



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/12/INF/16
5 October 2014

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Twelfth meeting

Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, 6-17 October 2014

Item 16 of the provisional agenda*

ASSESSMENT OF BARRIERS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DECISIONS OF THE CONVENTION RELATED TO POVERTY ERADICATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Pursuant to its terms of reference, provided in the annex to decision XI/22, the Expert Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development has submitted a summary of its work in the working document entitled “Report on progress made to address biodiversity in poverty eradication and sustainable development” (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/6),¹ and its report, “Progress Report on the Work of the Expert Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development” (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/INF/11),² to the fifth meeting of the Ad-Hoc Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting. The report was based on the outcomes of the second meeting of the Expert Group that took place in Chennai, India from 4 to 6 December 2013, and the extensive work accomplished, thereafter, through electronic means. In accordance with its mandate, the Expert Group provided, among other, important recommendations and guidance to support the implementation of the integration of biodiversity, poverty eradication and sustainable development in line with paragraphs 4 (a) to (j) of the annex to decision XI/22.

2. In paragraph 4 (k) of the annex to decision XI/22, the Conference of the Parties also requested the Expert Group to “assess the barriers to the implementation of the decisions of the Convention related to poverty eradication and sustainable development”. Due to limited time available during the second meeting in Chennai, the Expert Group had decided to prepare this assessment separately and to present it to the Conference of the Parties, at its twelfth meeting. Hence, the present document presents the results of the assessment including the identified priority barriers and solutions, as well as recommendations/guidance for overcoming them in order to further support Parties during their efforts to implement the integration of biodiversity, sustainable development and poverty eradication, and to provide information to the Conference of the Parties, at its twelfth meeting, that could serve as useful input during the discussions and negotiations on issues related to biodiversity for poverty eradication and sustainable development.

* UNEP/CBD/COP/12/1/Rev.1.

¹ <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/wgri/wgri-05/official/wgri-05-06-en.pdf>

² <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/wgri/wgri-05/information/wgri-05-inf-11-en.pdf>

II. SOME DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES RELATED TO POVERTY ERADICATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

3. Biodiversity conservation and poverty eradication are both challenging goals requiring international and national attention and commitment. It is increasingly being acknowledged that biodiversity is inextricably intertwined with the well-being of people and all life on Earth. Many of the world's biodiversity-rich areas are located in developing countries, and the poor are particularly and often directly dependent on ecosystems for their livelihoods. The importance of integrating biodiversity into poverty reduction policies, development plans, programmes and projects, and mainstreaming biodiversity in all sectors and at all levels including development cooperation is now more and more recognized. There are numerous decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention that concern different topics and programmes of work in relation to poverty eradication and sustainable development. Some of the key relevant and recent decisions are found in the annex of the *Introduction Paper* prepared as a working document for the session on paragraph 4 (k)³ of the term of reference of the Expert Group at the second meeting of the Expert Group in Chennai, from 4 to 6 December 2013.

4. In short, the Conference of the Parties, at its tenth meeting, has stressed, inter alia, the importance of mobilizing the necessary resources (decision X/3), called for enhanced efforts for capacity-building for mainstreaming, involvement and commitments of development cooperation and implementing agencies, strengthened coordination among partners and stakeholders, noting the importance of scientific information and knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities, gender consideration, North-South and South-South cooperation and synergies (decision X/6). Implementation of the programme of work was, inter alia, further addressed in decisions related to inland waters biodiversity; marine and coastal biodiversity; mountain biological diversity; protected areas; and biodiversity and climate change in decisions X/28 to X/31 and X/33 respectively.

5. At its tenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties also adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 with its twenty Aichi Biodiversity Targets annexed to decision X/2 and urged Parties and other Governments, with the support of intergovernmental and other organizations, as appropriate, to implement this Strategic Plan in paragraph 3 of this decision. The Strategic Plan puts reduction and eradication of poverty at the heart of its rationale, noting that biological diversity "is essential for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), including poverty reduction"; and its mission highlighting the importance "to take effective and urgent action to halt the loss of biodiversity in order to ensure that by 2020 ecosystems are resilient and continue to provide essential services, thereby securing the planet's variety of life, and contributing to human well-being and poverty eradication."

6. At the eleventh meeting, the Conference of the Parties emphasized the need and requested the Executive Secretary to provide information about the indicator framework to assist the process to establish sustainable development goals agreed by the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), and to participate in the processes of the post-2015 United Nations development agenda and Sustainable Development Goals (decisions XI/3 and XI/22). The Conference of the Parties also highlighted, among many others, the importance of sustainable tourism; assisting businesses in improving their biodiversity-friendly sustainable development strategies; and assisting subnational governments for the implementation of the Strategic Plan in decisions XI/6 to XI/8 respectively. Establishing and monitoring gender-based indicators (decision XI/9); focusing on invasive alien species, climate change and island biodiversity (decision XI/15); rehabilitation or restoration of ecosystems (decision XI/6); and marine and coastal biodiversity (decision XI/18) were emphasized. These are only few examples of the many decisions taken by the Conference of the Parties at its eleventh meeting. In general, the decisions are all in support of the achievement of the Strategic Plan with its twenty Aichi Biodiversity Targets, vision and mission including poverty eradication and *Life in Harmony with Nature* and, thereby, the objectives of the Convention.

³ <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/development/egm-bped-02/background/10-introduction-paper-4k-en.pdf>

7. The High Level Forum on Biodiversity in Development Cooperation⁴ in Nagoya, Japan also recognized nine needs related to, inter alia, development approaches with least negative impacts on biological resources and ecosystem services; economic policy tools that eradicate poverty, preserve biodiversity and catalyze sustainable ecosystem management; decision-making related to ecosystem management through methodical use of environmental assessment tools; regulatory and voluntary means to augmenting social and environmental responsibility of development agencies and their partners in the design and implementation of sectoral development plans; transparent and accountable governance framework for biodiversity and ecosystems services to build resilience and adaptation; Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+)⁵ and ensuring positive synergies of these actions with conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity; gender dimensions of biodiversity management; indicators for measuring of development cooperation agencies to global biodiversity and ecosystem services; and improving synergies and experience sharing among development cooperation agencies to achieve optimum coherence between poverty eradication and conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and healthy ecosystem. Many of these were built on the fourteen “Priorities for Action” previously set out in the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Policy Statement on Integrating Biodiversity and Associated Ecosystem Services into Development Cooperation⁶. This statement endorsed at DAC’s Senior Level Meeting on 15 April, 2010 indicates that support will be provided to partner countries, in the context of development cooperation, to undertake the priorities for action.

8. This assessment of barriers presents a summary of the results from desk research as well as inputs provided and views expressed by the members of the Expert Group. It identifies some of the main priority barriers to implementation of decisions of the Convention, suggests possible solutions and provides some proposals and/or recommendations/guidance on voluntary actions and measures that can be taken to overcome these barriers in accordance with national circumstances, vision, priorities and goals. Overcoming the barriers, among other, could lead to consistent policies across sectors and policy scales and domains, better institutional framework and governance, more coherence and synergy that could ultimately facilitate the implementation of the three objectives of the CBD. The benefits of overcoming these barriers, in short, would be substantial contributions to sustainable development, poverty eradication and, at the same time, positive biodiversity outcomes that can benefit the well-being of societies in the current as well as future generations. This cannot be taken for granted.

III. METHODOLOGY

9. In order to address the assessment of barriers the barriers to the implementation of the decisions of the Convention related to poverty eradication and sustainable development, in line with paragraph 4 (k) of the annex to decision XI/22, a hybrid approach consisting of a top-down and a bottom-up analytical approaches was proposed by one of the members of the Expert Group, Mr. Luc Janssens de Bisthoven, during the second meeting of the Expert Group in Chennai, India.⁷ The proposed approach consists of assessments starting from relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties to identification of barriers and solutions (top-down), and from identification of barriers and solutions via a literature review and the group’s own expertise to matching with the relevant decisions of the tenth and eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties or relevant Rio+20 outcome where appropriate (bottom-up) respectively.

⁴ <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/development/hlfbdc-01/official/hlfbdc-01-declaration-en.pdf> - Nagoya Declaration on Biodiversity in Development Cooperation.

⁵ REDD+ is used as a shorthand for “reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries”, consistent with paragraph 70 of decision 1/CP.16 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The acronym REDD+ is used for convenience only, without any attempt to pre-empt ongoing or future negotiations under the UNFCCC.

⁶ www.oecd.org/dataoecd/37/52/46024461.pdf

⁷ <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/development/egm-bped-02/presentation/item-10.pdf>

10. This brief assessment of barriers used a three-pronged approach as a methodological framework to identify some priority barriers and possible solutions, and to propose some recommendations/guidance. This approach consists of the hybrid approach consisting of the: (i) ‘top-down’ and (ii) ‘bottom-up’ approaches; and (iii) Expert Group’s consideration and identification of some priority barriers to arrive at a set of relevant solutions and recommendations to help overcome these barriers, taking into account that these need to be adapted to national circumstances, vision and priorities, especially developing countries Parties. The Expert Group recognizes, *a priori*, that there is no “one-size-fits-all” formula applicable to overcoming the barriers and that each recommendation may be, as appropriate, implemented by Parties according to their vision, national circumstances and priorities. The findings from approaches (i) and (ii) are summarized in tabular form in annex I: *Summary of Identified Barriers and Possible Solutions*; and the results of step (iii) possible priority barriers and solutions identified by the Expert Group as well as the Group’s recommendations are presented in the following section.

IV. POSSIBLE PRIORITY BARRIERS

11. Through consideration of the barriers in decisions, the literature review and the feedback and input of the members of the Expert Group, the barriers selected as priority are listed below. A list of other identified possible barriers at various levels is also presented in annex II: *Summary of Barriers by Level and Type* for purposes of information.

12. It is important to note that two of the members of the Expert Group found **annex I** and **annex II** prescriptive and did not want to keep them in the document. However, the information in the annexes is the results from the use of the methodological framework, a review that was done to help identify the priority barriers, solutions and arrive at the recommendations.

(i) Priority Barriers at Inter-governmental Level

13. The following were identified as priority barriers at the inter-governmental level by the Expert Group:

- (a) ***Overemphasis on conservation in the international arena discussions***: Insufficient protection of traditional knowledge and indigenous and local communities’ rights, and consideration of poverty eradication and sustainable development at the same time as biodiversity conservation to ensure that communities that depend directly on the biodiversity and ecosystem services also benefit from the protection of biodiversity. The international arena discussion should emphasize the importance of considering these issues during the protection and conservation of biodiversity and ecosystems.
- (b) ***Ad hoc nature of partnerships on biodiversity and development*** that was meant to provide financial means, capacity building or other positive incentives to developing country Parties – This means lack of structural integration and sustainability over time.
- (c) ***Disconnect between recommendations, statements and commitments*** at multi-lateral policy level and their concrete follow-through and implementation at country and field level; limited follow-through from e.g. the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Policy Statement on Integrating Biodiversity and Associated Ecosystem Services into Development Cooperation⁸.
- (d) ***Insufficient acknowledgement of the importance of integrating biodiversity into poverty eradication and key development processes***, including United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) development, and poverty eradication and sustainable development into the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). Addressing this would support mainstreaming biodiversity into poverty eradication and sustainable development processes, e.g. through, *inter alia*, capacity building, enhancing enabling environment, awareness raising, appropriate monitoring, and facilitating access to

⁸ The policy statement on integrating biodiversity and associated ecosystem services into development co-operation, released in 2010, outlines about fourteen priority action areas that international donors agreed to give support for to halt the loss of biodiversity and associated ecosystems.

information, within the scope of the respective ongoing development processes.

(e) *Limited availability of resources for developing countries Parties:*

- (i) Partly due to a lack of international resource mobilization and capacity building for integration of biodiversity into sustainable development processes; and
- (ii) Sub-optimal use of and lack of adequate domestic or other resources available in developing countries Parties.

(f) *Insufficient international cooperation.*

- (g) *Lack of Fair and equitable access to biological resources and benefit sharing (ABS) mechanisms*** in such a way that those of who directly depend on biological resources also benefit from these resources.

(ii) Priority Barriers at National and Subnational levels

14. The Expert Group also identified priority barriers at the national and subnational level. National and sub-national level issues are vastly different in many developing countries depending on numerous factors. For instance, in South Africa legislation, strategies and tools are in place at national level, while at sub-national level, the capacity and resources are minimal to implement those tools. Similar situation appears to be present in other developing countries as well. Hence, it is important to distinguish between national and sub-national issues, in accordance to national circumstances, strategies, priorities, goals and targets, institutional and governance framework as well as implementation strategy and mechanism.

- (a) *Lack of appropriate accounting for interlinkages between biodiversity conservation and poverty eradication:*** There is a growing evidence of strong scientific and policy interlinkages between biodiversity conservation and poverty eradication. However, these two often appear as different priorities for some governments and treated separately as well. There is a need for further analysis of the linkages to enhance understanding of their interdependence and complementarity. Interventions aiming to eradicate poverty need a broader reference that goes beyond just monetary income, to account for the different services and functions that biodiversity and ecosystems provide and for the importance of sustainable use of renewable natural resources for the wellbeing of societies in the context of the wider system, in general, and those who directly depend on these resources, in particular. Overall, sustainable use of biodiversity can help eradicate poverty.
- (b) *Limited capacity of human and other resources and of incentives*** for identifying and mainstreaming biodiversity-development-poverty eradication issues.
- (c) *Limited or inappropriate tools for:***
- (i) Identifying entry points for biodiversity-development-poverty eradication issues and making the case to key decision-makers with convincing evidence; and
 - (ii) Meeting the implementation challenge, e.g. via appropriate budgeting and national monitoring tools.
- (d) *Insufficiency or lack of engaging biodiversity issues with development processes over the long-term,*** due to:
- (i) Difficulty of identifying and costing appropriate policy measures;
 - (ii) Lack of or limited availability of country-specific information or cases for enhancing understanding.
- (e) *Limited knowledge of:***
- (i) Monetary and non-monetary values of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and lack of sharing of existing evidence where any;
 - (ii) Appropriate indicators for the link between loss of biodiversity and poverty increase, and

limited literature (research) on real cases.

- (f) **Limited appreciation of the economic and social values of biodiversity and ecosystem services**
 - (g) **Limited communication, cooperation and synergies** between levels of biodiversity governance (with specific reference to national, sub-national and local levels) and inflexibility of institutions, e.g. line ministries.
 - (h) **Too little emphasis on biodiversity and labour** - Biodiversity needs to be seen as a key employment sector that could help eradicate poverty;
 - (i) **Spatial disparities excluding the poor from the benefits of development** (Spatial planning encouraging responsible inclusive development can address this).
 - (j) **Substantial financial and other resources need for biodiversity and sustainable development including poverty eradication.** Issues include:
 - (i) Need for appropriate earmarking of funding based on priorities of developing country Parties. Priorities include eradication of poverty and socio-economic issues to which biodiversity and healthy ecosystem services can substantially contribute.
 - (ii) Financing for biodiversity is invariably the lowest in the hierarchy of priorities for development in developing countries.
 - (iii) There is generally a huge gap in the funding amount, from both domestic and international sources, required for the integration of biodiversity into sustainable development⁹ including poverty eradication.
 - (k) **Policy and decision-making processes neither always nor sufficiently engage affected groups**, including, *inter alia*, the poor, marginalized and vulnerable segments of populations, women, and Indigenous and Local Communities (ILCs).
 - (l) **Lack of land tenure security is an important barrier** - it restricts access to resources and limits people's ability to undertake diverse economic activities, in addition to hampering their notion of wellbeing.
 - (m) **Nature-based environmental approaches to create work opportunities and support livelihoods** by alleviating poverty and greening the economy¹⁰ are not always recognized as they should.
 - (n) **Many economies are overly and unsustainably resource intensive.**
- (iii) **Priority Barriers at all Levels**
- (a) **The need to shift the anthropocentric paradigm towards a cosmocentric¹¹ paradigm** of the Living Well in Balance and Harmony with Mother Earth¹², which, among other, includes valuing nature's intrinsic values and the importance of polycentric governance, in order to better understand the linkages between biodiversity, sustainable development, and poverty eradication.
 - (b) **Lack of coherence between policies and sectors with divergent interests**, such as security,

⁹ See e.g. the global Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN):

http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/environmentandenergy/projects_and_initiatives/biodiversity-finance-initiative/.

¹⁰ Reference to greening the economy or use of the term `green economy` was rejected by particularly one of the Expert Group members. However, green economy is encouraged by Rio+20, para...

¹¹ Cosmocentric - It's a way of viewing universal life and nature as an integral part of who we are and learning to live in harmony with the universal rhythms of life. See also footnote below.

¹² Pacheco, Diego (n.d.) "Living-well in harmony and balance with Mother Earth" A proposal for establishing a new global relationship between human beings and Mother Earth. Universidad de la Cordillera Fundacion, Bolivia. <http://ucordillera.edu.bo/descarga/livingwell.pdf>

trade, energy, urban expansion, etc. with regards to poverty eradication and biodiversity conservation.

- (c) ***Lack of technical and scientific knowledge*** about the linkages between biodiversity, sustainable development and poverty eradication, monetary and non-monetary values of biodiversity and ecosystem services, positive incentive tools, appropriate indicators and mechanisms, funding needs, and relevant case-studies. This pleads for more efforts towards research and capacity development on this matter. Poverty issues should be aligned with IPBES programme of work and capacity building that should encourage a bottom up approach that fosters the strengthening of citizen science and local assessments.
- (d) ***Not enough space for discussion of different visions and approaches***, as recognized in the first governing council of the UNEP and the conceptual framework of the IPBES.
- (e) ***Lack of proper land-use and the use of systematic planning*** to ensure habitat destruction is avoided or limited as well as proactive planning to promote responsible development rather than reactive management largely through Environment Impact Assessment processes;
- (f) ***Lack of appropriate tools*** at all levels tailor made for the country's development needs;
- (g) ***No sufficient/adequate consideration of traditional and indigenous knowledge, perspectives and visions***. The contribution of indigenous and local communities to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are not well accounted for.
- (h) ***Inadequate promotion of synergy***: Multiplicity of emerging sustainable development-related issues, provoking a tendency to competition between environmental matters for the access to limited resources for implementation, whereas more synergy should be sought. This is typically the case with climate change, which has powerfully managed to bring some environmental concern at the top of political agenda, but with the counter-effect that "green awareness" of highest-level decision-makers is often limited to low-carbon approaches. Biodiversity is often watered down in such landscape.
- (i) ***Intra- or inter-community and regional conflicts*** affect production, conservation and development activities

V. POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS TO OVERCOME THE PRIORITY BARRIERS

12. The possible solutions identified to help overcome the barriers are:

- (j) ***Promotion of a good governance, land tenure security and access and benefits sharing (ABS)***

13. The promotion of a good polycentric governance in terms of transparency, accountability, effectiveness, monitoring, verification and reporting, together with the development of suitable impact indicators, as well as cooperation across sectors and ministries will be very important. This also requires the development of a legal framework and enhancement of enabling environment for sustainable development. This may need to include the issues of governance of local communities over their natural resources, including autonomy and decentralization, also considering the role of collective action of indigenous and local communities in sustainable management of renewable natural resources in general and biodiversity and ecosystems services and functions in particular. Capacity building on good governance concerning the development and the implementation of NBSAPs would also be important.

14. The promotion of land tenure security can enhance access to resources and fair and equitable benefits sharing can unleash people's ability to undertake diverse economic activities, in addition to enhancing their notion of wellbeing and improving their livelihood.

- (ii) ***Mainstreaming***

15. Implementation of mainstreaming of biodiversity and poverty eradication into national development plans, and other sectors, such as mining, agriculture, business etc, and sustainable

development and poverty eradication into NBSAPs, learning, among other, from programs such as, *inter alia*, the joint UNDP-UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI) is important. Some important tools for mainstreaming include:

- (a) Maps of biodiversity priority areas, based on best available science (e.g. spatial plans);
 - (b) Guidelines to accompany and add value to maps of biodiversity priority areas;
 - (c) Online access to this information;
 - (d) In addition to these practical tools that provide an essential foundation for mainstreaming, a range of less tangible factors are equally important for success. These include:
 - Paying close attention to policy and institutional context: Mainstreaming biodiversity into policy, planning, decision-making or management processes in another sector requires an intimate understanding of the policy and institutional context in that sector, which can be developed only through substantial contact and careful listening;
 - Building ongoing relationships: Mainstreaming is not a once-off event but a process, which be achieved only through building ongoing long-term working relationships with key individuals in the receiving sector;
 - Providing in situ support: No matter how user-friendly the maps and guidelines are, mainstreaming can never be achieved simply by handing maps or guidelines over and expecting them to be used. Training workshops help with uptake, but are also not sufficient. Successful mainstreaming requires in situ support to users of the tools, usually over an extended period (for example several years);
 - Convening regular forums for coordination and sharing lessons among those involved in mainstreaming in a particular sector, and strengthening networks of relationships between key individuals. Although the immediate benefits of bringing people together to share, learn, and discuss are often hard to quantify, investing time and resources in such processes can be invaluable for developing shared objective and understanding across sectors and disciplines, thereby helping to embed mainstreaming outcomes.
- (iii) **Significant increase resources by enhancing resource mobilization, including innovative financial mechanisms and incentives, private-public partnership and enhancing the environment for a green economy¹³**

16. Mobilization of resources for capacity development, and regional and national programmes taking into account the preservation of biodiversity and poverty eradication should be undertaken at international, national, public and private levels. Special attention should be devoted to the trickling down of international and national conventions, frameworks and programmes to the civil society, including women, the poor, marginalized, and vulnerable, and indigenous and local communities, to promote effective protection of biodiversity linked to poverty eradication (top-down), as well as rights-based approach at grassroots level (bottom-up), encouraging meaningful participation of stakeholders, free prior and informed consent of indigenous and local communities, and the use of traditional knowledge and practices. There is also a need for capacity building in mainstreaming biodiversity and poverty eradication in all sectors, ministries and political levels and society as a whole.

17. Resource mobilization, including Innovative Financing Mechanisms (IFM)¹⁴ should have their respective, appropriate safeguards in order to preserve their social and environmental integrity. IFMs are a set of initiatives aiming at finding financial solutions where traditional aid flows cannot

¹³ There are different views on this within the Expert Group, reflecting the diversity of views in society. However, the economy should become more green, less polluting and destructive, and the engagement and active involvement of the private sector sectors is needed to help facilitate the implementation of the integration of biodiversity, poverty eradication and sustainable development in alignment with the public sector.

¹⁴ <http://www.cbd.int/financial/innovations/>

adequately address development challenges. They should be seen as complementary to rather than a replacement of traditional aid flows. It is important to make further research on and test innovative financial mechanisms and positive incentives in accordance with CBD provisions and other international obligations. Other, important approaches include:

- (a) Small grants as easily accessible fund for biodiversity-development mainstreaming champions and initiatives;
- (b) Awards programme to reward and recognize national and subnational efforts;
- (c) Calling for implementation of the DAC statement and follow-up through the OECD members;
- (d) Increased CBD involvement in the processes related to the post-2015 UN development agenda and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). Currently biodiversity is addressed in terrestrial and marines resources related goals and directly or indirectly as targets in other goals. It is important that biodiversity gets also sufficient attention in the design of the means of implementation, and financing of the future SDGs;
- (e) The development of private-public partnerships or the creation of an enhancing environment for a green, inclusive economy, are ways to be explored for scaling up the integration of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into the legitimate aspirations of people and countries for their economic growth and development;
- (f) Provision of public financial resources for holistic, comprehensive and integrated approaches, including market and non-market-based approaches, the role of collective actions and tools for strengthening the methodological understanding of the management of biodiversity and ecosystems by promoting alternative visions and policy approaches such as, *inter alia*, Living Well in Balance and Harmony with Mother Earth and different methodological instruments such as, *inter alia*, the management of Systems of Life of Mother Earth (SLME)¹⁵ that are oriented towards strengthening the non-commodification of Mother Earth;
- (g) Adaptive learning processes and knowledge generation, where indigenous, local and scientific knowledge systems are viewed to generate different manifestation of knowledge, which, through complementarities, can generate enhanced governance solutions, ideas and innovations.

(iv) Additional Possible Solutions

18. There are numerous possible solutions depending circumstances in different countries, their national vision, priority goals and targets, among other. The following activities are also identified as potential solutions to the barriers to implementation of decisions of the Convention that need to be considered:

- (a) Publications and diffusion of experiences (tools and case-studies, lessons, peer-to-peer exchange e.g. the NBSAP 2.0 project) where poverty has been reduced or eradicated while enhancing the conservation of renewable natural resources and strengthening environmental functions and services; including cases that consider different visions and approaches as encourage in the Rio+20 outcome, such as, rights-based-approaches. A suitable platform for engagement, can link to IPBES too.
- (b) Use of Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI) approach and experience for biodiversity mainstreaming, where appropriate; roll out BIOFIN project to more countries, that is if the results from the pilot projects bring benefits encouraging replication elsewhere and depending on countries priorities and needs.
- (c) Development of economic and social incentives and legal framework, including capacity building on legal framework and compliance, to promote an enabling environment for sustainable development and poverty eradication, through, *inter alia*, sustainable start-ups and small businesses.

¹⁵ <http://www.fundaciondelacordillera.org/index.php/2013-05-14-22-20-09/boletin-ruta/finish/12-boletin-ruta-critica/72-living-well-in-harmony-and-balance-with-mother-earth/0>
<http://www.fundaciondelacordillera.org/index.php/2013-05-15-00-22-33/desarrollo-y-madre-tierra/viewdownload/24-desarrollo-y-madre-tierra/116-vivir-bien-en-armonia-y-equilibrio-con-la-madre-tierra-diego-pacheco-una-propuesta-para-el-cambio-de-las-relaciones-globales-entre-los-seres-humanos-y-la-naturaleza>

(d) Encourage business and other sectors to incorporate biodiversity concerns into their production processes to avoid risk of loss and negative impacts. This can also help harness private sector investment and encourage a culture of biodiversity friendly entrepreneurship.

(e) Promote understanding of the space and time dimension of targets to strengthen the link between targets and solutions for a realistic outcome. It is also important to ensure legitimacy since the persons setting the targets are not the ones implementing the solutions, and to take the institutional costs of solutions into account.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN TO OVERCOME THE BARRIERS

19. The Expert Group recommends that appropriate measures be taken in order to address the identified barriers through addressing the solutions proposed above, and taking into account national vision, priority goals and targets and circumstances. Some recommendations are listed below:

Parties to the CBD should be encouraged:

(a) To promote the eradication of poverty in areas having higher biodiversity considering different visions and approaches, including, *inter alia*, that of the Living-well in balance and harmony with Mother Earth;

(b) To integrate fully the link between biodiversity and poverty eradication through their NBSAPs into national development plans;

(c) To enable and promote a closer mutual integration between the constituencies in charge of the implementation of biodiversity policies (in particular, the NBSAPs) and those which lead national development and sustainable development policies, as well as constituencies from biodiversity-impacting or biodiversity-sensitive sectors of the economy;

(d) To pursue their efforts to convert situations of trade-off between competing interests – either biodiversity conservation or development – into synergistic and win-win solutions – that simultaneously benefit biodiversity conservation and socio-economic development;

(e) To ensure a solid and reliable governance and institutional framework, based on rights, transparency, accountability, including monitoring and reporting, cross-sectoral cooperation and engaging relevant stakeholders, as appropriate, and according to national circumstances, priority goals and targets.

The CBD Secretariat should:

(a) Compile and disseminate successful experiences of countries that managed to reduce poverty while improving the environmental, biodiversity and ecosystems using different approaches;

(b) Promote mainstreaming of the integration of biodiversity, sustainable development and poverty eradication;

(c) Develop a suite of indicative impact indicators to streamline the link between biodiversity and poverty eradication and provide the necessary capacity building for Parties that consider applying them;

(d) Integrate the findings of the Expert Group into the IPBES programme of work to encourage a bottom up approach, capacity building, and enhance local assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services;

(e) Promote joint activities with other United Nations bodies and processes that are related to, *inter alia*, social development growth, business and trade; human rights; in order to address policy coherence issues and, in particular, to enhance the integration of biodiversity into other priority areas of human development.

Annex I: Summary of Identified Barriers and Possible Solutions

Barriers identified in the decisions themselves	Solutions proposed in the decisions themselves
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call for the Expert Group to assess the barriers (XI/22); suggested (through being antecedents to the solutions) as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Lack of mainstreaming of the issue; (b) Lack of resources: financial, legal, human, information, policy, scientific and material; (c) In conventional Official Development Assistance (ODA) biodiversity is not sufficiently viewed as part of development of livelihoods; and (d) Lack of adequate will of decision makers. • Lack of adequate entry points such as Ministries of Planning and Finance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Limited capacity; (b) Lack of or insufficient partnership; and (c) Insufficient resources and scaling-up opportunities, at all levels, in all sectors. • Lack of planning at community level • Top-down policy development without bottom-up coordination • Ignorance of biodiversity and its importance and values due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Destructive behavior as a result of lack of awareness; (b) Marginalization of women, indigenous peoples, other groups directly involved in the management of biological resources; and (c) Lack of sufficient education on the issue. • Lack of protection and use of traditional knowledge; neglect of traditional customs and practices • Lack of access to and control over natural resources including by local communities and indigenous peoples leading to un-sustainable use of natural resources/biodiversity 	<p>Mainstreaming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainstreaming biodiversity into: national sustainable development strategies (X/3, XI/22); national, regional and local decision-making processes (X/3); plans and projects • Using Strategic Environment Assessments (SEAs), Environment Impact Assessments (EIAs), and other tools (X/24) • Creating enabling environments for individuals, organizations and societies • Communication between and cooperation amongst different ministries and cross sectoral coordination • Monitoring and integrated indicators (XI/3) <p>Capacity-building:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem services into broader poverty eradication and development processes (X/6, XI/22) • To enhance environmental governance, biodiversity finance mechanisms and the generation, transfer, and adaptation of biodiversity related technologies and innovations through the promotion of win-win solutions to development needs(X/6) • Human-resources development and institution-building (X/6) • Improving environmental policies in relevant development agencies and sectors (X/24) <p>Resource mobilization and scaling-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilizing the necessary resources for mainstreaming biodiversity (X/3) • Scaling-up of good practices (X/6, XI/22) • GEF should provide resources (X/24) <p>Partnership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement of development cooperation agencies to support mainstreaming (X/6, XI/22) • Sharing of experiences of mainstreaming between countries (X/6) • A South-South cooperation forum (X/6) <p>Equity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting gender equality and gender and human rights mainstreaming (X/6)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor, marginalized and vulnerable (X/2)
<p>Identified key barriers (via literature review and group’s input)</p>	<p>Identified solutions (via literature review and group input)</p>
<p>Policy, institutional and governance barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of cohesive multi-sectoral perspectives; • Biodiversity priorities are disconnected from main national development planning and budgeting frameworks/Limited mainstreaming and synergy efforts; Disconnect between decision-making and implementation(Olsson J. 2010); implementation is often ultimately local; • Lack of clearly defined roles, responsibilities and accountability; • Lack of outreach/power of influence of the CBD toward other multilateral, non-environmental fora. <p>Political barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited political will and understanding of the link between poverty, biodiversity and ecosystem services; Marginalized/affected groups have limited influence; • Domestic conflicts/issues; • Corruption and confiscation of resources by national/local elites at the expenses of the most vulnerable groups. <p>Economic and financial barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of adequate resource mobilization and need of external funding • Lack of incentives to implement without funding availability; • Strong financial interests linked to illegal wildlife trafficking. <p>Technology and knowledge barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of relevant scientific base, and limited availability of integrated information (socio-economic and biodiversity together) • Lack of standardized and applicable methodology to assess and measure the state of biodiversity loss and ecosystem services depletion and their relationship with the response measures that have been implemented. <p>Capacity barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited technical expertise to respond to all decisions; • Challenge to innovate, with limited good cases as guidance. <p>Others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smallholder business sustainability may be hampered by market economy 	<p>At inter-governmental level, there are 3 broad approaches to strengthen implementation of any MEA decision (Neumayer E. 2006).</p> <p>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Sunshine methods”: improved monitoring, indicators, reporting, peer-to-peer verification, and access to information; • “Sticks” or negative measures: some kind of penalties against those who fail to implement (these are used very rarely in MEAs); and • “Carrots” or positive measures: financial or other incentives to assist countries in building the necessary capacities, in this case for mainstreaming biodiversity and development. <p>The latter involves (adapted from PEI) support to national and sub-national levels for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finding the entry points and making the case for biodiversity and development links (X/6, X24); • Integrating biodiversity into national development processes (X/3, X/6, XI/22 etc): country-specific evidence, influencing policy processes, developing and costing policy measures; • Meeting the implementation challenge: monitoring and indicators, budgeting and financing, supporting policy measures, strengthening institutions and capacities, (X/24); • Engaging stakeholders and coordinating within the development community; • Addressing thematic poverty-biodiversity issues: Protected Areas, REDD+, Ecosystem Based Approaches (EBA), etc ; and • Creating enabling environment for sustainable small scale business <p>(More details related to PEI available from: http://www.unpei.org/knowledge-resources-services)</p>

Note: Perkins and Neumayer (2007) show implementation of MEAs by governments (more generally) is shaped by “a combination of rational calculations of domestic compliance costs and reputational damage, domestically institutionalized normative obligations, and legal and political constraints”. Four main theoretical models have been developed to explain compliance or non-compliance with agreements/decisions: (i) Domestic adjustment - a rational calculation based on domestic circumstances, (ii) Reputational - based on reputational consequences – positive or negative), (iii) constructivist - what becomes normal based on common practice; can relate to identities, preferences and beliefs. Important role for public expectations here; (iv) and managerial (actual constraints, even where there is will to implement, e.g. legal systems, institutional set-up, relations between sectors/groups in-country. Others (e.g. Luck and Doley 2004) suggest the **inability to comply** is more important, reflecting either an administrative inability to enforce obligations domestically, or insufficient political capital to deploy against domestic opposition.

Annex II: Summary of Barriers by Level and Type

Level	Barriers					
	Policy, institutional and governance	Political	Economic and financial	Technology and knowledge	Capacity	Others
<i>Inter-governmental</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ad hoc nature of partnerships on biodiversity and development - Insufficient acknowledgement of biodiversity in key development processes - Lack of coherence between policies with divergent priorities and interests - Lack of outreach/power of influence of the CBD toward other multilateral, non-environmental fora. 	International conflicts /issues	Lack of adequate mainstreaming biodiversity and sustainability in economic fora	Lack of standardized and adequate methodology to assess and measure the state of biodiversity loss and ecosystem services depletion and to assess impacts of the response measures that have been implemented	- Lack of trickle-down of intergovernmental decisions	
<i>Regional</i>	Insufficient acknowledgement of biodiversity in key development processes	Regional conflicts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of incentives to integrate biodiversity into sustainable development or shift economic activities more respectful of the environment - Strong financial interests linked to illegal wildlife trafficking 	Influence of climate change on regional conflicts and biodiversity loss	- Lack of harmonization of Education and capacity building programmes	

<p>National/sub-national</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rules of subsidiarity and competence unclear, - - Lack of transparency - Lack of cohesive multi-sectoral perspectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity priorities disconnected from main national development planning and budgeting framework/Limited mainstreaming and synergy efforts; • Disconnect between decision-setting and implementation that is ultimately local (Olsson J.A. 2010; Thomas D. In Roe et al 2013) 	<p>Political will, Conflicts, Corruption, Confiscation of resources at the expenses of vulnerable groups</p>	<p>Lack of enabling environment to create jobs which, at the same time, reduce poverty and are respectful to or promote the environment</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project- and sector based activities, not enough transversal work across ministries; - Lack of linkages between local and national levels, and of meaningful participation of indigenous and local communities, women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legislation un-adapted, unknown, not implemented - Different cultural contexts, economic conditions and budget as well as view of nature
-------------------------------------	--	--	---	--	--	---

Note: These are barriers identified from the literature and input from the Expert Group. The identified priority barriers are those listed in the text.

Reference and Additional resources

- Barret S. (1998). On the Theory and Diplomacy of Environmental Treaty-Making. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 11:317-333.
<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1023%2FA%3A1008243528330#page-2>
- BIOFIN: The Biodiversity Finance Initiative, started in 2012, was set up to develop a methodology for countries to analyze, calculate and develop strategies to generate biodiversity finance.
http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/environmentandenergy/projects_and_initiatives/biodiversity-finance-initiative/
- Duraiappah, Anantha Kumar, Stanley Tanyi Asah, Eduardo S. Brondizio, Nicolas Kosoy, Patrick J O'Farrell, Anne-Helene Prieur-Richard, Suneetha M Subramanian and Kazuhiko Takeuchi, 2014, Managing the mismatches to provide ecosystem services for human well-being: a conceptual framework for understanding the New Commons, *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 7:94–100.
- GEF STAP Biodiversity Mainstreaming Workshop Cape Town, South Africa, October 1, 2013.
- Gu, Hongyan and Subramanian, Suneetha M. (2014). Drivers of change in socio-ecological production landscapes: Implications for better management. *Ecology and Society*, 19(1):41 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-06283-190141>.
- Huntley, B.J. and Redford, K.H. (2014). 'Mainstreaming biodiversity in Practice: a STAP advisory document'. Global Environment Facility, Washington, DC. <http://www.stapgef.org/stap/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Mainstreaming-Biodiversity-LowRes.pdf>
- IIED. (2013). NBSAPs 2.0: Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Development. Maun Statement on Biodiversity and Development Mainstreaming.
<http://povertyandconservation.info/sites/default/files/Maun%20Statement.pdf>;
<http://pubs.iied.org/G03695.html>
- IIED (2013). NBSAPs 2.0: Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Development. Entebbe Statement on Biodiversity in Development Planning.
<http://povertyandconservation.info/sites/default/files/Entebbe%20Statement%20on%20Biodiversity%20in%20Development%20Planning.pdf>
- Luck E.C. and Doyle M.W. (2004). International Law and Organization: Closing the Compliance Gap. OECD DAC Policy Statement on Integrating Biodiversity and Associated Ecosystem Services into Development Co-operation.
- Neumayer E. 2006. "Multilateral Environmental Agreements, Trade and Development: Issues and Policy Options Concerning Compliance and Enforcement" available from:
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/geographyAndEnvironment/whosWho/profiles/neumayer/pdf/CUTS.pdf>
- Olsson J. 2010. Implementation of the CBD and conflicts between targets. Available from:
[http://www.epbrs.org/PDF/Johanna%20Alkan%20Olsson%20\[Skrivskyddad\].pdf](http://www.epbrs.org/PDF/Johanna%20Alkan%20Olsson%20[Skrivskyddad].pdf)
- Perkins R and Neumayer E. 2007. Implementing Multilateral Environmental Agreements: An Analysis of EU Directives. *Global environmental politics* 7(3): 13-41.
- Pittock J. 2011. A pale reflection of political reality: Integration of global climate, wetland, and biodiversity agreements. *Climate law* 1(3): 343-373.

Rametsteiner E et al. 2011. Sustainability indicator development—Science or political negotiation?
Ecological Indicators 11(1): 61–70.

Roe D et al 2013. Biodiversity Conservation and Poverty Alleviation: Exploring the evidence for a link.

Sands P and Linehan J. 2004. Compliance with Multilateral Environmental Agreements: the Climate Change Regime. Pages: 93-119, in Luck E and Doyle M. 2004. International Law and Organization: Closing the Compliance Gap.

UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative: Mainstreaming Poverty-Environment Linkages into Development Planning: A Handbook for Practitioners. UNDP-UNEP: 2009.

UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative: Stories of Change. UNDP-UNEP: 2013.

UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative: Stories of Change from Africa. UNDP-UNEP: 2014.

Suneetha M.S and Balakrishna Pisupati (2009), Learning from the Practitioners: Benefit sharing perspectives from Enterprising Communities, UNEP and UNU-IAS.
