



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/EM-BD&DC/1/2  
30 June 2009

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXPERT MEETING ON MAINSTREAMING  
BIODIVERSITY IN DEVELOPMENT  
COOPERATION  
Montreal, 13-15 May 2009

### REPORT OF THE EXPERT MEETING ON MAINSTREAMING BIODIVERSITY IN DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

#### INTRODUCTION

##### A. *Background*

1. The Expert Meeting on Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Development Cooperation was held in Montreal from 13 to 15 May 2009 at the premises of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD), with the technical and financial assistance from the French and German Governments and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

2. The meeting took place in the context of 3 decisions of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, which was held in Bonn, in May 2008:

(a) Decision IX/8 on the review of implementation of goals 2 and 3 of the Strategic Plan requests the Executive Secretary to invite all bilateral and multilateral development cooperation agencies to promote mainstreaming of the environment, including biodiversity, into development cooperation activities;

(b) Decision IX/11 B on the review of implementation of Articles 20 and 21 calls for the development of concrete activities and initiatives to achieve the goals of the strategy for resource mobilization in support of the achievement of the Convention's three objectives for the period 2008-2015. Goal 5, entitled "Mainstream biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services in development cooperation plans and priorities including the linkage between Convention's work programmes and Millennium Development Goals" invites Parties:

5.1. To integrate considerations on biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services into the priorities, strategies and programmes of multilateral and bilateral donor organizations, including sectoral and regional priorities, taking into account the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

5.2. To integrate considerations on biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services in economic and development plans, strategies and budgets of developing country Parties.

5.3. To integrate effectively the three objectives of the Convention into the United Nations development system, as well as international financial institutions and development banks.

(c) Decision IX/15 on the follow-up to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) invites Parties and other Governments to make full use of the framework, experiences and findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) when they review, revise and implement their national

/...

biodiversity strategies and action plans, relevant development plans, and development cooperation strategies, as appropriate.

### ***B. Objectives***

3. The main objectives of the meeting were to advance biodiversity mainstreaming in development cooperation by:

- (a) Identifying obstacles and challenges;
- (b) Reviewing existing mainstreaming approaches, tools and instruments;
- (c) Identifying entry points at different policy cycle stages of partner countries as well as in donors' internal processes;
- (d) Developing key considerations for a more effective inclusion of biodiversity in development cooperation processes;
- (e) Reinforcing partnerships between the Secretariat and donor organizations as well as between donor and partner countries.

### ***C. Participation***

4. Participating experts came from bilateral and multi-lateral development cooperation agencies, development banks and United Nations agencies. Resource people from developing countries and representatives from international organizations and research institutes with relevant experience on the theme of the workshop also participated. A list of participants is available at <https://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/development/emmbdc-01/information/emmbdc-01-inf-02-en.pdf>.

## **ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP**

5. Mr. Ravi Sharma, Principal Officer, Implementation and Technical Support (ITS), from the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, opened the meeting on behalf of the Executive Secretary, Mr. Ahmed Djoghla, at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, 13 May 2009. Ms. Vivien Lo from Environment Canada provided opening remarks on behalf of the Government of Canada. Mr. Éric Belvaux, Senior Programme Officer, ITS, introduced the Secretariat's Biodiversity for Development Initiative and presented the meeting's agenda and expected objectives.

### ***Opening statements, overview of the agenda and objectives***

6. Mr. Ravi Sharma underlined that it was the first time in the history of the Secretariat that more than 45 development cooperation agencies, development banks, United Nations agencies and international non-governmental organizations involved in development gathered in the same room to exchange on how to better integrate biodiversity into the development cooperation agenda. He expressed gratitude to the participants for the valuable expertise they would share with a view of assisting the 191 Parties in mainstreaming biodiversity into development sectors. He added that the meeting workshop should be seen as a continuation of the effort that started in Paris in September 2006 at the Conference on Biodiversity in European Development Cooperation.

7. Mr. Sharma recalled that in its contribution to the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development, the Conference of the Parties stated that: "The most important lesson of the last ten years is that the objectives of the Convention will be impossible to meet until consideration of biodiversity is fully integrated into other sectors. The need to mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources across all sectors of the national economy, the society and the policy-making framework is a complex challenge at the heart of the Convention". In this context he reminded participants that the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity will remain unfulfilled without the effective implementation of Article 6, on general measures for conservation and sustainable use, including the commitment by Parties to "integrate, as far as possible and as appropriate, the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and

policies”. He summarized how the MA demonstrated the continuous decrease in biological diversity is endangering the services provided to human kind and how the pressure on ecosystem services can create a spiral of increasing poverty and further degradation of ecosystem services. Mr. Sharma reminded that a revised Strategic Plan of the Convention would be adopted at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to be held in Nagoya, in 2010. A high-level meeting during the sixty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly will precede the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. He suggested that the participating agencies work on a road map toward the Nagoya Summit.

8. Ms. Vivien Lo from Environment Canada underlined that National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) increasingly reflect broader development and environment objectives, and that NBSAPs are in turn being linked to national development planning processes such as cross-sectoral policies and strategies linked to development and poverty alleviation. She recalled the considerable interest in the interface between biodiversity and economics among the G-8 and developing country environment ministers. In adopting the *Carta di Siracusa* at their April 2009 meeting, countries at the table decided to strengthen the use of economics as a tool to achieve biodiversity policy goals through mainstreaming and improved understanding of the benefits arising from biodiversity and ecosystem services. Ms. Lo recalled in that regard the saliency of The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) initiative. Ms. Lo also recalled commitments of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, which sets out an ambitious reform of development aid based on partnership between donor agencies and developing countries.

9. Mr. Éric Belvaux, from the Secretariat, stressed that the links between biodiversity, poverty alleviation and development are reflected in numerous decisions of the Conference of the Parties and in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).<sup>1</sup> He mentioned NBSAPs were, in principle, an appropriate instrument for mainstreaming in country systems albeit limited progresses on their implementation. Recalling the background note prepared by the Secretariat, he proposed that, if the integration of biodiversity in development cooperation processes was important, it was also crucial to reflect on how the Convention’s Programmes of Work could integrate considerations for poverty alleviation and development issues more consistently. He pointed out that a range of approaches and instruments (Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Ecosystem Approach, Ecological Goods and Services) already exist to better integrate biodiversity in development cooperation. He underlined however that the MA introduced a new conceptual framework highlighting the key services to human well being derived from biodiversity and that the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) proposed a new framework which defines more precisely the decision-making hierarchy as well as identifying entry points for the integration of technical inputs. He highlighted that it was in light of these developments on environmental mainstreaming that the Secretariat believed there were interesting new conceptual elements to move forward. He concluded his presentation by recalling the objectives of this meeting.

10. Following the introductory remarks, participants briefly introduced themselves.

11. The meeting’s programme included three different sessions: an update session summarizing where we stand in relation to the mainstreaming of biodiversity in development cooperation and introducing available tools and approaches followed by an open dialogue session where experiences and lessons learned from developing countries and development cooperation agencies were exposed. This was succeeded by a session dedicated to the development of key considerations stemming from three group discussions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Éric Belvaux’s presentation is available at: <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-scbd-01-en.pdf>

## ITEM 2. UPDATE SESSION

### A. *General introduction - Mainstreaming biodiversity in development cooperation: key building blocks*

12. Mr. Nik Sekran from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) highlighted some barriers to biodiversity management and explained what biodiversity mainstreaming entailed in the perspective of the 2004 meeting of the Global Environment Facility's Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (GEF-STAP) in Cape Town.<sup>2</sup> The introductory presentation outlined the frameworks and approaches of two converging strategies for mainstreaming biodiversity: (i) mainstreaming into landscapes with policies, legal frameworks, institutions and planning processes governing land and resource use; and (ii) mainstreaming into economic sectors and markets through, *inter alia*, the integration of biodiversity management into supply chains. He recalled that mainstreaming could be done through, *inter alia*: (i) Strengthening institutional capacity, policies, and enforcement mechanisms; (ii) Reforming environmental governance and accountability frameworks; (iii) Increasing public awareness, participation and training; (iv) Implementing environmental cost recovery practices (internalization into fiscal policies) and; (v) Strengthening SEA and impact assessment. He highlighted the case of South Africa's Biodiversity Act as an example of efficient biodiversity mainstreaming and described its implementation through tools such as satellite imaging to inform policymaking, an idea coming out of the country's NBSAP.

13. Ms. Linda Ghanimé, Senior Programme Officer on secondment from UNDP to the Secretariat, , further outlined enabling conditions for biodiversity mainstreaming. She underlined that trade-offs are inherent to any mainstreaming process. She also highlighted the main lessons from UNDP's review of the experience of 150 countries in implementing the MDGs: (i) Countries make most progress on environmental sustainability with a clear evidence-based and widely shared vision of how they want to manage their environmental resources in the long term; (ii) Countries do best when they tailor environmental sustainability targets and responses to national conditions; (iii) Systems for monitoring environmental resources and ecosystem goods and services need to be enhanced with quantitative and statistical capacities; (iv) Environmental sustainability is best tackled through cross-sectoral, interdisciplinary approaches with support across agencies.

14. Mr. Steve Bass from the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) provided an update and outlook on country experiences in mainstreaming environmental sustainability.<sup>3</sup> He mentioned that mainstreaming equates to the need for long-term sustained management, highlighted the need to work on long-term policy processes and the importance to factor in the time necessary to understand each partner country's context. He noted that views from developed countries often dominated mainstreaming agendas to the detriment of its efficient implementation. He focused his presentation on the challenges for aid agencies of integrating environment and development in Low Income Countries (LICs).

### B. *Biodiversity mainstreaming tools and approaches*

#### 1. *Ecological goods and services and the economics of ecosystems and biodiversity - TEEB Report*

15. Mr. Markus Lehmann, economist at the Secretariat introduced and provided an update on The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) initiative.<sup>4</sup> He proposed an analysis of the costs and benefits associated to the loss of ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation through concrete examples illustrating the quantification of ecosystem services. He recalled TEEB's objective is to make

---

<sup>2</sup> Nick Sekran and Linda Ghanimé's presentations are available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-undp-en.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Steve Bass' presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-iied-en.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Markus Lehmann's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-scbd-05-en.pdf>.

the case for incorporating the true value of ecosystems services into decision-making, and to identify innovative tools for the undertaking. In relation to market distortion, he alluded to TEEB as a way to repair, in the words of the TEEB Study Leader, the “defective economic compass” to allow for the consideration of environmental externalities in economic activities. In describing the second phase of TEEB’s activities, Mr. Lehmann suggested that the upcoming TEEB Report for local administrators will provide practical tools which will help implementing development cooperation activities on the ground.

2. *Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment, ecosystem approach and ecosystem services, assessment and planning*

16. In his presentation, Mr. Roel Slootweg from Slootweg en van Schooten (SEVS) described how ecosystem services in EIA and SEA allowed putting biodiversity and stakeholders interests on decision maker's agendas.<sup>5</sup> After a brief introduction to EIA and SEA he suggested preconditions for the optimal use of SEA. Mr. Slootweg introduced OECD’s Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Policy statement on SEA, which aims at developing and applying common approaches for SEA at the sector and national levels. He described the entry points identified for SEA by the DAC. They range from national and sectoral policies to spatial plans and assistance strategies. He also referred to the 2006 SEA Guidelines for biodiversity inclusive impact assessment developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity. The use of SEA is rapidly spreading across the world. He stressed the need to adapt the environmental assessment language to make its use as simple as possible by policy makers and the need to gather case-studies that provide good practical evidence on the appropriateness of SEA to development objectives.

17. Ms. Maria Schultz from the Swedish International Biodiversity Programme (SwedBio) made a complementary presentation on SEA and ecosystem services and presented the “Strategic Environmental Assessment and Ecosystem Services”, one in a series of Advisory Notes that supplement the OECD DAC Good Practice Guidance on strategic environmental assessment (SEA) endorsed by members of the DAC Network on Environment and Development Co-operation (ENVIRONET). The Guidance provides a broad framework, steps and principles of SEA application across the full range of policies, plans and programmes (PPP). The target audience of the Advisory Notes is SEA practitioners.<sup>6</sup> She highlighted that ecosystem services indicators would be very useful at the agency level to monitor decisions taken on the ground. Among other useful publications she alluded to the World Resources Institute’s publications entitled “Ecosystem Services: A Guide for Decision Makers”, and “Corporate Ecosystem Services Review. Guidelines for Identifying Business Risks and Opportunities Arising from Ecosystem Change”.

18. In his presentation, Mr. Arnolfo Matus Kramer from the OECD provided participants with a brief overview of the OECD Policy Guidance on Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Development Co-operation.<sup>7</sup> The Policy Guidance is mainly intended for policy makers and practitioners in both donor countries and partner countries. In line with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, the Policy Guidance seeks to align donor support with the strategies, institutions and procedures of partner countries. He introduced the “climate lens” concept and explained that the application of the “lens” was interesting to build cross-sectoral adaptation activities and top-down adaptation activities identified during the sectoral planning stage. He pursued with a description of the different entry points laid out in the guidance. The same framework could be used in the case of biodiversity and as such the Policy Guidance could be an interesting tool to consider in any ongoing work on mainstreaming biodiversity in development cooperation. He made a brief description of challenges present at the local level and noted

---

<sup>5</sup> Roel Slootweg’s presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-sevs-en.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> Maria Shultz’s presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-oecd-01-en.pdf>.

<sup>7</sup> Arnolfo Matus Kramer’s presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-oecd-en.pdf>.

that the lessons learnt on effective mainstreaming could inform future discussions held under the auspices of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

19. Participants suggested that an important challenge was the sectoral integration of biodiversity at the national level. While institutional resistance is observed, there are reasons for optimism since there is political will at the donor and national levels. The increasing use of the ecosystem services approach was believed to be another reason for optimism. If the use of an economic language by the conservation community provides common ground for discussions, considerations for biodiversity should also permeate the policy language for greater impact. Participants stressed that associating economic values to environmental services was often proven too small an incentive to motivate the allocation of resources for conservation by policy makers. Participants believed that the MA was a very good first attempt to look at ecosystem services and had been influential in providing a common language needed by the development community. It was mentioned that, in the experience of development agencies, once valuation work was finalised, it would usually be well received by planning and finance ministries. Climate change adaptation was said to be an interesting opportunity to mainstream biodiversity since it takes a salient stage in international environmental forums. In associated discussions, participants pointed out that since holistic approaches have proven their worth, and in the context of the OECD Policy Guidance on Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Development Co-operation, it would be interesting to find examples of projects that link biodiversity protection and climate change adaptation. Other participants questioned the use of the lens concept by suggesting too many lens could preclude from a good overall vision of the issues at stake. Others suggested, in a plea to keep mainstreaming processes simple, that SEA should not be considered as a lens but as a scoping tool. Some participants suggested that donor agencies should look more closely at the SEA guidelines or legislations from partner countries, and this, as early as the planning stage or as early as the writing of projects' terms of reference.

3. *Discussion groups: Institutional and financial challenges of biodiversity in development processes and cooperation*

20. Following these presentations, participants were divided in 3 discussion groups. Discussions centred on the most critical institutional and financial challenges of biodiversity mainstreaming in development processes and cooperation.

21. Reporting back in plenary, participants highlighted the following challenges:

- (a) Limited institutional and technical capacity at the national level for long term implementation of mainstreaming measures;
- (b) Need for the economic, environment and development sectors to use a common language;
- (c) Lack of effective donor coordination under partner country leadership;
- (d) Mainstreaming "fatigue" or "overload";
- (e) Insufficient evidence (case-studies and success stories) on the advantages of mainstreaming biodiversity to reach development goals;
- (f) Difficulties in the in the formulation of development outcomes incorporating biodiversity in programmes;
- (g) Results-based management is complex since biodiversity benefits are dispersed in space and time while development projects are often funded for a short period of time and decisions at the national level are often based on short term returns;
- (h) Difficulties to raise awareness and to ensure engagement from the private sector;
- (i) Effective measurement of financial flows for biodiversity;



(j) Lack of systematic utilisation of economic valuation tools - both at the national and at the donor agencies levels;

(k) Finding biodiversity champions within ministries associated to development sectors or in ministries of finance and planning to make the case for biodiversity's critical input into their sectors;

(l) Biodiversity considerations are not sufficiently accounted for in budget support;

(m) Current trends of general budget support may lie in the way of biodiversity mainstreaming since it becomes more difficult to dedicate aid to environmental sustainability – in comparison, aid for investment projects tends to decrease and associated mainstreaming tools such as EIA or SEA do not find appropriate application grounds.

(n) Allocating financial resources for biodiversity and dedicated human resources in both agencies and country partners;

(o) Resistance to change in some institutions creating inertia;

22. Participants suggested that public expenditure reviews were a good place to factor in biodiversity and related ecosystem expenditures. Participants suggested that the Life Web Initiative launched at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties could serve as a good framework to explain how donor agencies can coordinate funding and support.

#### *4. Developing and using indicators to measure progress and impacts*

23. In a presentation on ecosystem services indicators, Mr. Christian Layke of the World Resources Institute (WRI), explained that it was essential to place values on ecosystems to assure investments that will secure economic growth and people's well being.<sup>8</sup> Among the services described are those of supplying and filtering freshwater, storing carbon, preventing erosion, reducing floods, or offering places for recreation. He presented the potential of the ecosystem services framework for mainstreaming biodiversity. The multiple services ecosystems provide should be recognised in development cooperation activities. A good way to do so is through the development and use of appropriate indicators. Mr. Layke explained that progress toward integrating biodiversity into policy-making were observed but that it was still very inadequate in Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS) and that it did not yet penetrate sectoral planning. In light of WRI's experience, he stressed the need for an institutionalization of ecosystem services indicators and suggested there was a need to develop an integrated indicators framework.

24. Mr. Mark Zimsky of the Global Environment Facility Secretariat (GEF) made a brief assessment of progress in monitoring biodiversity mainstreaming experiences in the GEF Portfolio.<sup>9</sup> Mr. Zimsky exposed the need to gather success stories in environmental mainstreaming and underlined that the breadth and diversity of GEF's portfolio poses particular challenges to portfolio monitoring. Biodiversity portfolio monitoring at such a large scale can be very complex due to the large and heterogeneous portfolio of GEF projects. Outcomes and impacts may not be seen or measurable until project closure. He added that overarching portfolio monitoring could add costs to project level monitoring since most data is found at that level. Another complexity to the process is that the GEF is a networked institutional arrangement of many partners with different monitoring systems. As part of a range of working solutions to these challenges, he noted the creation of simple tools for data collection as well as the limitation of portfolio indicators. To complement its investments to strengthen the sustainability of protected area systems, the GEF promoted sustainability measures to help reduce the negative impacts productive sectors exert on biodiversity, particularly outside of protected areas, and that highlight the contribution of biodiversity to economic development and human well being. He described some of the indicators to be used by the GEF in the monitoring of GEF-4's second objective of mainstreaming biodiversity

<sup>8</sup> Christian Layke's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-wri-en.pdf>.

<sup>9</sup> Mark Zimsky's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-gef-en.pdf>.

conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors. To achieve an increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity considerations, the GEF will use the landscape or seascape area certified by internationally recognized standards as indicator. Data recorded is the coverage in hectares of certified landscape or seascape. He pointed out that including qualitative criteria in the monitoring of outcomes should not be left out.

25. A panel summarized their reading on common ground and on ways for moving forward at the end of the first day's discussions. Linda Ghanimé, from the Secretariat, observed that many good tools existed for biodiversity mainstreaming in development cooperation and that there is a consensus around SEA and EIA. She highlighted the need for the biodiversity community to work with other sectors including other development assistance areas (such as governance) and to adjust the language accordingly. The use of measurement metrics, usually translated in monetary terms, was said to be helpful for doing so.

26. Mr. Roel Slootweg of SEVS highlighted that more and more EIA and SEA were being used around the world at the national level. It was also welcomed that EIA and SEA have been formalized as an approach for biodiversity protection and sustainable use by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and development agencies. He recalled consensus on the use of two main approaches to further biodiversity mainstreaming: an area, or spatial, and a sectoral approach. Here, NBSAPs were said to possess the potential to become good tools for the refinement of spatial approaches. As for the sectoral approach, the use of thresholds could be useful and EIA could be used to precise them. The need to open the processes to stakeholders and of making better use of local knowledge was reinstated.

27. Mr. Steve Bass, from IIED observed that there was not much demand from countries for biodiversity mainstreaming. Development practitioners could therefore support enabling conditions to further the mainstreaming agenda. Donors need to use a "how can we help you" attitude instead of a "let me help you" one. There seems to be agreement on the need for both the development and the environment communities to change their attitudes accordingly. It was pointed out that the French word for mainstreaming better reflects this discussion. "*Intégration*" (integration) suggests an attitude change from both communities. In this spirit, it was said that it would be easier to work on a common agenda and on a common body of knowledge. He recalled the interest for the compilation of case-studies and success stories that could be done through a system wide assessment of biodiversity mainstreaming activities in development cooperation. He pointed out the need for cross-sector monitoring and evaluation of biodiversity mainstreaming.

5 *NBSAPs: integration in development strategies, sectoral and cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies*

28. Mr. David Cooper, Senior Programme Officer, Implementation and Technical Support of the Convention on Biological Diversity made a presentation on NBSAP's integration in development strategies, sectoral and cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies.<sup>10</sup> He informed the participants of decision IX/8 of the Convention on Biological Diversity which provides guidance to assist Parties in the development and revision of NBSAP. He introduced the recent publication by the Convention on Biological Diversity entitled "Mainstreaming Biodiversity in NBSAP's". NBSAPs could be important frameworks for action on the ground; especially in relation to spatial planning. Examples were given to illustrate this point. The rationalization of the protected area system in Togo was given as an example of the need to make trade-offs that could lead to economic development and well-being while taking into account biodiversity priorities. Recalling some of the main findings of the 2007 NBSAPs review, he pointed out that mainstreaming had been done in some sectors such as forestry and tourism but that, generally, it remained weak in poverty reduction strategies and in national development planning processes. He recalled the Training Modules on NBSAPs under the Convention on Biological Diversity, which includes one relating to the mainstreaming of biodiversity into sectoral and cross-sectoral

<sup>10</sup> David Cooper's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-scbd-08-en.pdf>.



strategies, plans and programmes. These tools and strategies include incorporating biodiversity into national development and/or poverty reduction strategies, using sectoral strategies and tools as entry points for mainstreaming, applying SEA or the Ecosystem Approach. The Consolidated Guidance for NBSAPs from the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties highlights the contribution of biodiversity and ecosystem services to human well being using the MA approach and valuation tools. It also addresses planning processes to mainstream biodiversity in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and sectoral strategies. There are opportunities in development cooperation to link NBSAPs to broader planning processes by using NBSAPs as planning tools for bilateral and multilateral partners. Some countries had developed or revised their NBSAPs as contributions to national development and poverty reduction strategies. The imperative of adapting to climate change provides an opportunity to highlight the role of biodiversity in underpinning the provision of ecosystem services and the maintenance of ecosystem resilience.

29. Some participants expressed interest as to identifying the number of countries that integrate considerations for biodiversity from NBSAPs in their development plans and in elaborating good practices for this. Some participants questioned the use of NBSAPs to inform development cooperation processes, considering the fact that NBSAPs are often prepared by ministries, which usually have little power on policy making affecting economic development. Greater synergy between the Rio Conventions was suggested and it was proposed that the Joint Liaison Group (JLG) could coordinate work on the use of these action plans to inform development processes.

### **ITEM 3. OPEN DIALOGUE WITH DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**

#### **A. *Experiences and lessons learned from developing countries and development cooperation agencies***

##### ***1. Successful examples of biodiversity integration in poverty reduction strategies***

30. In his presentation, entitled “Greening growth and poverty reduction strategy of Benin”, Mr. Bonaventure Guedegbe of Benin explained how the Government of his country envisioned to bring the country up to the “Emergent Nation” category by 2011 and how, in this context, Benin’s second generation poverty reduction strategy was aiming at improving quality of life through growth and equity in revenue distribution.<sup>11</sup> In this context, the country’s “Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy” (GPRS) serves as a basis for resources mobilization and coordination, community-based development, and equity in national revenues with multiple trickling down effects. Beninese legislation highlights the link between poverty and environment and requests the application of SEA. The greening of the GPRS was described by Mr. Guedegbe as an attempt to ensure sustainable economic growth through a wise use of natural resources and pollution control. Among the specific objectives of the GPRS is that of integrating environmental conservation aspects and actions in each component of the GPRS.

31. Mr. Mathias K. Pofagi of Benin completed the presentation on Benin by pointing out some key observations on the integration of the environment to the country’s planning processes.<sup>12</sup> He highlighted that all initiatives should be subject to an appropriate review to assure they are set in the context of the country’s sustainable development objectives. Mr. Pofagi explained that it was especially important in the case of the review or preparation of documents of key strategic importance to economic development.

32. In his presentation, Mr. Konrad Uebelhör from the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) explained the relevance of biodiversity for German development cooperation and the different

---

<sup>11</sup> Bonaventure Guedegbe’s presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-benin-fr.pdf>.

<sup>12</sup> Mathias K. Pofagi’s presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-benin-01-en.pdf>.

mainstreaming approaches used by the agency.<sup>13</sup> He explained that the GTZ's approach to biodiversity mainstreaming was not comprehensive since it was stronger at the institutional than at the programme or project level. Since the mainstreaming work of the GTZ was relatively new, the outcomes of associated activities were still imprecise. He proposed a reflection on the following definition of biodiversity mainstreaming: "the informed inclusion of relevant environmental / biodiversity concerns into the decisions and institutions that drive national and sectoral development policy, rules, plans, investment and action". In providing an outlook of GTZ's biodiversity mainstreaming activities, he pointed out that the use of SEA was probably one of the most promising entry points.

33. Ms. Blandina Cheche from Tanzania described how Tanzanian National Development Planning benefited from biodiversity mainstreaming.<sup>14</sup> She provided participants with a description of how the Tanzanian Government succeeded in formulating a National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP) which outcome is focused on, and used for, sector planning and budgeting. In this strategy, space is left for the environmental sector to contribute to growth and the reduction of poverty through the promotion of sustainable broad based growth or the reduction of income disparity for both men and women in rural areas. In supporting governance and accountability, the NSGRP sets effective mechanisms for equitable access and use of natural resources. The strategy takes into account the country's NBSAP and identified various priority measures to conserve biodiversity. If some priority measures were not implemented, it was due to inadequate financial resources.

34. Ms. Anna Maembe from Tanzania presented a number of case-studies on biodiversity integration in development planning at the district level.<sup>15</sup> She explained that the Government of Tanzania acknowledged socio-economic growth and environment conservation linkages as being of crucial concern to the country, and this, especially since prospects for growth depend upon the use and exploitation of natural resources. She pursued her presentation with case-studies on sustainable fishing and beekeeping. The case-studies described involved the improvement of villagers' income as well as the recovery of the resource base.

35. Mr. John Horberry from UNEP-UNDP Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI) highlighted some challenges and lessons learned in poverty-environment mainstreaming stemming from the PEI.<sup>16</sup> After a brief description of the PEI and of its work on poverty-environment mainstreaming in which biodiversity is a key component, he presented examples of what had been achieved in selected countries. By working jointly with finance and planning ministries, the PEI aims at influencing the production of PRSPs and MDG Plans. Mr. Horberry explained that environmental mainstreaming was targeted at governmental processes for planning, budgeting, sector implementation, and local level implementation. He pointed out the use by PEI of an ecosystem services framework in explaining the importance of biodiversity conservation for a country's economy. One of PEI's goals is to increase investments by countries and donors by making the case for an easier reach of national poverty and development objectives through environmental protection. The PEI experience shows that there is an increase in budget allocation to biodiversity conservation that ensues from the understanding of these interlinkages by decision makers. A programmatic approach to mainstreaming proved to be best solution. Among other lessons learnt, he described country-led environmental mainstreaming processes has significant transaction costs. This is mainly the case because it is new, because it seeks to change government priorities, and because it involves a number of different ministries. He introduced participants to a publication summarising PEI's early findings and entitled "Mainstreaming Poverty-Environment Linkages into Development Planning: a

---

<sup>13</sup> Konrad Uebelhör's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-gtz-en.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup> Blandina Cheche's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-tanzania-en.pdf>.

<sup>15</sup> Anna Maembe's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-tanzania-01-en.pdf>.

<sup>16</sup> John Horberry's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-pei-en.pdf>.

Handbook for Practitioners”. The 2009 publication is designed to serve as a guide for champions and practitioners engaged in the task of mainstreaming poverty-environment linkages into national development planning.

2. *Successful examples of biodiversity integration in national development planning*

36. In her presentation, Ms. Vidya Sari Nalang from Indonesia described how Indonesia’s Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (IBSAP) had been influential for the country’s development planning system.<sup>17</sup> Ms. Nalang described how the National Spatial Planning System includes a biodiversity inclusive SEA process informed by IBSAP. She summarised the relevancy of IBSAP’s to mainstreaming by describing how it serves as a guidance for carrying out activities related to biodiversity at the sectoral and local levels. Development sectors which have roles and responsibilities related to biodiversity included biodiversity considerations into strategic planning (forestry, fisheries, agriculture) but this is not widespread in other sectors. The Government enacted a legislation in 2007 pertaining to the mainstreaming of biodiversity at the local level. The legislation requires local governments to develop local biodiversity strategies and action plans that make direct reference to the country’s NBSAP. The Government is developing guidance on SEA for spatial planning at the national and local levels and this should soon be enforced by law. Despite positive advances, an obstacle to effective mainstreaming is the absence of a mechanism to ensure strategic plans and programmes in each sector and at the local government level contributes to reduce biodiversity loss.

37. Ms. Constance Corbier-Barthaux from the French Development Agency (AFD) explained how the AFD initiated a reflexion on biodiversity mainstreaming.<sup>18</sup> The reflection involved both operational and back-office staff and resulted in the production of an operational typology of AFD activities, programmes and projects from a biodiversity perspective. This typology has been used as a tool for exchanging views between project managers, economists and analysts within the AFD. Mrs. Corbier-Barthaux explained that the matrix was used to invite all involved in reconsidering their involvement in projects from a biodiversity point of view. Mrs. Corbier-Barthaux described the 3 stages of associated activities proposed for the AFD. In the first stage, it is proposed to take stock from a first range of “green” or “dedicated” projects in the area of conservation and local development in and around protected areas, as well as of sustainable use of natural resources, in order to draw a new strategy in these fields. In a second stage one should look at the programmes and activities aiming at the strengthening of national governance, in particular in environmental policies at national levels, with a view of advocacy, capacity-building and knowledge outputs (monitoring systems and indicators, new tools for sustainable financing, economic valuation, etc.). In the third and final stage, it is proposed to mainstream biodiversity concerns in all productive sectors. She explained that this could be done through an attenuation of risks and negative impacts on biodiversity and through win-win approaches to improve the environmental quality of each project.

38. In his presentation on managing agro-biodiversity for better livelihoods in Morocco, Mr. Abdallah Bari from Biodiversity International explained that the role played by biodiversity protection was more important than ever in Morocco.<sup>19</sup> Mr. Bari explained that a large percentage of the population relies on agriculture for its livelihood. He described how new opportunities appeared in diversifying agricultural production and in moving towards a greener economy with distinctive high quality products. Such considerations are said to have led to the development of a national strategy for mainstreaming biodiversity into agricultural activities with a strong developmental component. Mr. Bari explained that Morocco’s agro-biodiversity strategy calls for broadening local community and

<sup>17</sup> Vidya Sari Nalang’s presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-indonesia-en.pdf>.

<sup>18</sup> Constance Corbier-Barthaux’ presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-afd-en.pdf>.

<sup>19</sup> Abdallah Bari’s presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-morocco-en.pdf>.

stakeholder participation with the aim of an effective management and use of biodiversity to, *inter alia*, increase the income of farmers and communities in rural areas.

39. In her presentation Ms. Jana El Baba from the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (UN-ESCWA) provided an overview of past, current and upcoming UN-ESCWA efforts targeted at mainstreaming biodiversity concerns in socio-economic development in its member countries.<sup>20</sup> Such efforts feed into the Convention's work through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between United Nations Regional Commissions and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The MOU focuses especially on the exchange of experiences. Placing an emphasis on lessons learned, Ms. El Baba exposed case-studies in which activities undertaken to bridge the gap between trade and environment allowed for sustainable land use management and sustainable livelihoods. A first example concerned the implementation of a Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) within the Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area (EMFTA) to assess potential economic, social and environmental impacts of trade liberalization in the region. In her view, the SIA can serve as a tool to foresee planning processes and to counter pressures on natural resources through, for instance, greater resource efficiency. Another example presented was that of the cultivation of traditionally wild medicinal and aromatic plants such as zaatar and sumac in South Lebanon. Through the building of capacity, the project demonstrated that preserving local species through domestication had positive implications for biodiversity while it generated income in an area impoverished by civil conflict.

40. Ms. Marie-France Houle from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) described how SEA was considered as the main process for the integration of international environment concerns such as biodiversity loss in the agency's country strategies. Results Based Management (RBM) is another such framework used by environment specialists within CIDA to articulate their environment related recommendations in a language that is understood by Programme/Project Managers. She also listed some of the strengths and weaknesses of these integration processes and of the changes that are planned to make environmental mainstreaming more efficient. One of the challenges was that many projects/programmes in the Agency are labelled as concerning a specific productive sector and that it was hard in this context to monitor which ones addressed biodiversity directly.

41. Mr. Nikita Eriksen-Hamel from CIDA described USC Canada's Seeds of Survival Programme as a success story in biodiversity programming.<sup>21</sup> He explained that the programme provided support for communities to preserve and take advantage of agricultural biodiversity through the development of community seed banks, participatory plant breeding and community natural resource management. Mr. Eriksen-Hamel described the USC as a biodiversity spirited programme but that, following the explanation provided by Ms. Houle, it was not labelled as biodiversity related. A biodiversity project that has a functional activity such as the improvement of livelihoods is most likely to be labeled under "agriculture" or "forestry". This can be an obstacle to the identification of an agency's success in integrating biodiversity concerns in its activities.

42. Participants exposed the need to compile objective result indicators to evaluate the success of what was observed so far on strategies for bridging the gaps between environment and development indicators. Such metrics allow for easier evaluation of the effectiveness of mainstreaming efforts. Other participants stressed the need to strengthen and use existing biodiversity indicators within different productive sectors in a longitudinal perspective in order for mainstreaming efforts to be based on solid grounds. Doing otherwise could lead to methodological and procedural weaknesses in the process. Other participants believed that if the need for NBSAPs to inform development cooperation tools such as PRSPs is recognized, it would also be interesting to establish procedures for a reverse mechanism. It was suggested that PRSPs and other development tools be taken in consideration in the preparation of

---

<sup>20</sup> Jana El Baba's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-unescwa-en.pdf>.

<sup>21</sup> Nikita Eriksen-Hamel's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-cida-en.pdf>.

NBSAPs; that a “poverty or development lens” be applied to NBSAPs. Participants also suggested that United Nations Regional Commissions could be an important entry-point for biodiversity mainstreaming since they operate more closely with regional planning processes.

***B. Discussion groups - Reinforcing the integration of biodiversity in policies, plans and programmes of countries and development cooperation agencies***

43. Participants were divided in 3 groups considered the following three questions a) How can development agencies take advantage from NBSAPs on the one hand while contributing to their successful implementation on the other? b) Would biodiversity mainstreaming be more effective through a common framework covering the 3 Rio conventions? c) Could biodiversity mainstreaming be better served through the climate change agenda? d) Can biodiversity be better integrated in National Development Plans (NDPs) and PRSPs through Joint Assistance Strategies (JAS)? e) Could universally adopted indicators for environmental sustainability facilitate mainstreaming process?

44. In consideration of these questions, participants reported the following suggestions in plenary:

- (a) Post investment evaluations should be done by country partners in a rigorous manner;
- (b) Biodiversity mainstreaming efforts should take advantage of the fact that poverty alleviation takes an important place on donors agenda;
- (c) Development agencies should take advantage of NBSAPs in development planning on the one hand, while contributing to their successful implementation on the other;
- (d) A common development framework based on the OECD/DAC Secretariat’s Rio Markers methodology should be worked on to cover the 3 Rio conventions. As such it will be possible to single out aid activities targeting the objectives of the three Rio Conventions;
- (e) Joint Assistance Strategies (JAS) should be used to integrate biodiversity considerations more effectively in NDP and PRSPs with the active participation of environmental ministries;
- (f) Universally adopted indicators for environmental sustainability should be worked on to facilitate mainstreaming processes;
- (g) The value of biodiversity should be established for different economic sectors to explain the cost of non-action to decision makers – using the conceptual framework of ecosystem goods and services is a good way to incorporate biodiversity in productive sectors not directly related to biodiversity;
- (h) Development practitioners should make the case for biodiversity mainstreaming at the local level since it has more practical implications;
- (i) Development practitioners should work through donor coordination mechanisms to achieve greater impact at the systemic level. This is especially important since many donors emphasize wider programmatic approaches to development;
- (j) Environmental fiscal reforms should be pursued or promoted in partners countries to increase revenues for biodiversity conservation projects;
- (k) Institutional capacity at the country level should be built to drive the mainstreaming process across government and civil society;
- (l) The donor community should promote a systematic and coherent use of SEA across sectors and make sure SEAs are used in exchanges with ministries;
- (m) Appropriate budgets should be earmarked to implement SEA;
- (n) Space for flexibility should be created within donor agencies for consideration of pro-biodiversity measures in times of crisis (funds for disaster relief, etc.);

/...



(o) Improved donor coordination should be aimed at providing the high level support needed to advance biodiversity concerns in the spirit of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Plan of Action;

(p) A set of criteria should be worked on to relate biodiversity to development and should be accompanied by associated monitoring and evaluation - the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT) is an interesting tool to consider;

(q) A set of biodiversity-friendly sector development toolkits should be prepared for the use of, *inter alia*, sector representatives, local authorities and donors. Such toolkits should include social impact assessment and provide information, best practices and case-studies highlighting the links between biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services and development.

#### **ITEM 4. DEVELOPMENT OF KEY CONSIDERATIONS**

##### **A. Development cooperation agencies and biodiversity**

45. Ms. Maria Shultz from SwedBio presented the work of the organization around the issue of resilience as a contribution to poverty alleviation and improved livelihoods.<sup>22</sup> Ms. Schultz mentioned that SwedBio acts as a helpdesk to assist the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) with the integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in the agency's activities. SwedBio also provides policy advice to Swedish Government Offices and has a collaborative programme to contribute to strategically important biodiversity initiatives and projects. This is accompanied by the development of practical work, methods, ideas and policies concerning biodiversity, ecosystem services and local livelihoods. The Collaborative Programme has a focus on poverty and rights issues. She stressed the importance for development cooperation to grasp the full extent of the strong correlation that existed between biodiversity and ecosystem resilience.

46. In his presentation, Mr. Johan Sundberg from Sida described experiences from Sida's work on mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem services in development cooperation.<sup>23</sup> He highlighted the main findings of the 2004 report by Sida on biodiversity mainstreaming entitled "Integrating biological diversity". He mentioned that biodiversity issues within natural resources management (NRM) programmes rarely addressed biodiversity specifically despite the relevance of NRM to biodiversity. He explained that the most efficient way to integrate biodiversity concerns was of doing so as early as possible in project or programme design. In Sida's experience, biodiversity was not sufficiently addressed in regional, country and sector strategies. Sida is undertaking interesting work to palliate this. One way for doing so was through a strict application of EIA and SEA in all programming processes.

47. Ms. Mary Rowen from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) addressed USAID's approach to integrated biodiversity programming.<sup>24</sup> She explained that USAID viewed biodiversity conservation as an important component of sound and sustainable development and pointed out that in 2008 USAID supported biodiversity conservation programmes around the world for a total of approximately US\$ 195 Million. She described USAID's utilization of a rigorous threats-based approach and definition in its programmes. With the WRI, USAID promotes the "Nature, Wealth and Power" approach to foster stronger integration of biodiversity and natural resources management into development programming. She described the "Living in a Finite Environment" (LIFE) initiative as a good example of rural livelihoods improvement through a nationwide capacity built into conservancy support organizations. One of the initiative's proven results is the generation of benefits

---

<sup>22</sup> Maria Shultz's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-swedbio-en.pdf>.

<sup>23</sup> Johan Sundberg's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-sida-en.pdf>.

<sup>24</sup> Mary Rowen's presentation is available at: <https://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-USAID-en.pdf>



linked to the sustainable management of resources. This includes income and employment. She stressed the long time frame needed to assess the success of biodiversity mainstreaming and pointed out the long-term coherence and impact of different sequenced programmes. She suggested that success in biodiversity mainstreaming could be evaluated by looking at which extent development sectors recognize how biodiversity contributed to the success of their programmes. Ms. Rowen reminded that every USAID programme, project or activity undergoes an environmental impact assessment prior to the obligation of funds.

48. In her presentation, Ms. Kathleen Mackinnon from the World Bank presented an overview of how the bank mainstreamed biodiversity into sectoral lending projects and programmes.<sup>25</sup> She mentioned that considerable attention had been given to setting priorities for conservation and new protected areas, despite the fact that most of the world's biodiversity occurs in production landscapes and seascapes beyond protected areas boundaries. Illustrating her presentation with the case of the Lao People's Democratic Republic Nam Theun hydropower infrastructure project, Ms. Mackinnon explained that World Bank projects go through an environmental assessment process and that this was an ideal entry point for biodiversity mainstreaming. She suggested that ecosystem-based solutions for adaptation to climate change represented another opportunity. This was illustrated with a case-study from Argentina on flood regulation.

49. Some participants suggested there was a need for joint trainings on biodiversity in agency field offices and that this could be an opportunity to share various biodiversity mainstreaming related tools already prepared. Such trainings could be especially interesting for small agencies. Participants suggested that, in some circumstances, talking about development into biodiversity would make a more convincing case than talking about biodiversity into development.

#### ***B. Brief on proposed key considerations***

50. Ms. Linda Ghanimé from the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity pointed out that the meeting demonstrated there was a strong biodiversity mainstreaming community of practice that should sustain its work by following-up on the discussions. She summarized key recommendations that came up of the previous discussions groups:<sup>26</sup>

- (a) Biodiversity is natural capital and should be recognized as such;
- (b) Make the case at the local level: show local benefits, maximize convening powers of partners, build evidence, and involve local communities;
- (c) Establish value of biodiversity to economic sectors and the cost of not investing in biodiversity management;
- (d) Work with donor coordination mechanisms to ensure the environmental sector works upstream with other relevant sectors from the onset to integrate environmental objectives at multiple levels;
- (e) Consider environmental fiscal reform;
- (f) Recognize the need for champions to drive changes within institutions and enhance institutional capacity at the country level;
- (g) Donors should promote a systematic and coherent use of strategic environmental assessment across sectors;

---

<sup>25</sup> Kathleen Mackinnon's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-wb-en.pdf>.

<sup>26</sup> Linda Ghanimé's presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/development/presentations/emmbdc-01/2009-05-13-scbd-02-en.pdf>.

- (h) Support the use of NBSAPs for the recognition of biodiversity's contribution to development;
- (i) Donors should support a systems thinking and results-based approach that allows for the sharing of data across sectors and supports country level data and information systems;
- (j) Promote synergies between biodiversity, climate change and desertification conventions;
- (k) Enhance communication strategies on biodiversity-related issues to provide relevant ministerial briefings;
- (l) Develop user-friendly toolkits for development practitioners focusing on productive sectors.

51. She introduced the questions for the next round of discussion groups:

- (a) What are the next steps to move forward on key recommendations?
- (b) Are the concept of a biodiversity lens, the key considerations and the structure laid-out in the background document helpful for more effective mainstreaming of biodiversity in development cooperation processes?
- (c) Given that most of these considerations are not new, to what extent are they already part of agencies' policies and operational procedures?
- (d) Is there need for an additional guidance document on biodiversity in development cooperation?

52. Ms. Ghanimé described the biodiversity lens concept as an analytical process to assess and improve a policy, plan or programme. This enables a policy maker to decide whether a policy, plan or programme is benefitting from the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity or is at risk of biodiversity losses. Referring to the background document prepared by the Secretariat, Ms. Ghanimé exposed the different entry points identified for biodiversity mainstreaming in development cooperation processes.

**C. *Discussion groups: Mainstreaming biodiversity within development cooperation agencies***

53. Participants were divided in 3 groups to discuss the development of key considerations for mainstreaming biodiversity within development cooperation agencies at policies, plans, programmes and project levels. Groups also discussed manners in which key considerations could be promoted and disseminated effectively.

54. Possible areas for further action were reported in plenary and discussed among participants:

- (a) Enhanced cooperation to take stock of existing guidance tools;
- (b) Additional guidance tools for development practitioners as appropriate based on a need analysis;
- (c) Enhanced application of the ecosystem approach, including training targeted at field offices of development cooperation agencies;
- (d) Enhanced use of SEA by partner countries as an effective entry-point for biodiversity mainstreaming;
- (e) Greater convergence at the country level between poverty alleviation activities and biodiversity conservation strategies;
- (f) Survey mainstreaming efforts in various organizations to inform future discussions;

- (g) Implement an umbrella framework to link MDGs to biodiversity in consideration of NBSAPs and PRSPs;
- (h) Additional focus on spatial planning approaches used in conjunction with indicators based on satellite imaging;
- (i) Summarize operational implications of findings from processes such as MA, TEEB or IPBES;
- (j) Identify key development sectors as initial grounds for action by the development community—tourism, mining or human health could be some of the sectors considered and discussed in a future forum;
- (k) Compile a series of case-studies separated into sectors with a focus on success stories coming from development agencies – the compilation should be aimed for use at the country level in a language that makes for easy links with the MDGs;
- (l) Promote systematic and coherent use of SEA across sectors, taking advantage of any important reform programmes;
- (m) Further systematic biodiversity mainstreaming efforts through in-country donor coordination mechanisms such as JAS;
- (n) Support the use of NBSAPs for recognition and planning of biodiversity's contribution to development and poverty alleviation;
- (o) Enhance collaboration and cooperation with the secretariats of the three Rio conventions to benefit from synergies such as that of using a resilience or ecosystem based adaptation approach to address elements of the climate change agenda (Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD), adaptation to climate change, etc.);
- (p) Use RBM and the formulation of development outcomes as a mean to integrate biodiversity considerations in donors planning processes.

#### ***D. The way forward***

55. In reflecting on the next steps to be followed to further the reflection held during this meeting, Ms. Constance Corbier-Barthaux from AFD, observing a consensus among the participants, suggested that work undertaken during this forum should be furthered and that the group should build on this momentum to establish an informal network. The network could share best practices in a first phase and reconvene in a second phase to refine recommendations for more effective mainstreaming of biodiversity in development cooperation. Animated by the same desire to push the process forward, Mr. Johan Sundberg from Sida supported by Ms. Maria Shultz from SwedBio proposed to build on the momentum gained during the meeting by coordinating the activities of the network through SwedBio. This proposal was welcomed by all participants and it was suggested that the next meeting of the network should focus on sector specific case-studies and on their use to development practitioners in integrating biodiversity more effectively in their activities and on ways to operationalize biodiversity mainstreaming in these sectors. Ms. Bettina Hedden-Dunkhorst from the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BFN) offered to host the next meeting at the end of 2009 or at the beginning of 2010. Participants welcomed this offer and expressed optimism as to the capacity of this network to carry the process forward in the coming months. Ms. Kathleen Mackinnon from the World Bank suggested the bank would support country-led discussions on biodiversity mainstreaming.

56. Immediate activities that were suggested include:

- (a) Setting up a web-based exchange platform on the website of the Secretariat of the Convention. This will serve as a podium to share existing documents and guidance related to biodiversity mainstreaming produced by organization active in this practice;

- (b) Calling for case-studies related to biodiversity mainstreaming. Agencies will be invited to provide case-studies or links to agency data sets;
- (c) Development of biodiversity mainstreaming toolkits for different development sectors, and to accompany development organizations' internal processes.

#### **ITEM 5. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

57. Ms. Linda Ghanimé and Mr. Ravi Sharma from the Secretariat recalled that the overall goal behind discussions on biodiversity mainstreaming remained that of realizing a biodiversity-friendly development framework through enhanced collaboration with other sectors and development actors. This was also referred to as biodiversity results achieved through indirect impacts or without necessarily following the biodiversity regime's agenda. They recalled the participant's desire to keep the momentum of this meeting alive through a consolidation of links existing in this community of practice to pave the way to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to be held in Nagoya. They recalled that working on the consolidation of such links would be realized via an informal network of development practitioners aiming for the integration of biodiversity in development cooperation. They described the sharing of case-studies and existing guidance as one of the network's first activities. It will be possible as such to study operational gaps before engaging in the elaboration of new guidance. They recalled that participants pointed out a series of existing guidance from which future work could be based. It was in this context that participants identified opportunities in sharing practical experiences through country level workshops.

58. Speaking on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Mr. Konrad Uebelhör, highlighted the importance for development cooperation of the biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation thematic. In the context of a MOU between the BMZ and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, he recalled the financial contribution of the Government of Germany to the Secretariat's Biodiversity for Development Initiative which complements support provided by the French Government. He mentioned that the German Government guaranteed the current financing until the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Mr. Uebelhör pointed out that a follow-up meeting will allow exchanging experiences gained and to elaborate on key considerations laid out during the meeting. He described the elaboration of a development and poverty alleviation framework to link the MDGs to the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity as an important task for the Secretariat. Mr. Uebelhör suggested that building on the experiences gained by UNEP/UNDP PEI and Poverty and Environment Partnership (PEP) is a good starting point to undertake this work. He suggested enhancing cooperation on this matter with the JLG. He also stressed the importance of reorienting NBSAPs towards the consideration of biodiversity conservation with a development lens. He told participants that the issues discussed in this event could become important elements of a post 2010 strategy. In light of this, Mr. Uebelhör called for a compilation of convincing case-studies on the successful integration of biodiversity conservation in development and poverty alleviation.

59. In his closing remarks, Mr. Ahmed Djoghla, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity thanked participants for their valuable contributions. Reminding some of the key considerations laid out by the group, he reinstated that biodiversity is natural capital and stressed the need for this to be highlighted by examples at the local level. In light of the discussions, he observed that mainstreaming appeared to be a question of institutional culture. The broad use of SEA in donor processes was a case in point to illustrate this. In this context, the Executive Secretary pointed out that biodiversity-inclusive impact assessment appears to be an important approach to focus on. Development agencies were best placed to promote a systematic and coherent use of SEAs across sectors, including with ministries of partner countries. He underlined the need to mainstream biodiversity in development cooperation with an accompanying consideration of NBSAPs. The Executive Secretary was pleased that the group plans to continue exchanging. He underlined that the issues tackled were complex and that the time allocated in the meeting had been insufficient to lay down the various means to integrate biodiversity considerations at the various levels of development work. He welcomed the desire of participants to

remain active as a network and offered the support of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity to sustain its efforts. The Secretariat will make a series of relevant documents available on its website and will share toolkits currently being developed on the integration of biodiversity in different development sectors with members of the network and invited comments and inputs on their development. The Secretariat is currently working on several documents including a CBD Technical Series entitled “Interdependence between Biodiversity and Development” as well as on a mainstreaming source-book that will be produced jointly with the United Nations Development Programme and other partners.

60. The Executive Secretary expressed his gratitude to the participants for accepting to contribute to the first “Forum on biodiversity for development and poverty alleviation” to be convened with the heads of agencies in Nagoya, in October 2010 during the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. He noted that such a forum offered a unique opportunity to forge a strategic partnership between the Convention and the organizations represented during the meeting. He invited all organizations present to contribute actively to the discussions on this issue at the high level meeting during the sixty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York on 20 September 2010 as a contribution to the International Year of Biodiversity.

61. The meeting was closed at 1 p.m. on Friday, 15 May 2009.

*Annex*

**ADDITIONAL REFERENCES**

The annex to the present report contains a list of references to publications and tools relevant to the discussions held or presentations made by participants during the meeting. These references complement the list of documents found in the annex of the meeting's annotated agenda.

All presentations are available electronically from: <http://www.cbd.int/development/emmbdc-01/presentations>.

BASS, S. 2006. Making Poverty Reduction Irreversible: Development Implications of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. IIED Briefing Note. London: IIED: <http://www.iied.org/pubs/pdfs/11050IIED.pdf>

HAZELWOOD, P., G. KULSHRESTHA, and C. McNeill. 2004. Linking Biodiversity Conservation and Poverty Reduction to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals. In *The Millennium Development Goals and Conservation: Managing Nature's Wealth for Society's Health*, ed. D. Roe, pp. 143 – 166. London: IIED.

OECD, 2009. Policy Guidance on Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Development Co-operation: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/26/34/42747370.pdf>

PIERCE, S.M., R.M. COWLING, T. SANDWITH, and K. MACKINNON. 2002. Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Development: Case-Studies from South Africa. Washington DC: World Bank.

PISUPATI, B., and WARNER, E., 2003. Biodiversity and the Millennium Development Goals, IUCN Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia and UNDP, November 2003: <http://www.energyandenvironment.undp.org/undp/indexAction.cfm?module=Library&action=GetFile&DocumentAttachmentID=1576>

PISUPATI, B., and RUBIAN, R., 2008. MDG on Reducing Biodiversity Loss and the CBD's 2010 Target: United Nations University, Institute of Advanced Studies (UNU-IAS): [http://www.ias.unu.edu/resource\\_centre/Reducing\\_Biodiversity\\_Loss\\_user%20friendly.pdf](http://www.ias.unu.edu/resource_centre/Reducing_Biodiversity_Loss_user%20friendly.pdf)

SWIDERSKA, K. 2002. Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Development Policy and Planning A Review of Country Experience. London, UK: IIED.

UNDP, 2006. Making Progress on Environmental Sustainability. Lessons and recommendations from a review of over 150 MDG country experiences: [http://www.unep.org/poverty\\_environment/PDF\\_docs/mdg7english.pdf](http://www.unep.org/poverty_environment/PDF_docs/mdg7english.pdf)

UNEP / UNDP, Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI), 2009. Mainstreaming Poverty-Environment Linkages into Development Planning: a Handbook for Practitioners: <http://www.unpei.org/PDF/PEI-handbook-frontcover.pdf>

HANSON, C., et al. World Resources Institute (WRI), 2008. Corporate Ecosystem Services Review. Guidelines for Identifying Business Risks and Opportunities Arising from Ecosystem Change: [http://pdf.wri.org/corporate\\_ecosystem\\_services\\_review.pdf](http://pdf.wri.org/corporate_ecosystem_services_review.pdf)

-----