



CBD



**Convention on
Biological Diversity**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/12/INF/5
5 October 2014

ENGLISH ONLY

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
Twelfth meeting
Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, 6–17 October 2014

INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON FINANCING FOR BIODIVERSITY

Note by the Executive Secretary

1. The Executive Secretary is circulating herewith, for the information of participants in the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Co-Chairs' summary report of the international workshop on financing for biodiversity, which took place from 18-19 August, 2014, in Kartause Ittingen, Switzerland.
2. The document is being circulated in the form and language in which it was provided to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

International workshop on financing for biodiversity

18-19 August, 2014, Kartause Ittingen, Switzerland

Co-chairs' summary

Table of contents

Preface

Executive summary

Introduction

Summary of presentations and discussions

Opening session

Session I: Concrete and effective actions for implementing the financial targets under Aichi Biodiversity Target 20

Session II: Financing reporting framework

Session III: Enhancing the use of biodiversity financing mechanisms and complementary safeguards

Session IV: Looking ahead

Closing session

Annex I: Conclusions and recommendations of break-out group discussions

Annex II: Workshop programme

Annex III: List of participants

Preface

This summary report of the “International Workshop on Financing for Biodiversity” was prepared by its co-chairs, Mr. Jeremy Eppel (UK) and Ms. Sofia Cristina Panchi Robles (Ecuador). While the co-chairs assume full responsibility for the report, they wish to gratefully acknowledge the support of the facilitators of the different break out groups who, together with the co-chairs, also formed the steering group of the workshop: Ms. Clarissa Souza Della Nina, Brazil; Mr. Diego Pacheco Balanza, Plurinational State of Bolivia; Ms. Sofia Cristina Panchi Robles, Ecuador; Ms. Laure Ledoux, European Commission; Ms. Nicola Breier, Germany; Mr. Appukuttan Nair Damodaran, India; Mr. Rikiya Konish, Japan; Ms. Tone Solhaug, Norway; Mr. Seukwoo Kang, Republic of Korea; Ms. Malta Quathekana, South Africa; Ms. Gabriela Blatter, Switzerland; Mr. Andreas Obrecht, Switzerland; Mr. James Vause, The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; and Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez, Conservation International, Costa Rica.

Executive summary

1. The international workshop on financing for biodiversity was held on 18-19 August, 2014 in Kartause Ittingen, Switzerland. Organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity with the financial support from the Governments of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland, as well as the European Union, the overall aim of the workshop was to provide technical follow-up to the elements of the recommendation on resource mobilization adopted by the fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI recommendation 5/10), namely: on the development of concrete and effective actions on resource mobilization, on financial reporting, and on biodiversity financing mechanisms including safeguards.

2. On the concrete and effective actions for resource mobilization, the workshop concluded that many elements in the existing strategy for resource mobilization remain relevant, but, reflecting on the second Quito Dialogue and the work of the High Level Panel, some elements need updating, and that there is also a need for more specificity. To begin to address this need, the workshop was helpful in identifying a range of concrete and effective actions which could supplement and support the current strategy.

3. In general, the workshop recognized the need for alignment of the resource mobilization strategy with the Strategic Plan and establishing cross-references with other relevant Aichi Targets, in particular Aichi Targets 2 and 3. It also recognized the links between the resource mobilization decision and other decisions which can support the mobilization of resources from different sources in the Convention. In this context, the workshop emphasized the importance of taking action to mainstream biodiversity considerations and of efforts to raise the priority placed on such mainstreaming, as crucial factors to deliver resource mobilization across all drivers of biodiversity loss. The need to improve our collective ability to 'make the case' for biodiversity was highlighted: biodiversity expenditures should be understood and communicated as investments which deliver a wide range of benefits across our societies. In this context, the workshop underlined the ongoing importance of providing technical support and capacity building, e.g. for applying various methodologies for revealing and communicating the benefits of biodiversity investments to different stakeholders, including by strengthening the clearing house mechanism of the Convention.

4. On financial reporting, there was recognition that the work required to complete the reporting framework plays an important role in developing and implementing financial strategies for meeting the Aichi targets and understanding the range of (potential) sources of resources available. Such information is key to identifying the need for additional resources both domestically and internationally. In order to help this process move forward, there was a consensus on the need to further methodological improvements in the reporting framework. Various options were identified for such improvements, while some divergence remained on whether to focus on the development of tailored, country-specific approaches, or on the development of common approaches, reflecting the trade-off between the desire to achieve better comparability and the need, in light of country-specific circumstances and conditions, to allow for discretion about methodology. The workshop provided useful guidance on how to technically improve the draft reporting framework, on how to better reflect some finance streams (such as from the private

sector or on the contribution of indigenous and local communities), and on how to enhance methodological guidance, including the linkages to other processes.

5. On biodiversity financing mechanisms, the workshop recognized that there is a growing body of practical experiences and a need for Parties to learn from each other. Biodiversity finance mechanisms can have different roles in terms of mobilizing resources – while they can raise finance which can be spent on biodiversity related initiatives, they may also change incentives across different sectors and change the way current resources are used to reduce and potentially reverse drivers of biodiversity loss more widely. In the latter case, they may not necessarily raise biodiversity specific budgets; however, they can ensure that different sectors deliver their own goals without resulting in further biodiversity losses (and therefore subsequent needs for additional resources). Many opportunities for greater use of biodiversity finance mechanisms were identified and, while a range of persistent challenges or risks was reflected, it was understood that the risks of policy failure could be reduced through developing a good regulatory framework, and that the residual risks needed to be balanced against the potential biodiversity and resourcing benefits which could be delivered. The important role of appropriate safeguards was acknowledged as part of good instrument design to reduce and avoid a number of the risks identified.

6. The workshop reiterated the benefit of achieving some common understanding of key concepts associated with financing mechanisms, while recognizing that these mechanisms when used need to be country-specific and country-driven to reflect different circumstances on the ground. It was generally thought that more practical guidance was needed, including broad elements of global guidance, though it was generally felt that more detailed guidance would be most useful when developed locally. Future conceptual work on biodiversity financing mechanisms might thus include work on developing 'broad indicative descriptions', as well as the continued collection of case studies, good practices, and lessons learned. Wider dissemination through the clearing house mechanism of the Convention, ideally alongside more targeted capacity building and technical support, was seen as worthwhile.

7. The workshop enhanced mutual understanding of the issues at stake, and on areas of convergence and divergence. There were reflections on achieving an acceptable balance between international flows and domestic resource mobilization; on the respective role of governments and various stakeholders, including collective action by indigenous and local communities; and on the importance of technical support to enable mainstreaming of biodiversity and to utilize the opportunities available domestically and internationally to the fullest possible extent.

Introduction

1. The International Workshop on Financing for Biodiversity was held on 18-19 August, 2014 in Kartause Ittingen, Switzerland. Organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity with the financial support from the Government of Japan, Republic of Korea, and Switzerland, as well as the European Union, the overall aim of the workshop was to provide technical follow-up to the elements of the recommendation on resource mobilization adopted by the fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI recommendation 5/10). The participants of the workshop were selected on the basis of relevant expertise, while ensuring geographical and gender balance. The list of selected experts as well as of the representatives of United Nations and specialized agencies, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations is provided in Annex III of the present report.

2. In its deliberations, the workshop took into account the existing strategy for resource mobilization, the report of the High-Level Panel on the Global Assessment of Resources for implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and the Co-Chair's Summary of the Second Dialogue Seminar on Scaling up Finance for Biodiversity. The documents prepared for the workshop and the presentations that were delivered at the workshop are made available on the clearing house mechanism of the Convention, under <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=RMWS-2014-05>. The meeting was held in English.

3. The programme of the workshop is provided in Annex II.

Summary of presentations and discussions¹

Opening session

4. The opening session of the workshop sought to clarify the overall objective of the workshop and ensure understanding of the purpose, expectations and planned proceedings of the workshop.

5. Mr. Braulio Ferreira Dias, CBD Executive Secretary, welcomed participants to the workshop and provided a briefing on the state of affairs in preparing for the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, Noting the particular importance of the agenda item on resource mobilization, he reviewed the individual elements that would be taken up by COP-12, and expressed the hope that the workshop would provide useful technical input into the finalization of the pertinent documentation.

6. Mr. Ravi Sharma, Principal Officer, Implementation and Technical Support Division of the CBD Secretariat, delivered a presentation of the background and policy context on mobilization of resources from all sources. In reviewing the conceptual issues in mobilizing resources for biodiversity, he underlined that it is the economic invisibility, and not the lack of value, of the natural world leads to biodiversity decline. He provided data and information on the relevant

¹ All presentations are available as PDF files at <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=RMWS-2014-05>.

financial landscape, identified different approaches, and argued that there is significant potential for Parties to mobilize additional resources for biodiversity, both from domestic and from international sources. Referring to the draft report of the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing, he reviewed comparative data on financial needs between various sectors, including biodiversity, and discussed the various global initiatives currently under way to facilitate the mobilization of resources. Lastly, he introduced the recommendations adopted at the fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the follow-up in preparation for COP 12, including proposals for concrete and effective actions, reporting framework, establishing financial targets and milestones for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 3.

7. **Mr. Seukwoo Kang** (Republic of Korea) gave a presentation on possible key elements of the “*Pyeongchang Roadmap 2020*” for the enhanced implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. He explained that the Pyeongchang Roadmap could consist of a package of key decisions of COP-12 and may possibly include items related to: resource mobilization; review of progress in providing support in implementing the objectives of the Convention and its strategic plan 2011-2020; integration biodiversity into the post-2015 UN Development agenda and SDG; review of progress in revising/updating and implementing NBSAP and submission of fifth national report; fourth edition of the GBO, mid-term review of progress towards the goals of the strategic plan 2011-2020. He also explained the key elements of the “BioBridge Initiative”, which is envisaged to support COP-12 decisions on the enhancement of scientific and technical cooperation, and their relationship to Pyeongchang Roadmap.

8. Ms. Sofia Cristina Panchi Robles (Ecuador) and Jeremy Eppel (UK), the Co-Chairs of the workshop, welcomed participants to the workshop and outlined the programme (See Annex II).

9. Participants subsequently introduced themselves and presented their expectations for the workshop.

Session I

Concrete and effective actions for implementing the financial targets under Aichi Biodiversity Target 20

The objective of the session was to identify and compile possible concrete and effective actions for resource mobilization under the goals and objectives of the 2008 Strategy for Resource Mobilization.

10. **Mr. Yibin Xiang**, CBD Secretariat, presented a summary of the Global Monitoring Report on Resource Mobilization, by providing an overview on global trends in biodiversity financing: (i) bilateral official development assistance related to biodiversity experienced downward pressures in 2011- 2012 after a peak in 2010, but this declining trend in biodiversity-related official development assistance has seemingly being reversed in recent years; (ii) domestic budgets for biodiversity and ecosystem services have demonstrated upward trends in a number of countries and a fluctuating pattern in others; (iii) increases in private sector funding can be detected in approximately one fifth of countries, while others observed a downward trend in the recent

years; (iv) funding from non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia has been increasing both domestically and internationally in the past decade; (v) information regarding multilateral and non-ODA biodiversity-related public funding is overall very limited and presents a mixed picture; (vi) the number of South-South cooperation initiatives is increasing, with technical and financial support from both developing countries and developed countries. He concluded that the overall progress detected, even it is so far not sufficient to close the global funding gap, potentially demonstrates the positive contribution of the strategy for resource mobilization to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity.

11. Ms. Maria Schultz, Stockholm Resilience Centre and co-chair of the second Dialogue Seminar on Upscaling biodiversity Finance, held in Quito, Ecuador, from 9-12 April 2014, presented the outcomes of the meeting. She provided an overview of the issues addressed by the workshop as they relate to scaling-up finance for biodiversity, and identified key conclusions under each issue, including on: how to mainstream biodiversity; an analysis of different financing mechanisms, including the role of governance, safeguards and equity, with emphasis on payment for ecosystem services, biodiversity offsets, private sector financing and fiscal reforms; and possible synergies for biodiversity financing – with areas such as climate change and the emerging sustainable development goals.

12. Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez, Chair of the second phase of the High-level Panel on Global Assessment of Resources for Implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (HLP), presented the emerging conclusions of the HLP report, namely: (i) meeting the Aichi Targets will deliver substantial benefits to people and economies across the world; (ii) biodiversity contributes to sustainable development; (iii) biodiversity contributes to climate mitigation, adaptation and resilience; (iv) investments in biodiversity can strengthen the provision of ecosystem services on which vulnerable communities depend; (v) biodiversity provides insurance value; (vi) enhancing synergies, addressing trade-offs and promoting alignments across sectoral policies are prerequisites for effective implementation of the Aichi Targets and of major importance for resource mobilization; (vii) all countries need to invest in institutions and policy frameworks, direct conservation and sustainable use actions, incentives and economic instruments; (viii) design and implementation of appropriate policy and financial instruments is essential to halt the loss of biodiversity; (ix) the monetary and non-monetary benefits of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use far outweigh the costs; (x) there is a need to increase investments substantially to bridge financing gaps.

13. Based on these key findings, he noted that the following actions could be recommended: (i) assess financing baselines, needs and gaps, and the full range of potential financing sources (using the BIOFIN Initiative approach); (ii) identify opportunities for improving cost-effectiveness in national biodiversity expenditure; (iii) develop strategies and policies to bridge the biodiversity finance gap with a broadened base of sustained and predictable sources of finance including more ambitious and scale-up policy tools such as PES, offsets, tradable permits, other instruments such as spatial planning, quotas and restrictions, as well as policies for the elimination of environmentally harmful subsidies; (iv) present biodiversity investments as solutions to wider problems and challenges, for example, climate change, food security, water security, disaster risk reduction, livelihoods and poverty reductions, and national security, as well as to national revenue; (v)

integrate the economic rationale for conservation actions into training, education and capacity building programmes, and encourage its inclusion into secondary and tertiary education curricula, and civil society and private sector training programmes; (vi) increase focus of human and institutional capacity development programmes on the sharing of practical knowledge and experience in developing effective policies and instruments for mainstreaming that support increased investment, and seek to enhance the role of regional and south-south cooperation and support; (vii) include robust and verifiable baselines and indicators on the status and trends of biodiversity, ecosystems and ecosystem services into local and national sustainable development plans and NBSAPs; (viii) improve knowledge generation regarding the insurance value of biodiversity and better learning processes for adaptive governance of ecosystems and the use of appropriate financial measures.

14. Discussion

15. The participants were subsequently divided into break-out groups in order to identify possible concrete and effective actions that can be undertaken by Parties and others. The conclusions and recommendations of the break-out groups are provided in Annex I of the present report, while a summary of the discussions held under this item is collapsed into the co-chairs' summary provided under the closing session below.

Session II

Financial reporting framework

The objective of the session was to discuss the challenges associated with reporting on resource mobilization, and to identify possible ways and means to effectively address these challenges.

16. **Ms. Stephanie Ockenden**, OECD Secretariat, delivered a presentation on measuring and monitoring international development finance for biodiversity. She provided an overview on the OECD DAC statistical system, noting that finance statistics are developed through the following four steps: reporting; collection of data within the Creditor Reporting System (CRS); monitoring for quality control & reviews; and transparent online publication. She explained that biodiversity-related aid is tracked within the CRS using the biodiversity "Rio marker" and noted that, based on the pertinent dataset, bilateral biodiversity-related aid commitments by OECD DAC members have been almost doubled from 2004-06 to 2010-12. Most of the increase is in aid targeting biodiversity as a "significant" objective, accounting for 59% of the total biodiversity-related aid in 2010-12. She observed that a large number of members draw on Rio markers to provide the basis for their reporting to the UNFCCC, CBD and UNCCD on bilateral ODA. With awareness and recognition for the limitation of the Rio marker methodology which allows for an approximate quantification of financial flows, many members are adopting "innovations" for reporting, in particular applying coefficients to adjust the share of finance. In closing, she referred to the ongoing work of the joint ENVIRONET and WP-STAT Task Team on the improvement of Rio markers, environment and development finance statistics.

17. Diego Pacheco Balanza, Bolivia, presented the conceptual and methodological framework for evaluating the contribution of collective action to biodiversity conservation, in particular

quantitatively assessing contributions of indigenous and local communities. The framework was developed through an initiative of the Bolivian government with the support of the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization (OCTA) through the Amazon Regional Programme (ARP)-GIZ, and the IUCN South – Resilience and Development Programme (SWEDBIO). The framework and methodology aims at supporting countries to assess and report the contribution of collective action for biodiversity for the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including the development of country-specific frameworks for mobilization of financial resources that consider the contribution of indigenous people and local communities to the national strategy for biodiversity conservation.

18. The proposed methodology: Collective Action in Socio-Ecological Systems [CASES] consists of three modules: (a) a geospatial modeling approach to estimate the area of terrestrial ecosystems protected by local people; (b) an institutional analysis module that complements the geospatial analysis, and (c) an ecological-assessment module that outlines field-based protocols and sampling to validate the geospatial model. The implementation of these modules allow for the generation of indicators, either non-monetary or monetary, to evaluate the relationship between collective action and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of its components.

19. Ms. Laure Ledoux, European Commission, provided an overview on the EU internal financial monitoring system to track biodiversity-related expenses. The EU methodology applies reduction factors depending on categories: expenses are accounted for 100% when biodiversity is the principal (primary) objective; i.e., biodiversity objectives are fundamental in the design and impact of the activity, and an explicit objective of the activity. Expenses are accounted for 40% when biodiversity is a significant, but not predominant objective; i.e., biodiversity objectives are not one of the principal reasons for undertaking the activity.

20. Ms. Gabriela Blatter, Switzerland, reviewed different approaches to estimating biodiversity-related expenditures, covering public and private sectors as well as domestic and international investments, and identified challenges and the need for further methodological improvements. Lessons learned include: (i) the need for conservative estimates based on available data; (ii) don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good; (iii) the need to clarify indicators and increase transparency to ensure improve comparability and reliability of data; (iv) the need for Rio-Marker revisions and for convergence towards common methodologies; (v) persistent challenges to report investments of the private sector and NGOs/foundations finance due to lack of data and definitions; (vi) deficiencies in monitoring and evaluation of impacts; (vii) need for more and better data to enable establishing time series and estimating trends.

Discussion

21. The participants were subsequently divided into break-out groups to discuss the financial reporting framework. The conclusions and recommendations of the break-out groups are provided in Annex I of the present report, while a summary of the discussions held under this item is collapsed into the co-chairs' summary provided under the closing session below.

22. Following the plenary presentations on the results of the break-out groups, Mr. Markus Lehmann, CBD Secretariat, provided a briefing on the revision of the preliminary reporting

framework. Recalling the tasks identified by the fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of the Implementation of the Convention, as contained in recommendation 5/10, he explained that (i) the structure of the framework was brought into conformity with the targets for resource mobilization; (ii) the required scope and granularity of reporting was adapted; (iii) guidance to the individual questions was further developed; (iv) additional questions on other/private flows were introduced and cross-references to the national reporting guidance was added. He presented the resulting structure of the reporting framework as well as an overview of the feedback and comments received further to the invitation to Parties, sent by notification 2014/093 of 15 July 2014, to provide reviews and comments. Those pertained to: (i) opportunities to further improve clarity and associated guidance; (ii) strengthened guidance on reporting on collective action and non-market approaches; (iii) Reporting on international flows from private and other sources; (iv) concerns with regard to data accessibility and associated cost and practicality; (v) the classification of biodiversity-related activities. In closing, he said that those comments and suggestions, as well as any further observation at the meeting, would be taken in due consideration in the finalization of the draft framework and the associated document for COP-12.

Session III

Enhancing the use of biodiversity financing mechanisms and complementary safeguards

The objective of the session was to discuss opportunities for enhanced use of biodiversity financing mechanisms and safeguards.

23. **Ms. Katia Karousakis**, OECD Secretariat, presented the main findings of the OECD report on “Scaling-up Finance Mechanisms for Biodiversity”. The report examined the characteristics and applicability of the six “innovative financial mechanisms” presented under goal 4 of the strategy for resource mobilization, classifying them by scope (local, national, international); source (private, public); direct vs. indirect finance; the impact of drivers; and whether the beneficiary or the polluter pays. She highlighted the key design and implementation issues that would contribute to ensure environmental and economic effectiveness as well as distributional equity: (i) how to determine business-as-usual baselines; (ii) how to prioritize and target finance to areas with high biodiversity benefits, high risk of loss, and low opportunity costs; (iii) how to achieve robust monitoring, reporting and verification; (iv) addressing leakage and permanence issues; (v) identifying winners and losers of policies, and building well-targeted compensatory measures.

24. She highlighted the following key messages: (i) all six mechanisms have an important role to play in scaling up biodiversity outcomes, by raising revenue directly and/or help mainstreaming and/or reducing cost; (ii) in order to ensure effective outcomes, attention needs to be given to how mechanisms are designed and implemented; (iii) introducing new policy instruments (whether economic, trade-related, or environmental) may have impacts on other policy areas and sectors of the economy and it is therefore important to identify these impacts in advance, and put in place appropriate safeguards to address any possible trade-offs.

25. Mr. John Adrian Narag, Philippines, delivered a presentation on the experience of the Ministry of Finance of the Philippines in applying different financing mechanisms. He provided an overview on the different potential sources for biodiversity financing, namely: the public sector (national and local government, government corporations), bilateral/multilateral/international grants, foreign loans (ODA, but also debt swaps), and private/non-government sources. As a concrete example of a public sector source, he described the People's Survival Fund, a special fund for climate change adaptation programs and projects. The fund has been used toward water resources management, land management, agricultural and fishery, health, infrastructure development, and natural ecosystems including mountainous and coastal ecosystem. On debt-for-nature swaps, he noted that around USD 3.75 million has been mobilized under the Philippines-Italy debt for development swap programme.

26. Ms. Claudia Ituarte-Lima, Stockholm Resilience Centre, delivered, by video conference, a presentation on the report on biodiversity financing and safeguards, including lessons learned and proposed guidelines. She explained the evolution of the notion of safeguards and highlighted, in the context of CBD discussions, the need to distinguish substantive and procedural safeguards. Providing an overview on how safeguards could relate to different biodiversity funding mechanisms, she presented four guidelines of general applicability, addressing the following issues: (i) biodiversity underpins local livelihoods and resilience; (ii) people's rights, access to resource and livelihoods; (iii) local and country-driven/specific processes linked to the international level; (iv) governance, institutional frameworks and accountability.

27. Mr. Dirk Nemitz, UNFCCC Secretariat, delivered, by video conference, a presentation on REDD+ safeguards, namely: the scope of REDD+ (Cancun Agreements), REDD+ safeguards (Decision 1/CP.16 appendix 1, paragraph 2), and guidance on systems for providing information on how safeguards are addressed and respected (Decision 12/CP.17). The key elements of the UNFCCC's REDD+ safeguards, highlighted in the presentation are: consistency with the objective of national programme and international conventions and agreements; transparent and effective governance structures taking into national legislation and sovereignty; respect for knowledge and rights of ILCs; participation of relevant stakeholders; conservation of natural forests and biological diversity and enhancing other social and environmental benefits; addressing the risks of reversals; reducing displacement of emissions. UNFCCC also addresses the timing and frequency for provision of summary of information on safeguards. Developing country parties undertaking REDD+ should provide a summary of information on how all the safeguards are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of activities (decision 12/CP.19).

Discussion

28. The participants were subsequently divided into break-out groups to discuss options for voluntary guidelines for biodiversity financing mechanisms and safeguards. The conclusions and recommendations of the break-out groups are provided in Annex I of the present report, while a summary of the discussions held under this item is collapsed into the co-chairs' summary provided under the closing session below.

Session IV

Looking ahead

The objective of this session was to reflect on the implication of the discussions for COP 1.2

29. In introducing the session, **Mr. Braulio Ferreira Dias**, CBD Executive Secretary, recalled the political commitment to resource mobilization at the previous meetings of the Conference of the Parties, and noted the importance to not fall behind these achievements. He underlined that achieving an agreement on resource mobilization, including on financial targets, would be critical for the success of COP 12.

30. In the following exchange of views in plenary, participants welcomed the organization the workshop, underlining its usefulness, and made the following points:

- a. Recognizing that conservation costs are frequently dwarfed by the monetary and non-monetary benefits of biodiversity, highlighting biodiversity financing as an investment, not as expenditure, can help securing the political will to mobilize resources. Enhancing the capacity to present the Strategic Plan and revised NBSAPs in terms of costs and benefits, for instance through national accounting, would be one element to achieve such re-framing.
- b. On funding sources, while focus is typically on public resources, recognizing the fact that most funding comes from domestic budgets, it was emphasized that public financing is frequently inadequate and that there is a need to tap all available sources, public and private, international and domestic, in order to generate more impact. It is important to look beyond resources within the biodiversity community, for instance, by engaging the private sector.
- c. It was also emphasized that the allocation of more ODA for biodiversity requires efforts of both donors and recipients.
- d. On financial data, it was underlined that better baseline information is required and that its availability can be expected to improve with national submissions under the reporting framework. However, there is a persistent lack of human and financial resources and capacity to follow up on such obligations. The importance of global programmes and initiatives, such as UNDP BioFIN or WAVES, was underscored in this context.
- e. It was observed that assessments and associated decision making need to be evidence based. In light of ongoing efforts and initiatives, caution needs to be exercised in assessing the progress made so far in achieving resource mobilization. Recognizing the significant progress already made (i.e., some countries doubled their budgetary allocations in the past five years), there is a need to be optimistic about resource mobilization.
- f. There is a lack of capacity, and thus a need for technical support, on various biodiversity financing mechanisms. More global dialogues on financing, or financing fairs, similar to Quito seminars, could be helpful.
- g. For the upcoming COP, the need was recognized to align the strategy for resource mobilization with the Strategic Plan and to make cross-linkages to pertinent Aichi Target,

such as 2 and 3. It was also mentioned that a strengthened role given to Ministers during the High Level Segment could galvanize enhanced participation and thus become instrumental in awareness-raising. Some participants also expressed interest in exploring an effective follow-up process on resource mobilization under the Convention.

Concluding session

31. The co-chairs presented a summary of the discussions held at the workshop as follows.

- a. On the concrete and effective actions for resource mobilization, the workshop concluded that the major elements in the strategy for resource mobilization remain relevant but some elements need updating, and that there is also a need for more specificity. The workshop was helpful in identifying a range of concrete and effective actions. In general, there is a need for greater alignment of the resource mobilization strategy with the Strategic Plan and cross-reference with other relevant Aichi Targets, in particular Aichi Targets 2 and 3.

Several common threads emerged from the work in the different break out groups. Among those, the role of mainstreaming and changing priority-setting as critical preconditions for resource mobilization (achieving policy coherence) was particularly prominent. This would involve improving the collective ability to 'make the case' for biodiversity – highlighting benefits; recognizing and communicating biodiversity expenditures as investments with benefits for biodiversity and other sectors beyond. Achieving high level policy buy-in is also critical. The ongoing importance of providing technical support and capacity building was also emphasized, e.g., for applying various methodologies, including by identifying and disseminating good practice examples and lessons learned, through the clearing house mechanism of the Convention.

- b. A rich debate on methodologies took place under the financial reporting item. There was a consensus on the need to further improve methodologies to identify biodiversity-related investments/flows (e.g.: on ODA/OOF; on domestic expenditures; on private/other flows). While there were various options identified for such improvement, some divergence remained on how to achieve such methodological improvements: on whether to focus on the development of tailored, country-specific approaches, vs. the development of a common approach, reflecting the trade-off between the desire to achieve better comparability vs. the need to allow for discretion about methodology.
- c. It was emphasized that completing the financial reporting framework can help making the case for biodiversity, communicate resource needs and develop financial strategies for meeting the Aichi targets. The workshop provided useful guidance on how to technically improve the draft framework, on how to better reflect some finance streams (such as from the private sector and on the contributions of indigenous and local communities), and on how to enhance the methodological guidance, including by making appropriate cross-references to other processes.
- d. There is a growing body of practical experiences, including good practices and lessons learned, on various biodiversity financing mechanisms, and a recognition that they can

mobilize resources in different ways, whether through increasing public sector budgets or changing private sector incentives thus making decisions throughout our economies more biodiversity friendly. Generally many opportunities for the wider use of biodiversity finance mechanisms were identified. There was also a recognition that, if these are to deliver the benefits desired as their use is scaled up, they will need to be accompanied by the development of the regulatory framework including appropriate safeguards in order to reduce the risk of policy failure.

- e. It is important to achieve some common understanding of key concepts associated with financing mechanisms, while recognizing that biodiversity finance mechanisms need to be country-specific and country-driven. More guidance would be useful, including broad elements of global guidance and developing more detailed guidance at local levels. Future conceptual work on biodiversity financing mechanisms might thus include work on terminology – not necessarily strict definitions but rather ‘broad indicative descriptions’, as well as continued collections of case studies, good practices, lessons learned, to be disseminated through the clearing house mechanism, ideally alongside capacity building and technical support.

32. In closing, the co-chairs emphasized that a wealth of useful information was presented and analysed, including from the Report of the High Level Panel and the Quito dialogue, but also, critically, from the contributions of participants. They noted that the post-2015 development agenda and the emerging sustainable development goals, including the work of the intergovernmental committee on sustainable development financing, offer additional opportunities – particularly in terms of resource mobilization through mainstreaming biodiversity. The workshop also enhanced mutual understanding of the issues at stake, and on areas of convergence and divergence, such as on achieving an acceptable balance between international flows and domestic resource mobilization; and on the respective role of governments and various stakeholders, including collective action; and on the importance of technical support to enable us to mainstream biodiversity and utilize the opportunities available domestically and internationally.

33. In his closing remarks, Mr. Braulio Dias, CBD Executive Secretary, thanked participants for their contributions, which would enable richer documentation for COP-12 and improve the chances of a successful outcome. He also thanked the two co-chairs and the group of facilitators for their skilled guidance of the deliberations. Echoing the conclusions of the co-chairs, he emphasized the importance of the resource mobilization item for the effective implementation of the Strategic Plan for biodiversity 2011-2020, taking also into account the emerging post 2015 development agenda and the sustainable development goals: achieving comprehensive agreement on resource mobilization at COP-12, in particular on financial targets, building on the Hyderabad outcome and covering all, including domestic, funding sources in a balanced manner, would be critical for the overall success of the meeting. In closing, he expressed his optimism that the spirit of cooperation and compromise among Parties, which has been a hallmark of the Convention process, would again prevail and lead to successful outcomes at COP-12.

Annex I: Conclusions and recommendations of break-out group discussions

SESSION I. CONCRETE AND EFFECTIVE ACTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE FINANCIAL TARGETS UNDER AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGET 20

Group 1A: Goals 1 & 2 of the strategy for resource mobilization (facilitated by Ms. Tone Solhaug, Norway)

- Action on mainstreaming agenda to reduce the pressure on biodiversity and to highlight that benefit for conserving biodiversity is much higher than losing it. Drivers of biodiversity loss need to be the focus.
- There is always a biodiversity agenda in water and food security, as mentioned in recommendation number 4 in the HLP. More efforts need to be undertaken to enter in dialogue and forge cooperation with other sectors.
- Collecting all relevant knowledge is one action point. The other is to generate knowledge on the linkages of biodiversity with other sectors, including relevant institutional knowledge of key actors and processes. Generally speaking, it is a challenge for other sectors to recognize the role of biodiversity and ecosystem services. Could the SDG process be used to promote such linkages?
- On the generation of knowledge for mainstreaming and policy coherence, there is no one-size-fits-all approach for every sector. In agriculture for instance, products like TEEB for agriculture the expected report from FAO on food and biodiversity should deliver such arguments. Sources of knowledge need to be from outside the biodiversity community.
- National implementation of effective biodiversity policies is frequently hampered by: an absence of strategic planning; a lack of influence of sectors involved; insufficient expertise and training, and insufficient capacity to undertake the necessary inter-sectorial coordination. There is an ongoing need for capacity building, including improving research capacity on land degradation and biodiversity loss.
- There is a need to share best practices at global level, as well as a need to improve analyses on critical success factors and obstacles or barriers in implementing the Strategic Plan, and how these obstacles or barriers can be overcome or lowered.
- Communication is important for mainstreaming, to highlight co-benefits, synergy etc. It would also prevent very narrow finance goals as mainstreaming is very hard to track. Just the reporting by other sectors on biodiversity is very useful, such as asking other departments on how much biodiversity is contributing.
- WAVES has an interesting partnership approach which is a good example of how to proceed further. BIOFIN is another important programme.

- National Governments need to have their own resource mobilization strategy for which information basis is required to generate comparable data. Strategic approaches need to be country-specific.

Group 1B: goal 3 of the strategy for resource mobilization (facilitated by **Ms. Gabriella Blatter**, Switzerland)

There are eight objectives under Goal 3 (international funding) and related activities from Goal 5 (mainstreaming).

The group noted that elements of target 3 remain relevant but, in terms of concrete actions, are relatively vague and do not address how to achieve these elements

Subsequent focus of the group was on 5.1 and 5.2 (integration of biodiversity), and in particular on the issue of government priority setting (i.e., development vs environment financing) and changing it.

- Identify stakeholders, including the private sector, as potential partners for achieving integration of biodiversity (example of forest partnership in Vietnam bringing different stakeholders together)
- Generate tailored information and develop the case for such integration, including an assessment and presentation of economic benefits:
 - Develop national biodiversity assessments using methodologies like TEEB, WAVES, ACTO, etc.;
 - Make the case also for addressing harmful incentives: can both mobilize resources as well as reduce the need for resources;
 - Have pertinent actions well reflected in revised NBSAPs;
 - Have tailored outreach/communication – e.g. dedicated meetings with parliamentarians, ministry of finance, specific economic sectors, etc.;
 - have mainstreaming in a tailored manner, in accordance with national circumstances (e.g. different relationships between governments and private sector in different countries).
- Importance of high-level buy-in
- Importance of methodological support and capacity building for undertaking assessments of biodiversity values
- Follow through by establishing process towards concrete policy measures (biodiversity finance mechanisms, e.g. establishing national PES policy vs individual/isolated programmes), using use policy mechanisms that complement/not compete with existing arrangements
- Bundle forces by institutional reform (e.g. merge different biodiversity-related agencies)

In light of the above: align/cross-reference to Aichi Target 2 and 3 in revised strategy

Achieve a due balance between target on international flows and domestic resource mobilization

Group 1C: Goal 5 of the strategy for resource mobilization (facilitated by **Mr. Diego Pacheco Balanza**, Bolivia)

There are five objectives under Goal 5 (mainstreaming) related to domestic resource mobilization.

Some challenges of mobilizing domestic resources for implementing NBSAPs:

- Get biodiversity into priority areas of national development plans
- Secure the necessary political will among key / high level decision-makers
- Create better common understanding of biodiversity benefits such as the linkages between livelihoods and biodiversity
- There are different visions, approaches and understandings about biodiversity and other fundamental concepts (e.g. level of development, mainstreaming of biodiversity) among different countries. There is the need for developing a common framework.
- There are multiple disconnects: (i) between global policy debates and national actions/policy making; and (ii) between national biodiversity constituency/CBD focal points and people in charge of financial planning in ministries of environment, finance, etc. Solving those disconnects is a key national-level task.

Proposed actions:

- Need to reinforce the Paris declaration for the integration of international support into the priorities of the countries. Need for countries to have more clarity in priorities and ways to integrate financing and biodiversity.
- The multilateral scenario is problematic in order for mainstreaming biodiversity in spite of the Paris Declaration: (i) short time-span and project priorities; (ii) ideological bias; (iii) a lot of bureaucracy for the financial flows.
- Use/deploy international impulses to leverage national action – technical support, as well as regional coordination/workshops/S-S cooperation (e.g. BIOFIN) to improve this process by articulating experiences of countries working in a more systematic approach in the integration between financing and biodiversity.
- Establish the necessary national-level institutional frameworks (example Finland) for biodiversity finance and for enhancing integration among sectors. This could start with the creation of expert groups on specific areas, such as on strategies, subsidy reforms; the hosting of an environmental economist or similar to be in charge of regularly liaising with relevant finance actors; and the creation of cross-ministerial coordination mechanisms.
- The triggers for improving integration between financing and biodiversity: i) political leadership is fundamental; ii) policy strategies at the global level allowing integrating biodiversity into developmental goals; iii) decision-making based on cost-effectiveness.

- To catalyse improved political will in favour of biodiversity (biodiversity finance) using three tiered approach (from BIOFIN):
 - Conduct and use economic (and other) valuations (iii) developing a strategy of valuation of biodiversity (taking broadly different types of values), communicating, and developing political advocacy.
 - Communication strategies & media
 - Targeted advocacy (high level champions etc.)
- Develop and use global guidance for developing comprehensive RM Strategies covering the full range of financing mechanisms (by respecting national circumstances and using low-hanging fruits); the guidance should be endorsed by CBD to enhance adoption, such as through peer review / targeted technical support.
- There is the need to take advantage of the opportunity of the SDGs. The international adoption will lead to the development of the national translation/adoption of the SDG framework (such as through new development strategies); we must ensure that in this process biodiversity remains fully reflected. Technical support and/or a peer review process could be installed. (Also, SDGs must be integrated into relevant national policies and frameworks).
- Change the format of CBD COP-12 high level segment to give more roles to ministers, and thus attract more HL reps; in Korea mobilize Ban Ki Moon? Link to GBO-4 presentation.
- Participants commented that the SCBD report regarding the achievement of headline indicators on mainstreaming is too complacent. The data gathered through the reporting related to that issue needs a reality check.

Group 1D: Goal 6, 7, & 8 of the strategy for resource mobilization Group (facilitated by **Malta Qwathekana**, South Africa)

Goal 6: Build capacity for resource mobilization and utilization and promote South-South cooperation as a complement to necessary North-South cooperation

Objective 1: To build local, national and regional capacities on resource mobilization skills, financial planning and effective resource utilization and management, and support awareness raising activities

Objective 2: To promote exchange of experience and good practice in financing for biological diversity

WHO	WHAT	WHEN (TIMEFRAMES)
Ministries of Environment supported by GEF and other	Identify training needs, gaps and strengths	Ongoing Engagement with the NBSAP

development partners National Development Planning Departments and International Cooperation Agencies and other relevant agencies National Treasury (or equivalent Ministries of Economy, Finance, Budget)	Do matching and then providing assistance (in consultation with National Development Planning Department, the International Cooperation Agencies and other relevant agencies) Awareness raising between Ministries	processes, BIOFIN Technical M&E
Regional organizations	Regional programmes to support Resource mobilization (engage countries)	From now - Ongoing
SCBD	Outreach to countries	On-going
Triangular Cooperations using available regional expertise and engagement of development partners	Sharing of experience and expertise by neighboring countries Best practice on CBD website	On-going
National Treasury (Ministries of Finance/Economy/Budget) and Environment	Training and information sharing between Ministries to allocate national budgets	More emphasis and awareness raising on Biodiversity in cluster meetings

Goal 7: Enhancing implementation of access and benefit-sharing initiatives and mechanisms in support of resource mobilization

Objective 1: To raise awareness and build the capacity of different stakeholders to implement access and benefit-sharing initiatives and mechanisms.

Objective 2: To promote exchange of experiences and good practices in access and benefit sharing.

By Who	What	When
GIZ and other development partners National competent authorities National Treasury/Finance	capacity building on ABS training needs assessment identification of stakeholders	Ongoing

department		
SCBD	Best practice on CHM	Ongoing

Goal 8: Enhance the global engagement for resource mobilization in support of the achievement of the Convention's three objectives

Objective 1: To raise public awareness of the importance of biological diversity and the goods and services that it provides at all levels in support of resource mobilization.

By Who	What	When
All relevant sectors	Mainstreaming into SDGs and other national and regional processes to raise awareness. Not to re-invent the wheel when there are already existing programmes and processes	As soon as possible
Parties at a national level	International Environmental days	Annually

Key messages

- The Ministries of Environment (or any other competent authority responsible for biodiversity conservation/management) AND the National Treasury/Finance Department have the obligation to ensure that national budgets are allocated for biodiversity related activities such as capacity building and the general implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (its 2011/2020 Strategic Plan and the 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets).
- Using existing programmes and initiatives to enhance recognition, raise awareness, increase political will and raise the profile of the Convention so that it is prioritized in national budget allocations.
- Information sharing and documentation of best practices (because there are countries that do very well on certain matters relating to resource mobilization) through the Clearing House Mechanism would assist other countries in customizing and replicating such best practices as per their needs.
- The importance of mainstreaming to existing national and regional processes and planning would assist in raising awareness, profile and prioritization of the Convention in resource allocation, tapping into existing resources and avoiding duplication.

- The importance of South-South Cooperation in getting developing countries into a position to assist each other another. These can be bilateral or trilateral cooperation.

SESSION II. FINANCIAL REPORTING FRAMEWORK

Group 2A: Financial reporting architecture (facilitated by **Ms. Laure Ledoux**, European Commission)

Objective: To identify the process to submit the information, periodicity, and compilation and use of the information, and how to improve (i) response rates; (ii) consistency/comparability of responses; and (iii) accuracy of responses in the short, medium and long term.

1. Periodicity/compilation/use of information

- 2015, then link with national reports
- 4 yrs as minimum for full report but some data could be reported more frequently , especially given online reporting system
- Financial reports cannot be looked at individually – need to have the context of other Aichi targets
- Data on financing needs and gaps meaningful at national level in first place
- Eventually possible aggregation at global level, but need to improve comparability/response rate

2. How to improve response rate?

- Flexibility in frequency
- Capacity building, training, workshops, regular side events at COP for exchange of experiences, participation of external experts in national/regional workshops
- Simplification, use of minimum of questions
- Explain why data useful at domestic level
- GEF funding

3. How to improve consistency/comparability/accuracy

- Better integration, with existing processes
- Rio markers OECD process
- OECD/EEA questionnaire

- Use existing framework to gradually improve
- AHTEG – use planned one on indicators?

Group 2B: Methodology to estimate domestic public investments (facilitated by **Mr. Appukkuttan Damodaran**, India)

Objective: To compare different methodologies and develop guidance on how to estimate and report domestic public investments, how to improve consistency, comparability and policy relevance of the data provided.

Challenges:

- Lack of clear framework to assess biodiversity financing at national level
- Lack of capacity and readiness on reporting, requiring technical support (countries still do not know what to do with guidelines)
- What is the boundary of biodiversity (impacting and magnitude)

Possible ways forward:

- (i) Biodiversity coding
- (ii) Taxonomy or categories of biodiversity activities
- (iii) Capacity building and technical support
- (iv) Expenditure review or assessment of expenditure/flows (on first approximation)

Methodologies:

- Budgets vs expenditure: easier to have budgetary data;
- Budgetary allocations vs revenue generated from biodiversity institutions;
- Whether to use manpower(s) to estimate expenditure;
- Aichi targets should be used as reference in developing standards;
- The strategic plan is very broad, and some sectors can have huge funding numbers;
- Identification of different sectors;
- Define projects impacting on biodiversity;
- Consider various environmental programmes contributing to biodiversity (work for water programme for wetland restoration in South Africa): need to identify biodiversity activities in these programmes;
- Identify key players /institutions in line with Aichi targets to see what they plan to do;
- Local governments can be monitored and estimated;
- Central government's transfer to local governments;
- Public owned lands/waters that are leased to private sector;
- How to count anti-poverty schemes;
- How to count adverse impacts of public investment;

- Should core vs non-core activities be defined?
- How to count administrative costs of core institutions on biodiversity;
- References to be considered: IMF Government Finance Manual, Strategic Plan, SEER coding.

Stakeholders:

- National standards of reporting need approval by Ministry of Finance, as government adopts directives for using funds;
- Need to work with national bureau of statistics;
- Work with NBSAP process;
- World Bank's public expenditure review;
- Green economy accounting for available data.

Group 2C: Methodology to estimate international public investments (facilitated by **Mr. Rikiya Konish**, Japan)

Objective: To compare different methodologies and develop guidance on how to estimate and report international public investments (including the reporting of bilateral and multilateral biodiversity-related ODA), how to improve consistency, comparability and policy relevance of the data provided.

How to improve estimating and reporting:

- Bilateral ODA flows: Established measurement and reporting with OECD DAC Rio marker system whilst recognising scope for Rio marker methodology to be further refined (process underway).
- **Rio marker coefficients** approach good starting point, but mixed views for further improvement: **No one size fits all approach vs. common approach** that is good for transparency.
- Gap in information on Multilateral flows: Need to encourage MDBs to report – either motivated by members or directly by CBD.
- Questions on GEF – how do they track finance biodiversity-related expenditures?? (Some parties make assumptions for reporting to CBD, i.e. Japan report 30% GEF contributions as biodiversity-related).
- Gap in information on South-South Co-operation: i.e. significant flows from China, Brazil, South Africa – how to measure and capture these flows? Could they apply the Rio marker approach/coefficients or other different approaches? Could a source book be developed to help encourage and support reporting in this area?
- Other Official Flows and guarantees: - questions on how to classify and capture these flows.

Improving consistency, comparability and policy relevance:

- CBD reporting system needs to be revised and checked technically. Need to share lessons and experiences. More to be learnt from international statistical reporting...
- **On issue of harmonisation** – we need to be clear on what we want...
- Question – is comparability more important than accuracy?
- Scope for further improvements:
 - Consideration for **coefficients being developed for sector level reporting**
 - Need for **clearer approaches/methodologies on what is captured as direct and indirect** expenditures
 - **Issues of accounting for finance targeting multiple objectives** – i.e. biodiversity and climate change, Biodiversity and forestry... View that it is not incorrect to recognise and account for multiple benefits, natural – but if can distinguish between flows then may be useful...
- Issues of relevance and how to capture recipient perspective of finance:
- Some country experience is to take donor level reporting as biodiversity-related finance as starting point.
- Need to **improve communication and dialogue on what is biodiversity finance** - between what providers report and what recipient countries report and outline in their development plans.
- Development plans may also be a good way to report on international co-operation...
- Quality of finance also important: effectiveness, results, safeguards and sustainability
- Beyond scope of quantitative tracking finance per se, but part of good development co-operation.

Group 2D: Methodology for estimating contributions of indigenous and local communities, private sector, foundations, non-governmental organizations, academia (facilitated by Ms. Clarissa Souza Della Nina, Brazil)

Objective: To agree on practical methodologies for estimating these contributions

1 – Different nature of actors

2 – To monetize or not

3 – Common methodology and available data

4 – How much disaggregation?

5 – Need for a methodology for ILCs

- monetizing collective action
- Opportunity cost?
- Hypothetical incentive payments? Replacement cost?

- Difficult conceptual issues: ranging from epistemological to concern about resistance from ILC
- Provide opportunity to countries to report thereon; e.g., open format to allow different “currencies” or toolboxes
- Private sector
- Methodological challenges e.g. international value chains
- Transparency
- Need, possible and extent of baselining retroactively?
 - Creating incentives for government to further mobilize this source
 - Issues of additionaliy
- Ramsar experience on measuring Danone’s contribution to wetlands

SESSION III. ENHANCING THE USE OF THE BIODIVERSITY FINANCING MECHANISMS (BFMs) AND COMPLEMENTARY SAFEGUARDS

Group 3A: Payment for ecosystem services (facilitated by Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez, Conservation International)

Objective: To identify benefits, challenges and possible risks, mitigation options for advancing payment for ecosystem services

Round table

- Countries at various stages: from conceptual exploration to pilot programmes to wide-scale application within policies
- Generally positive assessments; are (or can be) very useful
- Some general tendency moving from pilot experiences into national policy formulation

Observations made:

- PES is an instrument that can (and has to) be adapted to national circumstances, including terminology/definitions
- important commonality: direct relationship between provider and beneficiary; critical difference to plain subsidies: need for some come common understanding (bearing in mind that some ecosystem services are public goods and there is not necessarily are clearly defined beneficiary)
- many PES programmes government-driven but governments could eventually move aside

Discussion on future steps:

- Continue upscaling efforts
- align PES to the Architecture of the strategic plan/Aichi Targets
 - linkages to carbon; social development; but strengthen use of PES for implementing Aichi Targets

- implementation – integration into NBSAPs

Discussion on need for more guidance thereon?

- E.g. to achieve more convergence on terminology?
- Agreed language useful generally but there is also merit in leaving it open and give discretion to countries (country-driven approach)
- 'broad indicative descriptions'
- Broad guidance: advantage of also covering potentially emerging BFMs (e.g. bonds)

Risks and mitigation options:

- Adverse reactions due to skepticism as regards commercialization of nature: need to invest in communications/outreach – and applying safeguards...
- Issue of distorting subsidies being 'disguised' as PES: refer to WTO AoA 'green box': see language on AT3
- Sweden: EU ag policy (agri-environmental payments) – application in Sweden very useful
- Argentina: can be useful; not well developed conceptually but national fund works into this direction
- FAO: strong recognition
- Nepal: could be used in forest/watershed management
- Georgia: PES discussed in TEEB scoping study: agro biodiversity, forestry, hydropower, mining, tourism; more work foreseen in the full study – with a view to move institutionalization
- Brazil: experiences in application for forest management (Atlantic forest) – different mechanisms/state level programmes – but ongoing discussion, also due to prospective linkages to REDD+
- Belarus: fundamentals (definitions of ecosystem services) integrated in legislative framework and concrete conceptual work going on the context of green economy work
- Possible work in the context of national fund (sources by fees and state funding)
- Costa Rica: financed through tax on fossil fuels and water fees plus some bilateral cooperation (32 mio \$ per/years) – many positive impacts for many Aichi Targets
- PA; carbon stocks; water

Group 3B: Biodiversity offset mechanisms (facilitated by Mr. James Vause, United Kingdom)

Objective: To identify benefits, challenges and possible risks, mitigation options for biodiversity offsetting

Benefits

- Biodiversity offset may be able to raise finance in certain circumstance, but it is not the main benefit of biodiversity offsets;
- Incentive not to impact high value sites (to avoid offset cost)

- Polluter-pay-principle
- Prevent biodiversity loss: no-net-loss principle

Risks

- Unforeseen impacts of development
 - Reserve funds plan for uncertainly ecological
 - Risk trading ratios
- Compensation not delivered (not specific to offsetting) – need for strong framework on monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV)
- Politics can override whatever system we set up

Challenges

- Tenure/involving all stake-holders
- Languages and definitions
- Ensuring mitigation hierarchy is followed
- Avoiding licence to trash
- Enforcing no go areas
- Good monitoring and reporting
- Transboundary impacts
- Paper parks is not strongly protected PAs.

Mitigation Options (This could go in safeguard decision?)

- Good land use planning
- Defining where offsetting cannot be used
- Use offsets in addition to current protections (not to weaken them)
- Value biodiversity in economic planning – get development in right places
 - Registry of offset sites
- Strong regulatory basis

Concrete Measures

- Reminder this is not just RM but it is about better incentives
- Improve land-use planning which should involve stakeholders; Offset planning also including stakeholders
- Define where offsetting is appropriate i.e. where the policy applies
- Make sure monitoring is long term to ensure delivery
- Have compliance and enforcement measures
- Offset should last as long as impact does
- Make sure adhering to mitigation-hierarchy first
- Need clear guidelines maybe regulatory support
- Message from CBD range of tools available; CBD can highlight issues
- Need to consider in policy development
- Provide a mechanism to share experience?

Group 3C: Market for green products (facilitated by **Ms. Nicole Breier, Germany**)

Objective: To identify benefits, challenges and possible risks, mitigation options for green market

Opportunities/benefits	Challenges
Reduce biodiversity footprints	Knowledge barrier
Generate income by using revenues	Tax differentiation to encourage green products
Raise consumer awareness to biodiversity issues	Too many different certification schemes
Involvement of private sector	Entry barriers for producers
Support products based on traditional knowledge – local communities	Reliable monitoring
	Economic viability

Concrete/effective actions

Opportunities for green market	Safeguards

More visibility for initiatives	
More comprehensive catalogue to get the whole range	
Definition of green products (improve production to reduce impacts; premium priced products; generate money for biodiversity)	
Identify minimum standards for green products	
Encourage incentives for the production of green products	
Discourage non-green products	
Catalogue of certification systems and their economic viability (biodiversity and business should work together)	
Common standards for certification	
Encourage companies to use certified products and raw materials, and produce biodiversity friendly products	
Use sustainable public procurement to use biodiversity friendly products	
Make better use of biodiversity and business platform (SCBD)	
Create consumer awareness at large scale	
International day (of biodiversity) on green products	
Green product exhibition facilitated by the public sector	

Group 3D: Climate change, private sector financing (facilitated by Mr. Seukwoo Kang, Republic of Korea)

Objective: To identify benefits, challenges and possible risks, mitigation options for climate change and private sector financing

Benefit for Climate Change Mitigation Options and Biodiversity

- There is a significant potential for co-benefits between climate change actions and biodiversity: so-called nature-based solutions to climate change.
- Incentives for multiple benefits are key drivers for harnessing these potentials.
- Good practices for nature-based solutions exist and are made available, including references in CBD COP decisions and technical support documents, but more concerted efforts are needed to improve access to, and availability of, this information, for more effective for promotion and scale-up.

- REDD+ and Climate change adaptation are most salient areas for now.

Risks and Challenges

- Policy coherence at country level as well as international level need to be enhanced. UNFCCC & CBD joint workshops and similar arrangements at domestic level need to be employed.
- More efforts are needed to enhance coordination, by sharing of best practices, strengthened capacity building, and increased dialogue between the two communities.
- Programs such as WAVE & TEEB are useful platforms to this end.
- The disaster reduction program and GEF-6's integrated work programme also provide a good opportunity to scale-up realization of co-benefit.
- Safeguards for biodiversity need to be integral part of climate change mitigation efforts.

Private Sector Financing

- Due to the nature of typical biodiversity-related project, private sector financing in this area is limited. Insurance value is main incentive for private sector financing.
- Need to develop a new financing scheme for private sector involvement. Green Climate Fund under UNFCCC can play a role for creating enabling environment for private sector financing for co-benefit projects.

Annex II

Workshop Programme

Time	Session	Presenter/ Facilitator
17 August 2014		
18:00-20:00	Meeting of co-chairs and facilitators of the breakout groups	
18:00-20:00	Registration (includes signing-up for break-out groups)	
DAY 1 (18 August 2014)		
Opening of the meeting		
Objective:	To provide overall objective of the workshop	
Expected results:	Participants will have clear understanding of the purposes, expectations and planned proceedings of the workshop	
Preparation:	Resource persons need to prepare their presentations	
Modality:	Presentations and questions/answers	
8:45 - 9:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome remark and briefing on COP-12 preparation on resource mobilization 	Braulio Dias, Executive Secretary, CBD
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation about WGRI 5 recommendation and follow-up 	Ravi Sharma, Principal Officer, CBD
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation on the 'Pyeongchang Roadmap' Q & A 	Seukwoo Kang (Republic of Korea)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of the workshop objectives and process Self-introductions by participants 	Co-Chairs: Sofia Cristina Panchi Robles (Ecuador) Jeremy Eppel (UK)
SESSION I. Concrete and effective actions for implementing the financial targets under Aichi Biodiversity Target 20		
Objective:	To list ideas on concrete and effective actions for resource mobilization	
Expected results:	A suite of ideas of concrete and effective actions under each goal (and objective) of the 2008 strategy for resource mobilization	
Preparation:	Participants should be familiar with the goals and objectives they are assigned to cover, and discuss with their colleagues and consult other available expertise on resource mobilization ideas, prior to their arrival to the workshop	
Modality:	Presentations and group discussions	
9:45 - 10:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlights of the Global Monitoring Report on Resource Mobilisation 	Yibin Xiang, Program Officer, CBD

Time	Session	Presenter/ Facilitator
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations on proposals for concrete and effective actions based on Quito seminar 	Maria Schultz (Quito seminar)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals for concrete and effective actions based on the HLP report 	Carlos M. Rodriguez, Chair, High-level Panel (HLP)
10:30	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
10:45 - 12:45	Break-out group discussion on possible concrete and effective actions that can be undertaken by Parties and others,	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 1A (Identified actions from the high-level panel and Goal 1 & 2 of the strategy for resource mobilization, see Annex I): There are three objectives under Goal 1 (information base and six objectives under Goal 2 (domestic mobilization). 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 1B (Goal 3 of the strategy for resource mobilization, see Annex I): There are eight objectives under Goal 3 (international funding) and related activities from Goal 5 (mainstreaming).. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 1C (Goal 5 of the strategy for resource mobilization, see Annex I): There are five objectives under Goal 5 (mainstreaming) related to domestic resource mobilisation. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 1D (Goal 6, 7, & 8 of the strategy for resource mobilization, see Annex I): There are three objectives under Goal 6 (capacity and south-south), two objectives under Goal 7 (access and benefit sharing) and one objective under Goal 8 (awareness). What concrete and effective actions can be taken by whom (with timelines) in order to advance these goals and objectives. 	
12:45 - 14:00	<i>Lunch</i>	
14:00 - 14:45	Reports of the break-out groups and plenary discussions	Co-Chairs

SESSION II. Financial Reporting framework		
Objective:	To discuss the challenges in applying the financial reporting for resource mobilization and suggest ways to improve it	
Expected results:	A list of guidance on financial reporting, including methodologies	
Preparation:	Participants should assess their own experiences in generating national and international financial information, as well as policy objectives and scoping of financial statistics, and discuss with their colleagues on success, obstacles and solutions in financial reporting, prior to their arrival to the workshop	
Modality:	Presentations and group discussions	
14:45 - 15:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation on international financial information via Rio Markers Q & A 	Stephanie Ockenden (OECD Secretariat)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation on assessing (quantitative) contributions of indigenous and local communities Q & A 	Diego Pacheco Balanza, (Bolivia)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation on EU internal financial monitoring system Q & A 	Laure Ledoux (EU)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation on different approaches to estimating biodiversity-related expenditures (WGRI-5 side event) Q & A 	Gabriela Blatter (Switzerland)
15:30	<i>Coffee break</i>	
15:50 – 17:30	Break-out group discussion on reporting framework	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 2A (Financial reporting architecture): To identify the process to submit the information, periodicity and compilation and use of the information, how to improve i) response rates ii) consistency/comparability of responses and iii) accuracy of responses in the short, medium and long term 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 2B (Methodology to estimate domestic public investments): To compare different methodologies and develop guidance on how to estimate and report domestic public investments, how to improve consistency, comparability and policy relevance of the data provided. Example of the IMF Classification of the Functions of Government in annex II as reference in identifying what should be counted as biodiversity financing, and what should be excluded from each sector. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 2C (Methodology to estimate international public investments): To compare different methodologies and develop guidance on how to estimate and report international public investments (including the reporting of bilateral and multilateral biodiversity-related ODA), how to improve consistency, comparability and policy relevance of the data provided. The group may use the OECD list of CRS purpose codes in annex III as reference in identifying what should be counted as biodiversity financing, and what should be excluded from each sector. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 2D (Methodology for estimating contributions of indigenous and local communities, private sector, foundations, non-governmental organizations, academia): To agree on practical methodologies for estimating these contributions 	
17:30 – 18:00	Reports of the break-out groups and plenary discussions	Co-Chairs
18:00	Reception	FOEN, Switzerland
DAY 2 (19 August 2014)		
9:00 – 09:10	Summary of the previous day	Co-Chairs
SESSION III. Enhancing the Use of the Biodiversity Financing Mechanisms (BFMs) and Complementary Safeguards		
Objective:	To discuss opportunities for the greater use of Biodiversity Financing Mechanisms and safeguards	
Expected results:	Ideas of concrete and effective actions under Goal 4 of the 2008 strategy for resource mobilization, and safeguards	
Preparation:	Participants should be familiar with benefits, challenges and possible risks, mitigation options of different Biodiversity Financing Mechanism, and relevant safeguards	
Modality:	Presentations and group discussions	
9:10 – 10:10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OECD report on Scaling-up Finance Mechanisms for Biodiversity 	Katia Karousakis (OECD Secretariat)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation on country-specific BFMs 	John Adrian Narag (Philippines)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion paper on safeguards 	Claudia Ituarte (SwedBio) presentation by video conference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation on REDD+ safeguards 	Dirk Nemitz & Jenny Wong (UNFCCC Secretariat) presentation by video conference

10:10 – 10:30	Tea/coffee break	
10:30 -12:00	Break-out group discussion on options for voluntary guidelines for IFMs and safeguards	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 3A (Payment for ecosystem services): To identify benefits, challenges and possible risks, mitigation options for advancing payment for ecosystem services 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 3B (Biodiversity offset mechanisms): To identify benefits, challenges and possible risks, mitigation options for offsetting • Presentation on offsets by OECD 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 3C (Market for green products): To identify benefits, challenges and possible risks, mitigation options for green market 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 3D (Climate change, private sector financing): To identify benefits, challenges and possible risks, mitigation options for mobilizing private sector (financial sector) financing 	
12:00 – 12:30	Reports of the groups and plenary discussions	Co-Chair
12:30 – 14:00	LUNCH	
SESSION IV. Forward Look		
Objective:	To reflect on the implication of discussions for COP 12	
Expected results:	A Co-Chair's Summary of the workshop	
Preparation:	Participants should read notes to be circulated during the course of the workshop	
Modality:	Plenary discussions	
14:00 – 15:30	Plenary discussion on reflections on implications of workshop conclusions for decision making in COP 12 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Strategy for resource mobilization): Brainstorming on options for the document UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/L.11 (Review of Implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization) • (Business and Biodiversity): • (Biodiversity and Sustainable Development): • Others 	Co-Chairs
15:30 – 16:00	Tea/coffee break	
Concluding Session		
16:00 – 17:00	Co-Chair's Summary: Main messages to be conveyed to COP 12 as an information document	Co-Chair
	Concluding remarks	Braulio Dias
17:00	Closure of the meeting	Co-Chair

Annex III: List of Participants

CBD Parties

Albania

Ms. Valbona Ballgjini
General Director of Supporting Services
Ministry of Environment
Email: valbona.ballgjini@moe.gov.al

Ms. Odeta Çato
Director
Biodiversity and Forests Directorate
Ministry of Environment
Email: odeta.cato@moe.gov.al, odeta.cato@gmail.com

Argentina

Ms. Jessica Noelia Diaz
Secretary of the Embassy
Directorate-General for Environmental Affairs
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores y Culto
Email: jnz@mrecic.gov.ar

Azerbaijan

Mr. Ilgar Aslanov
Head of Finance division
Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources
Email: emin.garabaghli@gmail.com,
sevinc.ibadova89@gmail.com

Belarus

Ms. Natalya Minchenko
Head of Department of Biological and Landscape Diversity
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection
Email: n_minchenko@tut.by, minchenkonataly@gmail.com

Belgium

Ms. Els Van de Velde
Policy Advisor
International Environmental and Energy Policies
Government of Flanders. - Environment, Nature and
Energy Dept.
Email: els.vandevelde@lne.vlaanderen.be

Brazil

Ms. Clarissa Souza Della Nina
Counselour
Ministério das Relações Exteriores /
Ministry of External Relations
Email: clarissa.souza@itamaraty.gov.br

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

Mr. Diego Pacheco Balanza
Consultant, Researcher and Professor
University of Cordillera
Email: jallpa@yahoo.com; jallpa@gmail.com

Colombia

Ms. Melissa Laverde
Asesora de la Coordinación de Asuntos Ambientales
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Email: melissa.laverde@cancilleria.gov.co

Cuba

Mr. Héctor Conde Almeida
Deputy Director
International Relations Department
Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment
Email: conde@citma.cu; hconde04@gmail.com

Ecuador

Ms. Sofia Cristina Panchi Robles
Responsable de Cooperacion Internacional
Coordinacion General de Planificacion
Ministerio del Ambiente
Email: sofia.panchi@ambiente.gob.ec;
sofi.panchi.robles@gmail.com

European Union

Ms. Laure Ledoux
Policy Officer for Biodiversity
Director General of Environment
European Commission
Email: laure.ledoux@ec.europa.eu

Finland

Ms. Marina von Weissenberg
Ministerial Adviser
Department of the Environment
Ministry of the Environment
Email: marina.vonweissenberg@ymparisto.fi

Georgia

Mr. Ioseb Kartsivadze
Head of Biodiversity Protection Service

Department of Integrated Environmental Management and
Biodiversity
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protectio
Email: s.kartsivadze@yahoo.com; s.kartsivadze@moe.gov.ge

Germany

Ms. Nicola Breier
Head of Unit/CBD/ABS Focal Point
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and
Nuclear Safety
Email: nicola.breier@bmub.bund.de

Haiti

Mr. Paul Judex Edouarzin
Point Focal CBD
Ministère de l'Environnement
Email: pauljudex.edouarzin@gmail.com

India

Mr. Appukkuttan Nair Damodaran
Chair Professor
MHRD-Intellectual Property Rights,
Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Management
Email: damodaran@iimb.ernet.in

Italy

Mr. Aldo Ravazzi
Adviser
Ministry of Environment, Land and Sea
Email: aldo.ravazzi@tfambiente.it,
ravazzi.aldo@minambiente.it

Japan

Mr. Rikiya Konishi
Deputy Director
Global Biodiversity Strategy Office
Minister of Environment
Email: rikiya_konishi@env.go.jp

Mr. Hiroki Sato
Official, Global Environment Division
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Email: hiroki.sato@mofa.go.jp

Maldives

Ms. Ilham Atho Mohamed
Assistant Director
Environment Department
Ministry of Environment and Energy
Email: ilham.mohamed@environment.gov.mv,

Mauritius

Mr. Manikchand Puttoo
Director
National Parks and Conservation Service
c/o Ministry of Agro Industry and Fisheries
Email: mputtoo@mail.gov.mu; mputtoo23@gmail.com;

Mexico

Mr. José Antonio Moreno Mendoza
Director General Adjunto de Financiamiento Estratégico
Subsecretaría de Planeación y Política Ambiental
Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
Email: antonio.morenom@semamat.gob.mx;
to_moreno@hotmail.com

Nepal

Mr. Braj Kishor Yadav
Joint Secretary and Chief
Environment Division
Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation
Email: brajkishoryadav05@gmail.com; bkyadav@mfsc.gov.np

Norway

Ms. Tone Solhaug
National Focal Point for the CBD
Ministry of Climate and Environment
Email: tone.solhaug@kld.dep.no; tone.solhaug@md.dep.no

Philippines

Mr. John Adrian M. Narag
Chief, Bilateral Assistance Division,
International Finance Group, Department of Finance
Department of Environment and Natural Resources
Email: jnarag@dof.gov.ph

Republic of Korea

Mr. Seuk-woo Kang
Director
Environment Industry Division
Ministry of Environment
Email: freelunch2000@gmail.com

Ms. Gi won Seo
CBD National Focal Point
Deputy Director
Global environment Division
Ministry of Environment
Email: g1seo@korea.kr

South Africa

Ms. Malta Qwathekana
Senior Policy Advisor
International Advisory Services
Department of Environmental Affairs

Email: mqwathekana@environment.gov.za

Sweden

Mr. Anders Arvidsson
Department for Multilateral Development Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Email: anders.arvidsson@gov.se

Switzerland

Ms. Gabriela Blatter
Scientific Adviser for Environmental Finance
Federal Office for the Environment
Email: gabriela.blatter@bafu.admin.ch

Mr. Andreas Obrecht
CBD National Focal Point
Federal Office for the Environment
Email: andreas.obrecht@bafu.admin.ch

Togo

Mr. Tchamilaba Minzah
Economiste, chargé de la mobilisation des ressources
Ministère de l'environnement et des ressources forestières
Email: minzatchamilaba@yahoo.fr

Tunisia

Mr. Abdelhakim Aissaoui
Directeur du Secretariat du Conseil National de LCD
Ministère de l'Environnement
Email: pfn.pca@mineat.gov.tn; hakissaoui@yahoo.fr;

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Mr. Jeremy Eppel
Deputy Director
International Biodiversity
Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Email: jeremy.eppel@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Mr. James Vause
Economic Advisor
International Biodiversity and Evidence Team
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Email: james.vause@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Viet Nam

Ms. Hoang Thi Thanh Nhan
Deputy Director
Biodiversity Conservation Agency,
Vietnam Environment Administration
Email: htnhan2001@yahoo.com; hoangnhan.bca@gmail.com

United Nations and Specialized Agencies

International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, FAO (ITPGRFA)

Mr. Kent Nnadozie
Senior Treaty Officer
International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for
Food and Agriculture, FAO
Email: kent.nnadozie@fao.org

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Mr. Yves De Soye
Regional Technical Advisor and Financing Specialist
Ecosystems & Biodiversity, Environment and Energy
Group
United Nations Development Programme
Email: yves.desoye@undp.org

United Nations Climate Change Secretariat (UNFCCC)

Mr. Dirk Nemitz
Associate Programme Officer
Mitigation, Data and Analysis
United Nations Climate Change Secretariat
Email: dnemitz@unfccc.int

Inter-Governmental Organizations

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

Ms. Katia Karousakis
Administrator
Climate Change, Biodiversity and Development Division
Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
Email: katia.karousakis@oecd.org, Jane.Kynaston@oecd.org

Ms. Stephanie Ockenden
Development Co-operation Directorate
Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
Email: Stephanie.OCKENDEN@oecd.org

Non-Governmental Organizations

Conservation International

Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez
Vice President and Senior Policy Advisor
Center for Environment and Peace
Conservation International
San José, Costa Rica
Email: cmrodriguez@conservation.org

Forest Trends

Mr. Sebastian Winkler
Senior Policy Advisor
Biodiversity Initiative and Business and Biodiversity
Offsets Program
Forest Trends
Washington, D.C, United States of America
Email: swinkler@forest-trends.org

Pro Natura - Friends of the Earth Switzerland

Mr. Friedrich Wulf
Head
International Biodiversity Policy
Pro Natura - Friends of the Earth Switzerland
Basel, Switzerland
Email: friedrich.wulf@pronatura.ch

Unnayan Onneshan, Forest People's Programme

Mr. Rashed Al Mahmud Titumir
Chairperson
Unnayan Onneshan, Bangladesh
Forest Peoples Programme
Dhaka, Bangladesh
Email: rtitumir@gmail.com

Research Institutes

Stockholm Resilience Center

Ms. Maria Schultz
Director
Stockholm Resilience Center
Stockholm University
Email: maria.schultz@stockholmresilience.su.se

Ms. Claudia Ituarte Lima
Research Project Leader
International Environment Law
Stockholm Resilience Center
Stockholm University
Email: Claudia.ituarte@su.se

CBD Secretariat

CBD Secretariat

Mr. Bráulio Ferreira de Souza Dias
Executive Secretary
Email: braulio.dias@cbd.int

Mr. Ravi Sharma
Principal Officer
Technical Support for Implementation
Email: ravi.sharm@cbd.int

Mr. Markus Lehmann
Programme Officer, Economics
Technical Support for Implementation
Email: markus.lehmann@cbd.int

Mr. Pong Gyun Park
Programme Officer, IFMs & Safeguards
Technical Support for Implementation
Email: pongyun.park@cbd.int

Mr. Yibin Xiang
Programme Officer, Resource Mobilization
Technical Support for Implementation
Email: yibin.xiang@cbd.int
