



Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity



Ref.: SCBD/STTM/DCO/va/64933

18 September 2008

NOTIFICATION

Voluntary reports for the in-depth review of implementation of the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems

Dear Madam/Sir,

The purpose of this notification is to invite Parties and relevant organizations to provide inputs into the in-depth review of implementation of the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland waters by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) at its fourteenth meeting, tentatively scheduled to be held in May/June 2010 in Bonn, Germany.

In paragraph 9 of decision VIII/14, the Conference of the Parties (COP) invited Parties, on a voluntary basis, to provide information, which could be useful for the in-depth review of thematic programmes included in the multi-year programme of work of the Conference of the Parties up to 2010. In paragraph 9 of decision VIII/15, the COP endorsed the goals and global outcome-oriented targets integrated into the programme of work on inland waters (as detailed in annex IV to that decision), noting that they are intended as guidance to Parties in their implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans. In annex II of decision VIII/10, the COP decided to undertake the in-depth review of the programme of work on inland waters at its tenth meeting. Accordingly, SBSTTA, at its fourteenth meeting, will be considering the in-depth review of implementation of the programme of work on inland waters, prior to the tenth meeting of the COP.

Parties and relevant organizations are invited to submit, on a voluntary basis, to the Executive Secretary as soon as possible, but **no later than 28 February 2009**, relevant information including on: (i) the status and trends of, and threats to, inland water biodiversity; (ii) the implementation of the programme of work on inland waters, including progress made towards achieving the goals, challenges and obstacles to implementation; (iii) capacity building needs; (iv) experiences with targets and indicators at national level; and (v) views on strategic opportunities post 2010. Since the submission is on a voluntary basis, information may be provided in any format, preferably electronically. For your reference, appended herewith is optional guidance for inputs.

Parties should consider sending information that is in addition to, or more detailed than, that already sent in their national reports. Parties that are also Party to the Ramsar Convention need not repeat information submitted through Ramsar national reports. For organisations, any pertinent information is also welcome, including simply providing copies of relevant reports.

Please accept, Madam/Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration

Ahmed Djoghlaif
Executive Secretary

To : All CBD National Focal Points
Relevant international and non-governmental organisations



ONE NATURE · ONE WORLD · OUR FUTURE
COP 9 MOP 4 Bonn Germany 2008



United Nations
Environment Programme

413 Saint-Jacques Street, Suite 800
Montreal, QC H2Y 1N9, Canada

Tel : +1 514 288 2220
Fax : +1 514 288 6588

<http://www.cbd.int>
secretariat@cbd.int

ANNEX

Guidance for the submission of information for the review of implementation of the programme of work on inland water biodiversity

Information required from respondents:

Name:	
Party (or organisation if responding from an organisation):	
Institution:	
email address:	

General guidance

1. In collecting and compiling relevant information for submission, refer to “Guidelines for the review of the programmes of work (POW) on the Convention” as contained in Annex III of decision VIII/15.
2. Provide case-studies, good and bad practices, success and failure stories, and lessons-learned from the implementation of the programme of work, which can illustrate and give insights on: (i) the contribution the POW has provided to Parties in implementing the Convention; (ii) the contribution of the POW in reducing the rate of biodiversity loss; and (iii) the effectiveness of the POW in the context of the Millennium Development Goals and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development.
3. Provide suggestions for modification of the existing POW, if necessary.
4. Provide information on the mobilization of the necessary financial resources, in particular those facilitated by the Convention Secretariat and other partners.
5. If you are a developed country Party it would be useful to have indications of both the national perspective and the extent to which the following subjects, as appropriate, have a bearing on your country’s development assistance programmes.
6. Organisations, as appropriate, should provide commentary on global and/or regional perspectives and, if using the format suggested below, tailor responses and/or modify questions to reflect this. Please distinguish clearly between comments on specific cases and global/regional considerations.
7. An option is to respond by using this document as a template (boxes are provided for this purpose), alternative means are acceptable and welcome.

Guidance on providing a simplified overview:

Respondents have the option to provide a simplified overview which may take the form of a summary taking into account, for example, key points regarding the following (and any other) points, or sub-groupings of them, according to the area of interest/experience:

- a. What is the trend in inland water ecosystems?
- b. What are the likely scenarios for the future?

- c. What are the levels of implementation and impact of the POW?
- d. If implementation/impact is limited – what is the problem?
- e. What is the experience with targets and indicators at national level?
- f. Is climate change well addressed in relation to this POW, and how to improve attention to this?
- g. What are the key capacity building requirements – and how to promote improved resource allocation for this purpose?
- h. What is missing in the POW, what areas need strengthening and are areas redundant?
- i. Are any elements of this POW (or additional elements) clearly going to be more critical than others post 2010?
- j. Is there a need to simplify the POW? What are the means to achieve this?
- k. What critical strategic policy responses are required for this POW post 2010? What are the ways and means to stimulate these responses?

Guidance on considering issues in more detail

The following are some more specific questions for guidance. For each subject area please try to be specific, elaborate on the nature of the constraints and propose ways and means to address these. This is not a full list of issues – but indicates some of the general areas where feedback would be very valuable.

Some of these questions are inter-related. They are provided to illustrate the nature of subjects of interest. They can also be used as background to formulate more simplified responses as above.

1. What is the overall situation regarding the status and trends of inland water ecosystems in your country?
 - a. steady, declining, declining fast, improving, improving rapidly?
 - b. how does this compare to other major biomes? (same, better than others and which ones, worse than others and which ones, the worst?)

2. Which are the main direct drivers of loss of inland waters biodiversity (list the most important, or in order of importance if possible/necessary)?
 - a. over use of water?
 - b. unsustainable land based practices (pollution, siltation, eutrophication)?
 - c. habitat (wetland) conversion?
 - d. over-exploitation of species?
 - e. invasive alien species?
 - f. other (specify)?

3. Do you generally tend to try to manage inland water ecosystems as a functioning ecological unit?

- a. are catchment/basin based approaches (or sub-catchments for larger systems) widely used?; i.e., is the land within the catchment generally considered and managed as part of the inland water ecosystem?
- b. to what extent is the relevant estuary/coastal region considered as part of the “inland water” ecosystem (if applicable)?

4. Does the POW have a significant influence on policies and management in your country?:

- a. yes, no, difficult to assess?
- b. do other policy and management frameworks result in outcomes relevant to the POW but these are not influenced directly the POW?; what are these (e.g., other regional frameworks; national measures/mechanisms but not directly influenced by the POW)?

5. Has the POW had a significant impact on relevant water-related policies in your country?:

- a. on water use policies – particularly water use by the sectors (agriculture including irrigation; hydropower; navigation; urban/industrial water supply and use etc.)?
- b. on water quality?;
- c. does this include adequate consideration of groundwater?; e.g., interactions between groundwater and surface water (e.g., how groundwater recharges other wetlands)? ; impacts of unsustainable groundwater use on terrestrial biodiversity (e.g., vegetation cover, forests)?

6. Are the linkages between inland water biodiversity and sustainable human development (and poverty reduction) adequately understood and considered in relevant policy making?:

- a. regarding the importance of the direct use of inland water fauna and flora (e.g., fisheries, medicinal uses etc.)?
- b. regarding the role of inland water biodiversity (ecosystems/wetlands) in sustaining freshwater for human uses?
- c. regarding the role of inland water ecosystems in the provision of other services (nutrient recycling, flood management, adaptation to extreme weather events)?
- d. is the problem lack of awareness of these, and other, roles that inland water ecosystems play or lack of appreciation of their values (or both)?

7. What is the level of awareness and attention to the importance of inland water biodiversity in relation to climate change?

- a. are people adequately aware that the main impacts of climate change are on water, therefore, not only are inland water ecosystems particularly vulnerable to climate change but their functions play a key role in adaptation measures to deal with the impacts of climate change (for example, responding to the increasing frequency and severity of droughts and floods)?

- b. and therefore, is there adequate attention to the fact that climate change significantly increases the importance of the POW in relation to sustainable human development?

8. Is there adequate awareness at policy and planning level of the need to consider managing the “ecosystem services” provided by inland water ecosystems?:

- a. do relevant policy makers (including in all relevant sectors) understand the concept of “ecosystem services” (even if using similar but alternative terminology) and do they use this as a framework for planning? For example, this approach would involve some level of trade off decision making in order to balance the services that are provided.
- b. alternatively - do policy makers and planners still manage water on a sector basis (and relatively independently of each other) and by looking at tangible products such as food produced, or water extracted for direct human use, e.g., urban water supplies), largely disregarding other services? This approach would tend to give less attention to trade off decision making.
- c. is there adequate awareness of the importance and value of the many other services provided (particularly those which currently have no “formal economic value” – such as climate regulation, freshwater regulation, nutrient recycling, mitigating the impacts of extreme weather etc.)?
- d. is the problem the decision making process in terms of infrastructure/governance/dialogue, or lack of awareness of values of services? If we had better valuations – would it automatically lead to better outcomes?

9. Which convention has the most influence on relevant inland water related policies and policies in areas which impact water (e.g., agriculture) in your country?

- a. CBD?, Ramsar?, CBD and Ramsar jointly?, or none? (if other more influential regional conventions/agreements are applicable please specify)
- b. If you are not a Party to Ramsar – is Ramsar guidance still used as a means to guide relevant policies and activities?

10. The CBD has many other programmes of work, the majority of which also influence the status and trends of inland water ecosystems:

- a. is there adequate attention to the objectives and activities of the POW on inland waters in these other POWs (e.g., agricultural biodiversity; marine and coastal; mountains; dry and sub-humid lands; forests)?

11. Has your country shifted policies (within the past 10 years or so) towards the rehabilitation and/or restoration of the functions inland water ecosystems? If so – what was the *main* driver of (reason for) this shift in policies?

- a. “economic” reasons, for example - based on financial cost-benefit considerations (which ones? e.g., more cost effective water management – including flood regulation?, more cost effective water supplies for human uses? etc.)

- b. to rehabilitate rural livelihoods among the poor (e.g., rehabilitating food supply from fisheries, to rehabilitate drinking water supplies etc.)?
- c. recreation/tourism/cultural reasons (including recreational fisheries)?
- d. “nature conservation” in its own right (e.g., endangered species protection)

12. What is the level of importance (balance) placed on this programme of work/subject in appropriate biodiversity related policy arenas in relation to other POWs/subject areas?:

- a. in relation to the conservation of threatened species? (high, medium, low)
- b. in relation to importance for human development (and development targets)? (high, medium, low)
- c. should the *relative* importance of this subject area be higher or lower?
- d. if this subject area needs a higher profile – what are best grounds (basis/arguments) and the key ways and means to achieve this?

13. What is the level of attention to this programme of work beyond the “environment sector”?:

- a. amongst the production sectors (agriculture, forestry, fisheries etc.)?
- b. is the private sector actively engaged in this POW? (please provide examples) ?

14. What areas in the programme of work:

- a. are the most critical?
- b. are missing or need to be strengthened?

15. Please summarise what the critical issues are with this programme of work in terms of:

- a. enhanced implementation?
- b. addressing barriers?
- c. technical or political constraints?

a: at your own national level?

b: (if appropriate) – globally/regionally?

16. Please suggest the best strategies to address the critical issues identified, for example through:

- a. highlighting status and trends in species?
- b. addressing linkages to human development/livelihoods/poverty reduction?
- c. improved valuations of ecosystem services provided?
- d. technical solutions (which technical areas)?
- e. improved decision/policy making processes (how?)?

a: at your own national level?

b: (if appropriate) – globally/regionally?

17. What are the critical capacity building needs for this POW?

- a. please specify the target group and subject area
- b. given that additional financial resources are invariably required (in all programme areas) – how can the provision of better resources/capacity be best promoted for this POW ? Which arguments will have the best outcome?

a: at your own national level?

b: (if appropriate) – globally/regionally?

=====