sources, build on existing efforts;
- Analyse and assess data;
- Report conclusions;
- Make recommendations
- Conditions:
- Capacity building;
- Resources;
- Transfer of approaches, methods, experiences, tools, lessons learned;
- Transparency

What do we need?

- Smart indicators
- Baseline data
- Organisational engagement from scientists
- Methodology for monitor and capacity for monitor
- Exchange of experience
- Observation on appropriate application
- Communication to decision makers in the field
- Enabling environment (legal, institutional)
- Reporting software
- Incentives for monitoring (rewards/funds)
- National manual guidance for application
- Resources (financial, capacity)
- Clearing house mechanism – identify needs and gaps
- Establish a national committee for CBD implementation
- Identify synergies with other MEAs
- Regularly reviewing progress
- Need commitment from policy makers to respond (e.g. through legal framework)
- Stronger involvement of external actors (e.g. National Audit Offices)
- IPBES

2 Key success factors for implementation

- Better cooperation and synergies between countries, CBD, MEAs and within Ministries
- Enabling environment resources
- Sufficient capacity
- Robust measurements for every target (you cannot manage what you cannot measure)

Session 5 – Improving Functioning of CBD Bodies & Mechanisms (Tables 9&10)

What can we do?

- Review functions of WGRI & SBSTTA (TOR/Modus Operandi). For example WGRI should be reviewing the implementation of the SP and SBSTTA to provide tools for implementation based on technical and scientific basis
- Shortening and reviewing of the processes of SBSTTA
- More practical outputs from SBSTTA
- UNEP regional office to facilitate inter-sessional regional consultation meetings on specific issues to improve work and implementation, communication and co-operation between COPs
- Streamline/shorten the GEF processes
- Independent objective science for decision making etc
- Compliance mechanism
- Improve/clarify the relationship between the Financial Mechanism and the COP
- Rules of procedure – decisions agreement by consensus
- Role of the secretariat in national level implementation
- Link to the UNFCCC – Redd

What do we need?

- Improve use of UNEP Regional offices
- Expedite the GEF processes
- Allow other UN Agencies to facilitate/mobilise resources
- Review of the financial architecture of program of CBD implementation
- Establish an Subsidiary body of Implementation (SBI) with a clear mandate
- Increase focus of SBSTTA for implementation tools
- Use IPBES in support of SBSTTA
- IPBES needs to be established (similar to IPCC)
- Independent review of the response of the GEF to the COP
- Greater than 5% (e.g. 80%) majority required so that Ro8P can be adopted
- Review of options for national support of Secretariat and Implementing of the GEF
- Role of the CBD on the Implementing Redd and Carbon Capture and Storage (CPS) e.g. Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) under the CBD – own version and ensure biodiversity is considered under the UNFCCC

2 Key success factors for implementation

- Full engagement of Ministers in the COP agenda
- Primary focus of CBD processes and objective is strategic plan
- Political will
- Compliance mechanism
- Finance (alignment with objectives)

Annex 7: Session 6 - Mini workshop outputs

Title of the mini-workshop: New actions declared at COP10 and in the revised Strategic Plan
Why is this topic important for you?
<p>On reflecting on the past experience, just theoretic as abstract discussion was made without actions started or strengthened.</p> <p>We need to consider way to ensure new actions should be started or strengthened.</p>
What were the key issues discussed in the mini-workshop? Please distinguish between areas of general agreement and diverging opinion.
<p>At high level segment, Minister should be requested to make an announcement on new actions to be implemented in their Countries.</p> <p>Guidelines should be prepared by Secretariat to provide Parties with information on instruments on measures to implement targets. For the purpose of developing the guidelines of potential measures, Parties should submit suggestions to SCBD.</p>
Any ideas for follow-on activities?
<p>Capacity building commitment is encouraged by Parties at COP10. Improvement of GEF mechanism and allocation should be sent from COP10 as message.</p> <p>Establishment of new permanent body on implementation.</p> <p>Establishment of other international networks on various themes.</p>

Title of the mini-workshop: Sustainable Land use Management: A tool for biodiversity conservation
Why is this topic important for you?
<p>Addresses drivers of biodiversity loss</p> <p>Poor planning</p> <p>Short term economic gains</p> <p>Political instability</p> <p>Population growth</p> <p>Conservation – Mesoamerican biological corridor</p> <p>Sustainable use and development</p> <p>Safeguards biodiversity can be in NBSAPs but not addressed in convention.</p> <p>Cross cutting issue</p>
What were the key issues discussed in the mini-workshop? Please distinguish between areas of general agreement and diverging opinion.
<p>Taxation- large land owners</p> <p>Corridor planning</p> <p>Tools developed</p> <p>Community and stakeholder involvement</p> <p>Linkages with other conventions (e.g.) climate change</p> <p>Sustainability</p> <p>Importance of coordination, monitoring commission</p> <p>Livelihoods projections</p> <p>Landscape approach</p> <p>Zoning and prescriptions</p>
Any ideas for follow-on activities?
<p>Useful to share regional ideas</p> <p>Monitoring systems</p> <p>SP should reflect sustainable land use management</p>

<p>Title of the mini-workshop: How to influence the UNFCCC and government/parties action on climate change. (Also, what can we offer the UNFCCC?)</p>
<p>Why is this topic important for you?</p>
<p>We need UNFCCC to meet their targets (and more) if we are to stop biodiversity loss AND we have a way to help them with adaptation/mitigation. The link is important at international and national planning level.</p>
<p>What were the key issues discussed in the mini-workshop? Please distinguish between areas of general agreement and diverging opinion.</p>
<p>Very strong general agreement throughout! This topic is being discussed by the cross-cutting environmental management group but needs to have more impact e.g. have joint targets <i>or</i> biodiversity targets in Climate Change (CC) agreements and vice versa Problem of integration is not really at the implementation level but more at abstract planning level. Therefore, need to develop joint CC/biodiversity action plans Also need donor countries/institutions to appraise CC investments on the basis of multiple benefits. Link between water biodiversity and CC is apparent at project level. Management need to remember to keep that link higher up. UNFCCC has created false boundaries in civil services – need to improve visibility of biodiversity and how it can help (coral reef message can help here) We need to specifically plan NBSAPs with other RAMSAR/CC/Desertification plans in mind There was a climate change background document drafted by the 3 environment conventions at COP9 – we need to act on this. Coral; can we support an umbrella initiative? It's an urgent problem It's readily understandable in terms of climate change biodiversity link, therefore helps with our communications There is also a direct link to food security and therefore MDGs It is something that we would be very good to “show case” at the UN General Assembly special session Also discussed the key concept that the most efficient/cheapest way to deliver on CBD and UNFCCC goals is to do them together not as 2 separate processes.</p>
<p>Any ideas for follow-on activities?</p>
<p>Invite UNFCCC to suggest targets for us to adopt COP decision on linking climate change into NBSAPs Invite UNFCCC COP to consider biodiversity in the national adaptation plans Support on umbrella initiative on coral reefs to be showcased at the UN GA special session</p>

Title of the mini-workshop: CBD – House keeping/streamlining the process
Why is this topic important for you?
Convention is important but is suffering from heavy workload (submissions, meetings). Parties do overload the Convention (decisions/impacts.....)
What were the key issues discussed in the mini-workshop? Please distinguish between areas of general agreement and diverging opinion.
Focus on implementation Strong regional focus. Consultations/learn from each other; success stories Adapt Clearing House Mechanism to these processes. Ask CNDP/UNEP for support Compliance mechanism Report to COPs on the setting of national targets – openly at COP – COP to decide and fires direction on implementation gaps. Long-term – compliance protocol Link high level segment to decision making process. SBSTTA – IPBES (Adaptation processes) subsidiary body for implementation
Any ideas for follow-on activities?
More focussed decisions – realism - simplification

Title of the mini-workshop: Role of science
Why is this topic important for you?
Need to make explicit that CBD is science-based IPBES does not yet exist, should be a priority to create, including as a communication tool
What were the key issues discussed in the mini-workshop? Please distinguish between areas of general agreement and diverging opinion.
World biodiversity survey, including capacity-building (5 or 50million species, dangerous for feeding doubters of the reality of the biodiversity crisis) ABS should enable basic biodiversity science Science should be multidisciplinary, including biology, anthropology, sociology, economics and address inventory monitoring ecosystem services etc. TEEB essential How to get science to policy makers? Need to communicate a consistent message to policy-makers DNA bar-coding as a strategic tool, including tracking for ABS Interfacing with CITES, IUCN, ICSU, Diversitas, WCMC, etc
Any ideas for follow-on activities?
Move to create IPBES! Send leading national scientists as part of parties' delegations at CBD meetings.

Title of the mini-workshop: Vision
Why is this topic important for you?
<p>Need a common reason for doing this work. To communicate a common and positive purpose for what we do. It is a motivation and inspires us to get out of bed in the morning. It describes a place we want to be. Serves as a foundation to make a reality of the CBD. Something to aim for Helps drives consensus</p>
<p>What were the key issues discussed in the mini-workshop? Please distinguish between areas of general agreement and diverging opinion.</p>
<p>No disagreement – only tension was the distribution between the vision and the mission.</p> <p><i>Principles:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Positive Language - Sparks everybody - Species - ecosystems - services - multi-valued <p>Building natural capital Living with and prospering with natural systems of planet Human well being - consequence of having a healthy business place</p> <p>Possible vision statement Securing planet's variety of life Change our behaviour and ways of consumption Multi stakeholder participation See people working to secure the planet's variety of life For its own value/sake and for human wellbeing Biodiversity is life Sustainability Paradise – a utopian place we want to be Healthy planet providing for people Resilience – maintaining ecological. No pests Living in harmony with nature (Japan)</p>
<p>Any ideas for follow-on activities?</p>
<p>The matter of creating a clear and ambitious vision for the CBD – potentially with a horizon to 2050, but with the potentially decoded implementing is essential to provide purpose and to galvanize the direction of the target. Further work on determining such a vision is needed. This is the <i>What</i> – the targets are the <i>How</i>.</p>

Title of the mini-workshop: Urban biodiversity conservation and conservation outside protected areas
Why is this topic important for you?
This topic is important for us because the problem of conserving biodiversity outside that of protected areas is very real and urgent and it is an irreversible trend as from 2008 that there are more people living in cities than rural areas and biodiversity has to be conserved – urban areas for their ecosystem services.
What were the key issues discussed in the mini-workshop? Please distinguish between areas of general agreement and diverging opinion.
The key issues discussed were A) how to ensure that the well being and subsistence of poor people living outside that of protected areas are maintained of while conserving biodiversity. Innovative solutions have to be derived taking into account traditional knowledge and the views of the communities. B) how to conserve biodiversity and retain their ecosystem services abilities in urban areas/cities. For all of the above it is important to know what biodiversity – these areas, their values and how to monitor them. The Space Index on Cities biodiversity has been designed as a self-assessment tool.
Any ideas for follow-on activities?
1. Include biodiversity convention – areas outside that of protected areas – the agenda of the Trondheim Conference and COP10 2. The Curitiba Declaration Satoyama Initiative and the Space Index on cities' biodiversity will be presented at COP10 for consideration It is proposed that these two issues be included in the new strategic plan.

Title of the mini-workshop: Genetic resources and ABS

Why is this topic important for you?

CBD must define those areas at regional level that are important to the world in production of food, medicine, etc; and establish priorities.

At a national level mostly countries know so much about “what” and “how” but still failing in “how”. “How” is a thing that happens on a global level and affects the national and local level.

In Guatemala, all the Genetic Resources important to the world are allocated outside of protected areas and ‘living together with indigenous communities’. Wild relatives of corn, beans and others still in cleared areas that nobody cares. In our care, we have the tools to care about, but, what can we offer to these indigenous communities?

What were the key issues discussed in the mini-workshop?

Please distinguish between areas of general agreement and diverging opinion.

- Prioritization of the Genetic Resources at regional, national and local level. GR important to the world
- Most of the GR are allocated outside protected areas and live into the cultural world of indigenous communities
- Strengthen the implementation in local level/incentives for ABS
- Ecosystem use in regional level/GR banks/service
- Indigenous have a traditional level/Bank of Knowledge/Ecosystem
- ‘World Bank for GR’ as an Ecosystem Service linked to traditional knowledge

Any ideas for follow-on activities?

1. Start work on 2nd and 3rd objectives of the CBD.
2. Give answers to any level, improve *implementations*. Direct drivers to biodiversity loss are poverty but also poverty keeps the richness in this world. Traditional knowledge and GR are alive in indigenous cultures, almost everywhere they are. (*Not now for centuries!!*)
3. Parties must develop their own regulations and policy in ABS
4. At a regional level CD must encourage the joining of work to benefit countries
5. Regional level can give a world service as a ‘World Bank’ of Grand as a possibility, (under clear regulations) a “knowledge bank”
6. CBD must prove that biodiversity is a tool to halt poverty and it is the only way to reach the rural, indigenous communities in the world and to go there with no empty hands, this will enhance implementation at a local level.
Enhance sustainable use of CBD

Title of the mini-workshop: Implementation Now: Local Level Action
Why is this topic important for you?
For the CBD to be successful, implementation at local level is critical as it is the place where biodiversity is located. Empowering local people to manage biodiversity needs to receive much more attention and emphasis.
What were the key issues discussed in the mini-workshop? Please distinguish between areas of general agreement and diverging opinion.
Agreements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - need to translate CBD text into national and local languages to disseminate message (communication) by government and - national legislation to support implementation with the involvement of as many stakeholders as possible - develop or strengthen partnerships amongst government, local authorities, ILCs, NGOs, for implementation at local level and to improve trust especially between central government and local government. - secure livelihoods through secure tenure, ownerships and rights over land and resources for ILCs (RBA) - effective decentralisation - Recognition of customary use and law
Any ideas for follow-on activities?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - include one point on these issues in revised doc. PREP/2 in sections 5 and/or 6 (pp 15-16) - organise follow up discussion (roundtable on misuse – w/shop or side event) during SBSTTA – WGRI Meetings in May)

Title of the mini-workshop: Communication
Why is this topic important for you?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to reach targets we must mainstream - accelerate the implementation of CBD
What were the key issues discussed in the mini-workshop? Please distinguish between areas of general agreement and diverging opinion.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Theory of communication - role of CBD/COP/CEPA/SP - the use of and strategies and stakeholders/champions/events
Any ideas for follow-on activities?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - right direction (not too vague) but need to be strengthened (1,2,3) - Develop national plan for the targets (agenda) - Improve the tools/ instruments of CBD towards Communication – capacity building

ends