



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/9/24  
26 February 2008

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

### CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Ninth meeting

Bonn, 19–30 May 2008

Item 4.16 of the provisional agenda\*

#### GUIDANCE TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM

##### *Elements for the four-year (2010-2014) framework for programme priorities related to utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity, and recommendations to enhance the process of formulating and consolidating guidance to the financial mechanism*

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

#### I. INTRODUCTION

1. In decision VIII/18, paragraph 6, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary, in consultation with the Parties, to explore opportunities for streamlining the guidance provided to the Global Environment Facility taking into account the framework for goals and targets in decision VII/30 as well as indicators for assessing progress toward the achievement of the 2010 target and to present the results to the Conference of the Parties through the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention.
2. On the basis of the submissions received from Argentina and Germany and the European Commission on behalf of the European Community and its member States, the Executive Secretary prepared a note on opportunities for streamlining the guidance provided to the Global Environment Facility taking into account the framework for targets and indicators of the 2010 target (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/2/5), for the consideration of the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention. That document provided brief background information on development of guidance to the financial mechanism under the Convention on Biological Diversity, examined guidance to the financial mechanism in the context of national biodiversity priorities as set out in national biodiversity strategies and action plans from developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and further considered the guidance within the framework for goals and targets as well as indicators for assessing progress toward the achievement of the 2010 target. It also presented views of the GEF entities on their experience in operationalizing the guidance, as well as the patterns of GEF funding for biodiversity in terms of the guidance, and raised

\* UNEP/CBD/COP/9/1.

/...

several questions concerning characteristic features of guidance and the process of formulating guidance and related reporting.

3. Responding to paragraph 2 of recommendation 2/3 (Streamlining the guidance provided to the Global Environment Facility as the institutional structure operating the financial mechanism of the Convention) of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/4, annex), the Executive Secretary circulated, on 18 July 2007, a notification seeking views on elements for the four-year (2010-2014) framework for programme priorities related to the utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity as well as ways and means to enhance the process of formulating and consolidating guidance to the financial mechanism by 1 December 2007. Submissions were subsequently received from Portugal and the European Commission, on behalf of the European Community and its member States.

4. The present note has been prepared in response to recommendation 2/3, paragraph 3, of the Working Group on Review of Implementation, on the basis of the results of the above mentioned exercise. Section II focuses on elements for the four-year framework for programme priorities related to the utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity, building on existing guidance of the Conference of the Parties, Strategic Plan of the Convention, anticipated outcomes of the meetings of the Conference of the Parties prior to the fifth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, GEF biodiversity portfolio and strategy, as well as scientific findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Section III considers ways and means to enhance the process of formulating and consolidating guidance to the financial mechanism. Recommendations are proposed in section IV, with the proposed elements for the four-year (2010-2014) framework for programme priorities related to the utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity provided in the annex. A compilation of existing guidance of the Conference of the Parties by proposed elements as well as agenda items of this ninth meeting is available as an information document (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/INF/15).

## **II. ELEMENTS FOR THE FOUR-YEAR (2010-2014) FRAMEWORK FOR PROGRAMME PRIORITIES RELATED TO THE UTILIZATION OF GEF RESOURCES FOR BIODIVERSITY**

5. Following the suggestions from Governments, the four-year (2010-2014) framework for programme priorities for the financial mechanism should take into account the following:

(a) The existing guidance has reflected a considerable degree of consensus on what to be financed by the financial mechanism, and thereby should be taken into account fully;

(b) The Strategic Plan of the Convention provides guidance on the implementation of the Convention up to 2010, and a number of indicators have been developed to measure the progress. The major themes and indicators identified are expected to have continuing relevance for the period under consideration;

(c) Further guidance to the financial mechanism may emerge out of the ninth and tenth meetings of the Conference of the Parties prior to the finalization of the fifth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, and should be incorporated into the four-year framework of programme priorities;

(d) National priorities identified in national biodiversity strategies and action plans should be the basis for developing the four-year priority framework;

(e) The four-year framework for programme priorities should be informed by the GEF operational experience and related strategies;

(f) Millennium Ecosystem Assessment conceptual framework provides a successful tool to organize scientific information and knowledge for biological diversity, and its scientific messages can be used to inform the development of a four-year framework for programme priorities.

6. Approaches for a four-year framework for programme priorities related to the utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity include:

(a) *Input-oriented approach* – to define time-bound activities for which incremental costs will be financed by the financial mechanism. Ideally this involves defining what (priority actions), why (rationale for funding decisions), who (concerned stakeholders), where (spatial factor), how much (quantitative limits), and when (temporal scale), and thus requires perfect information, ideal political dynamics and optimal actions of all concerned stakeholders. As a result, guidance recipients will need to conduct business as perfectly defined. This approach is not feasible in reality, nor is desirable in terms of allowing necessary flexibility, promoting innovations and initiatives as well as adapting to rapid changes, by the financial mechanism and its funding partners in supporting the achievement of the Convention's objectives;

(b) *Outcome-oriented approach* – to define expected outcomes or intended effects of GEF resources for biodiversity during the given period of time, measured by agreed indicators. This approach provides desired flexibility for guidance recipients to take optimal decisions concerning financial allocations, but also demands a very high level of expertise, experience, knowledge and know-how from guidance recipients that are required to deliver expected outcomes;

(c) *Hybrid approach* – to define measurable outcomes expected out of GEF resources for biodiversity during the fifth replenishment period, supported by identified activities. Focused on the short-term and medium-term effects or end results of GEF interventions, usually involving the collective effort of all partners, this approach implies that the existing body of guidance and its necessary additions from the future meetings of the Conference of the Parties will continue to guide financial allocations of the financial mechanism, but allows flexibility for guidance recipients to determine a best mix of priority measures to deliver desired outcomes for the reference time period. The proposal suggested in the present note is based on the hybrid approach.

#### ***Existing guidance from the Conference of the Parties***

7. The existing body of guidance consists of a total of 111 pieces of guidance related to over 27 subject issues of the Convention, reflected in a list of 13 programme priorities from the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 1994 and seven sets of adds-on from its second to eighth meetings. As analysed in the note by the Executive Secretary on the subject prepared for the second meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/2/5), the following pattern of the existing guidance needs to be taken fully into account in developing any further priority framework:

(a) The existing body of guidance has in general covered the substantive provisions of the Convention, from Article 6 to Article 20, with the exception of some aspects of Article 7 (Identification and monitoring) (while much work has been done on developing indicators, there has been little on the identification of threats), a few aspects of Article 8 (Article 8(f) – ecosystem restoration and species recovery, 8(g) – living modified organisms (at the national level, i.e. outside the scope of the Biosafety Protocol), 8(k) – protection of threatened species and populations, and 8(l) - regulation or management of threats), Article 9 - *ex situ* conservation, Article 14 - impact assessment and minimizing adverse impacts, and Article 17 - exchange of information;

(b) In terms of frequencies, more guidance has been provided on national reporting, national planning, identification and monitoring, the Global Taxonomy Initiative, invasive alien species, incentive measures, education and public awareness, access and benefit sharing, clearing-house mechanism and

biosafety. Other articles appear less frequently in the guidance, for instance, sustainable use and research and training have only appeared once;

(c) Among the programmes of work covering the major biomes, marine and coastal biodiversity, agricultural biodiversity, inland waters ecosystems, and forest biodiversity featured into the guidance three times or more. Mountain biodiversity, island biodiversity and the biodiversity of dry and sub-humid lands have less frequently appeared in the guidance. However, this may simply reflect the fact that the more frequently-featured programmes of work were addressed earlier than the others, and does not necessarily indicate that the Conference of the Parties attaches higher importance to them;

(c) Some issues and themes, which are not explicitly referred to in the Convention, have been incorporated into the guidance, such as endemic species, plant conservation, climate change and biodiversity, social dimensions including those related to poverty;

(d) Several pieces of guidance were so broad that virtually any nationally identified activity could be financed.

### ***Strategic Plan of the Convention***

8. The Strategic Plan of the Convention, adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting, was complemented by a framework to enhance the evaluation of achievements and progress toward its implementation and a set of associated indicators. The seven focal areas, though not mutually exclusive, of the framework have been widely used in the recent years and thus can be useful reference in developing the four-year (2010-2014) framework for programme priorities for the financial mechanism:

(a) Reducing the rate of loss of the components of biodiversity, including: (i) biomes, habitats and ecosystems; (ii) species and populations; and (iii) genetic diversity;

(b) Promoting sustainable use of biodiversity;

(c) Addressing the major threats to biodiversity, including those arising from invasive alien species, climate change, pollution, and habitat change;

(d) Maintaining ecosystem integrity, and the provision of goods and services provided by biodiversity in ecosystems, in support of human well-being;

(e) Protecting traditional knowledge, innovations and practices;

(f) Ensuring the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the use of genetic resources; and

(g) Mobilizing financial and technical resources, especially for developing countries, in particular least developed countries and small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition, for implementing the Convention and the Strategic Plan.

### ***Anticipated outcomes of the ninth and tenth meetings of the Conference of the Parties***

9. It has been a practice that while conducting an in-depth review or consideration of a subject issue under the Convention, the Conference of the Parties also provides guidance on how the financial mechanism can assist in advancing implementation. The following issues identified for in-depth review in decision VIII/10, annex II, should thus be considered in the development of the four-year (2010-2014) framework for programme priorities for the financial mechanism:

(a) The ninth meeting: agricultural biodiversity; Global Strategy for Plant Conservation; invasive alien species; forest biodiversity; incentive measures; ecosystem approach; national biodiversity strategies and action plans; identification and monitoring;

(b) The tenth meeting: inland waters biodiversity; marine and coastal biodiversity; sustainable use; protected areas; mountain biodiversity; climate change; fourth national reports; clearing-house mechanism, technology transfer, capacity-building.

***National priorities reflected in national biodiversity strategies and action plans***

10. As suggested by Governments in their submissions, sustainable achievement of global biodiversity objectives will greatly depend on the extent to which activities of the financial mechanism are country-driven, respond to programmes of national priority that fulfil the obligations of the Convention and are related to appropriate national policy frameworks and plans for sectoral, economic, and social development. Therefore, the establishment of the four-year framework for programme priorities in anticipation of the fifth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund has to be built on the principles of country-drivenness and country ownership, must give due consideration to the important role of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) as a tool in identifying national needs and priorities for GEF financing while recognizing the need to provide coherent and prioritized guidance to the financial mechanism.

11. According to the assessment of national biodiversity priorities presented in document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/2/5, national priorities reflected in 109 national biodiversity strategies and action plans had demonstrated the following pattern:

(a) Over 70 per cent of national biodiversity strategies and action plans have strong components on protected areas (Article 8), education and public awareness (Article 13), identification and monitoring (Article 7), and research and training (Article 12);

(b) Over 50 per cent of national biodiversity strategies and action plans include sustainable use (Article 10), incentive measures (Article 11), biosafety (Article 19), clearing-house mechanism (Article 18), indigenous communities and traditional knowledge (Article 8(j)) and access and benefit-sharing (Article 15);

(c) Relatively few national biodiversity strategies and action plans make use of the ecosystem approach;

(d) The consideration of the thematic programmes of work is uneven: agricultural biodiversity (48%), coastal and marine biodiversity, inland water biodiversity, forest biodiversity, mountainous areas, arid and semi-arid areas/dry and sub-humid lands (11%);

(e) Less than 10 per cent of national biodiversity strategies and action plans contain measures to address preparation of national reports, Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, island biodiversity, social dimensions, development activities consistent with biodiversity needs, Global Taxonomy Initiative, and endemic species;

(f) More than half contain measures to address *ex situ* conservation, species programmes and impact assessment. A sizable number seek to integrate biodiversity into tourism, forestry, agriculture, fisheries, land use planning, energy and water resources management, implying that the sectoral approach may have carried equal importance at the national level as does the ecosystem approach. Other measures contained in those national biodiversity strategies and action plans are mining, urban development, hunting and game animal management, transport, industry, population, defense, aquaculture, medicine, manufacturing, and health.

12. Information made available by country representatives at the regional and sub-regional workshops on national biodiversity strategies and action plans and biodiversity mainstreaming held during 2008 suggest an evolution in the scope and strategic approach of NBSAPs. Compared to earlier versions, more recently developed or revised NBSAPs give more emphasis on integration of biodiversity into other national plans, programmes and strategies; incorporate more fully the ecosystem approach and address additional threats to biodiversity such as invasive alien species.

***GEF biodiversity portfolio and strategy***

13. As of the end of 2006 (GEF project database accessed in March 2007), the Global Environment Facility had approved over 500 full-sized and medium-sized biodiversity projects, and nearly 330 biodiversity enabling activities based on its operational strategy, programmes and criteria as well as on its strategic priorities introduced for its third phase. Enabling activity biodiversity projects had been funded through several, but not necessarily mutually exclusive, rounds: country studies, national biodiversity strategies and action plans; national reporting; clearing-house mechanisms; prioritized capacity assessments. According to document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/2/5, more than half enabling activity projects were for national reporting or contained national reporting components, and it is probable that enabling activities related to the development of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and of clearing-house mechanisms had been undertaken in all eligible countries. Over 50 capacity-assessment projects provided an indication of relative priorities assigned by eligible countries:

(a) The most frequently mentioned areas are identification and monitoring, *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation, taxonomy and traditional knowledge;

(b) About half of these projects consider access and benefit-sharing, agricultural biodiversity, and incentive measures;

(c) One or two projects mention forest ecosystems, invasive alien species, sustainable use, education and public awareness.

14. GEF operational programmes for biodiversity include arid and semi-arid zone ecosystems (OP1), coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems (OP2), forest ecosystems (OP3), mountain ecosystems (OP4), integrated ecosystem management (OP12), conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture (OP13), operational program on sustainable land management (OP15). The full-sized and medium-sized biodiversity projects can be country-based, regional-based or global in scope, and the country-based projects may provide a better reflection of areas of intervention identified by countries. According to document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/2/5, the 245 country-based full-sized projects and 133 country-based medium-sized projects have been assessed in terms of operational programmes:

(a) Within country-based full-sized projects, forest ecosystems and coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems account for nearly 70 per cent of the total funding, each having similar number of projects. Since the average size of projects under coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems are only two third that of projects under forest ecosystems, forest ecosystems take over 40 per cent of the total funding. In terms of both project numbers and allocations, arid and semi-arid ecosystems account for less than 20 per cent, and mountain ecosystems for less than 10 per cent.

(b) Country-based medium-sized projects share the overall pattern demonstrated in country-based full-sized projects, but are more skewed to forest ecosystems with 44 per cent of the total funding designated to this subject area. The portion for mountain ecosystems and agricultural biodiversity largely remains the same. The share of arid and semi-arid ecosystems tends to be higher while that of coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems becomes lower.

15. The country-based full-sized and medium-sized projects share the similar pattern in terms of subject areas, though the focus of the country-based medium-sized projects is more dispersed:

(a) Over two thirds of the country-based full-sized projects are concentrated on in-situ conservation (Article 8) identification, assessment and monitoring (Article 7), training and research (Article 12), education and public awareness (Article 13) as well as institutional capacity building;

(b) Nearly half of these projects deal with financial sustainability, either through establishing dedicated trust funds or through resource mobilization strategies or efforts;

(c) Traditional knowledge, information generation, sustainable use and incentive measures, and planning are found in 16-25 per cent of these projects;

(d) Only a few projects specifically mention the ecosystem approach, invasive alien species, access and benefit-sharing, technology and taxonomy.

16. The country-based full-sized and medium-sized projects often contain components that are site-specific, including:

(a) Tourism is considered in a third of the country-based full-sized projects;

(b) Forestry is considered in a quarter of them;

(c) Agriculture, fisheries, and land use planning account for around 10 per cent of these projects;

(d) Several projects contain elements on water resources, mainstreaming, medicine, energy, mining and health;

(e) *Ex situ* conservation and impact assessment has also been funded by several projects.

17. The GEF Council has recently approved the Focal Area Strategies and Strategic Programming for GEF-4, consisting of strategic long-term objectives and strategic programmes as the focus of GEF-4 activities. The GEF-4 focal area strategy for biodiversity seeks to relate to the three objectives of the Convention and its Protocol, and should thus be taken into account in the development of the four-year (2010-2014) framework for programme priorities for the financial mechanism. According to the submission from Governments, however, its linkages to the three objectives of the Convention should be further strengthened. Operational experience of implementing the new strategy for biodiversity will become more available when more projects have been approved and implemented in line with the new GEF strategic approach.

#### ***Findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment***

18. Given the general interest in sustaining ecosystem services through securing as much global biodiversity value for GEF investments in incremental-cost funding as possible, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment conceptual framework and its findings have relevance to the development of the four-year (2010-2014) framework for programme priorities for the financial mechanism. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment identified five indirect drivers of changes in biodiversity and ecosystem services--demographic, economic, sociopolitical, cultural and religious, and scientific and technological, and concluded that the most important direct drivers of biodiversity loss and change in ecosystem services are: habitat change (such as land-use change, physical modification of rivers or water withdrawal from rivers, loss of coral reefs, and damage to sea floors due to trawling), climate change, invasive alien species, overexploitation of species, and pollution.

### **III. WAYS AND MEANS TO ENHANCE THE PROCESS OF FORMULATING AND CONSOLIDATING GUIDANCE TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM**

19. Ways and means to enhance the process of formulating and consolidating guidance to the financial mechanism may include:

- (a) Permanent dialogue between the Chief Executive Officer of the Global Environment Facility and the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties;
- (b) Dialogue between the Global Environment Facility and the Conference of the Parties;
- (c) Standing committee of the Executive Secretary, Chief Executive Officer of the Global Environment Facility and its Executive Coordinators;
- (d) Reporting of the Global Environment Facility on implementation of the four-year framework for programme priorities related to utilization of GEF resources for biological diversity;
- (e) President of the Conference of the Parties to communicate with the Council of the Global Environment Facility.

20. Governments also suggested mandating a group/committee of financial mechanism negotiators, set up during each Conference of the Parties, to deal with the guidance to the financial mechanism. The group/committee should be established at the beginning of the Conference of the Parties instead of having the group/committee merely consolidate all guidance to the financial mechanism developed under other agenda items during the last days of the Conference of the Parties. The group/committee should have a regionally balanced composition. To better use the expertise of this group/committee to improve the guidance process, the mandate of the group or committee could be:

- (a) To review existing guidance in relation to the agenda of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (see table 1 of document UNEP/CBDWG-RI/2/5);
- (b) To identify obsolete, repetitive, overlapping and missing guidance;
- (c) To retire, streamline, consolidate old guidance and suggest guidance for gaps;
- (d) In light of the above, to clarify the new guidance with respect to earlier guidance (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/2/5, para. 36);
- (e) To play a role in the prioritization process agreed at the second meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation, bearing in mind the need for broader assistance and consultation beyond the group/committee.

21. The development of the four-year (2010-2014) framework for programme priorities for the financial mechanism, coinciding with the replenishment cycles of the GEF Trust Fund, provides an opportunity to test the utility of consolidating guidance into a four-year framework. If successful, the experience could be replicated for the future replenishment cycles.

### **IV. RECOMMENDATIONS**

22. The Conference of the Parties is invited to consider recommendation II/3 of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/4, annex I) and adopt the four-year (2010-2014) framework for programme priorities related to utilization of GEF resources for biological diversity contained in the annex to the present note.



*Annex*

**ELEMENTS FOR THE FOUR-YEAR (2010-2014) FRAMEWORK FOR PROGRAMME PRIORITIES RELATED TO UTILIZATION OF GEF RESOURCES FOR BIODIVERSITY**

The following outcome-oriented framework for programme priorities related to utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity for the period 2010 to 2014 should be implemented in accordance with Article 20 and Article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention and in conformity with decisions I/2, II/6, III/5, IV/13, V/13, VI/17, VII/20 and VIII/18 of the Conference of the Parties as well as any additional guidance from the ninth and tenth meetings of the Conference of the Parties.

In this regard, the Global Environment Facility shall provide financial resources to developing country Parties, taking into account the special needs of the least developed countries and the small island developing States, for country-driven activities and programmes, consistent with national priorities and objectives, recognizing that economic and social development and poverty eradication are the first and overriding priorities of developing countries, and taking fully into consideration all relevant decisions from the Conference of the Parties, including the ecosystem approach.

Eligible countries shall determine their own funding priorities for national biodiversity activities based on the Strategic Plan and programmes of work of the Convention, national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and taking into account the outcome-oriented framework for programme priorities.

***Programme priority area 1: Significantly reduce the rate of loss of biological diversity and ecosystem services***

**Outcome 1.1** Comprehensive, representative, resilient and effectively managed protected area systems are established and strengthened at the national level.

**Indicator:** Increased coverage and number of national protected areas, improved sustainability and management effectiveness of protected areas.

**Outcome 1.2** Pressures from habitat change, land-use change and degradation, and unsustainable water use is reduced.

**Indicator:** Decreased rate of loss or degradation of habitats (for example decreased deforestation or loss of wetlands), ,.

**Outcome 1.3** Resilience of the components of biodiversity to adapt to climate change is maintained and enhanced.

**Indicator:** Increased number of policies, regulations and incentives that integrate climate and biodiversity management, higher level of institutional capacity and investments to address both climate change and loss of biodiversity, increased connectivity/fragmentation of ecosystems.

**Outcome 1.4** Pressures from nutrient loading and pollution reduced.

**Indicator:** Decreased nutrient loading and concentration of pollutants, decreased eutrophication.

**Outcome 1.5** Threats to biological diversity from invasive alien species are controlled.

**Indicator:** Increased number of strategies, action plans and measures, under design or implementation, to address invasive alien species at national and regional levels, identified and controlled pathways for major potential alien invasive species.

**Outcome 1.6** Sustainable use, trade and consumption related to biological diversity is promoted.

**Indicator:** Increased number of projects and programmes that integrate sustainable use of biological diversity.

**Outcome 1.7** Social, economic and legal incentive measures are supportive of the Convention's objectives.

**Indicator:** Increased number of development policies and incentive measures addressing the driving forces of loss of biological diversity.

**Outcome 1.8** The level of protection is increased in the field of the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms resulting from modern biotechnology that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.

**Indicator:** Increased number of national biosafety regulatory, policy and administrative frameworks under development and implementation, strengthened institutional capacities, improved participation in biosafety clearing-house.

**Programme priority area 2: *Maintain biological capacity of ecosystems to deliver goods and services and support human well-being***

**Outcome 2.1** The Convention's objectives are advanced in forest ecosystems.

**Indicator:** Extent of forest cover maintained, increased coverage of forest areas protected or under sustainable management, increased application of sustainable use and benefit sharing schemes.

**Outcome 2.2** The achievement of the Convention's objectives is enhanced at the catchment/watershed/river basin levels.

**Indicator:** Reduced level of ambient threats, deepened scope of sectoral integration, increased areas of inland water ecosystems under sustainable management, strengthened institutional capacities, improved water quality in inland water ecosystems.

**Outcome 2.3** The loss of marine and coastal biological diversity is reduced and the capacity of marine and coastal ecosystems to provide goods and services is sustained.

**Indicator:** Substantially increased number and coverage of protected areas in marine and coastal ecosystems, marine trophic index, coverage of live coral, artisanal fisheries sustained.

**Outcome 2.4** The rate of island biodiversity loss is reduced as a contribution to poverty alleviation and the sustainable development of islands, particularly small island developing States.

**Indicator:** Increased areas of island ecosystems under protection and sustainable management, sustainable tourism.

**Outcome 2.5** Biological diversity in dry and sub-humid lands is conserved and sustainably used, and benefits arising out of utilization of its genetic resources are fairly and equitably shared.

**Indicator:** Increased coverage of dry and sub-humid protected areas, reduced level of ambient threats, improved knowledge about dry and sub-humid ecosystems, reduced degradation of ecosystem services.

**Outcome 2.6** Agricultural biodiversity is promoted in agricultural systems and practices, and genetic resources important for food and agriculture are conserved and sustainably used and associated benefits are shared equitably.

**Indicator:** Reduced level of threats, deepened scope of sectoral integration, increased application of economic incentives, improved sharing of benefits arising out of utilization of agricultural genetic resources, increased area of agricultural ecosystems under sustainable management.

**Outcome 2.7** Mountain biological diversity loss is reduced as a significant contribution to poverty alleviation in mountain ecosystems and in lowlands dependent on the goods and services of mountain ecosystems.

**Indicator:** Reduced level of ambient threats, increased areas of protected mountain areas, agriculture and forestry under sustainable management, sustainable tourism.

**Programme priority area 3: *Improve national capacity to implement the Convention and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety***

**Outcome 3.1** National biodiversity planning capacity is enhanced.

**Indicator:** Increased number of integrated national strategies, plans and programmes on biological diversity under revision or implementation, number of national programmes and policies which specifically address the integration of biological diversity into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies.

**Outcome 3.2** The problems of insufficient knowledge of all components of biological diversity and lack of taxonomic capacity is addressed.

**Indicator:** Increased number of projects and programmes to implement the Global Taxonomy Initiative.

**Outcome 3.3** Transfer of and access to technologies are promoted and facilitated from developed to developing countries, including the least developed among them and small island developing States, and to countries with economies in transition, as well as among developing countries and other Parties.

**Indicator:** Increased number of projects and programmes aimed at technology transfer and cooperation.

**Outcome 3.4** Technical and scientific cooperation and clearing-house mechanism are promoted and facilitated among Parties, other Governments and stakeholders.

**Indicator:** Number of sustainable national clearing-house mechanisms integrated into national environmental information systems, and quality of information exchanged in terms of relevance, quantity, accuracy and timeliness.

**Outcome 3.5** Biodiversity-related communication, education and public awareness activities are promoted

**Indicator:** Increased number of national programmes and activities aimed at communication, education and public awareness about the importance of biological diversity

**Outcome 3.6** National compliance with reporting obligations under the Convention and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety is promoted

**Indicator:** Increased timely national submissions under the Convention and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety through flexible global projects.

**Programme priority area 4:** *Promote the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources*

**Outcome 4.1** The achievement of the Convention's objective on access to genetic resources and benefit sharing is promoted.

**Indicator:** Increased number of national policies and regulatory frameworks on access to genetic resources and fair and equitable sharing of the benefit arising out of their utilization, projects addressing capacity and information constraints, cases of fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the commercial and other utilization of genetic resources.

**Outcome 4.2** National capacity is improved to protect traditional knowledge, innovations and practices, and strengthen the involvement of local and indigenous communities in the achievement of the Convention's three objectives.

**Indicator:** Increased number of development policies and measures addressing traditional knowledge, innovations and practices as well as local and indigenous communities, cases of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices used to achieve the Convention's objectives, cases of involvement of local and indigenous communities.

-----