



## CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WS-Syn.LAC/1/3  
25 October 2006

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

### REGIONAL SYNERGY WORKSHOP FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN ON THE BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY OF AGRO- ECOSYSTEMS WITHIN DRY AND SUB-HUMID LANDS

Bolans Village, Antigua and Barbuda, 20-23 November 2006  
Item 4 of the provisional agenda\*

#### **OBSTACLES TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE 2010 TARGET IN AGRO-ECOSYSTEMS WITHIN DRY AND SUB-HUMID LANDS**

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. In paragraph 5 of decision VII/2, and paragraph 11 (e) of decision VIII/2, on the biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity requested the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the secretariats of the Rio conventions and the other biodiversity-related conventions, to further develop mechanisms for facilitating the synergistic implementation of these conventions, especially at the national level, including through the organization and follow-up of national and regional synergy workshops.
2. The objectives of the workshop are to:
  - (a) Exchange knowledge and experience relating to the implementation activities toward the achievement of the 2010 biodiversity target in agro-ecosystems within dry and sub-humid lands;
  - (b) Identify obstacles to the implementation of mutually supportive activities amongst the three Rio conventions and other biodiversity-related conventions within agro-ecosystems within dry and sub-humid lands and explore means to overcome them; and
  - (c) Build capacity for participants to develop relevant project proposals and activities which achieve the objectives of the multiple conventions, and explore options for the funding of such activities.
3. The Executive Secretary has prepared the present document to assist participants in the Regional Synergy Workshop in their discussions on the achievement of objective (b) above.
4. Section II of the document outlines the findings of the in-depth review of implementation of the programme of work on the biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/11/4); section III provides an overview of obstacles identified through the first Regional Workshop for Africa on Synergy among the Rio Conventions and Other Biodiversity-related Conventions in Implementing the Programmes of Work on Dry and Sub-humid Lands and Agricultural Biodiversity held in Gaborone from 13 to 17 September 2004 (UNEP/CBD/WS-Syn.Afr/1/6); section IV presents the findings highlighted in

\* UNEP/CBD/WS-Syn.LAC/1/1.

decision VI/26, on the Strategic Plan for the Convention on Biological Diversity to guide further implementation at the national, regional and global levels (in particular, the appendix to decision VI/26 on obstacles to implementation); and section V contains an overview of the obstacles to implementation of the agricultural biodiversity programme of work identified in the third national reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

## **II. OVERVIEW OF OBSTACLES IDENTIFIED THROUGH THE IN-DEPTH REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON THE BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY OF DRY AND SUB-HUMID LANDS**

5. The programme of work on the biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands was adopted in decision V/23 and contains two parts: part A on assessments and part B on targeted actions in response to identified needs. Both parts were considered in the in-depth review of implementation (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/11/4), which was welcomed in paragraph 1 of decision VIII/2 on the biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands.

6. The review of implementation of the activities in part A revealed that:

(a) The consolidation of information from various ongoing sources has largely been left to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Few Parties or organizations have made concerted efforts to build on past experiences with the exception of the environment conventions, which have continued to build synergies;

(b) There are examples among institutions such as the centres within the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) of successful targeted research programmes. Nevertheless, serious gaps remain particularly when considering the assessment of status and trends, the valuation of areas of particular value, and the identification and dissemination of case-studies including the consideration of traditional knowledge;

(c) Many of the actions in support of activities 5 (on benefits from biodiversity) and 6 (on best-management practices), call for an approach to biodiversity conservation from a multidisciplinary and cross-sector angle. However, there has been little indication that this multidisciplinary approach is being mainstreamed into national planning; and

(d) Capacity-building has been sporadic with most successes revealed through participation in regional and global collaborative partnerships.

7. The review of implementation of the activities in part B revealed that:

(a) Conflicts over natural resource use and access continue to present challenges for a number of Parties;

(b) In many cases, there is a lack of political will to address biodiversity issues in dry and sub-humid lands. This is often associated with the political marginalization of dry and sub-humid lands inhabitants;

(c) There is a great deal of potential benefits to be derived from closer collaboration and coordination of activities towards the implementation of the programme of work however, these benefits are seldom realized; and

(d) Perverse incentive frameworks and a lack of economic incentives continue to hamper implementation of the programme of work at the local level.

8. A more detailed summary of progress and obstacles to the implementation of the activities within both part A and part B of the programme of work is available in the annex to the present note.

9. Most constraints identified through the in-depth review of implementation can be classified within three categories: (i) capacity constraints; (ii) limited collaboration and coordination; and (iii) gaps in scientific and technical knowledge.

*Capacity constraints*

10. Capacity constraints reflect a lack of institutional, technical, and financial capacity that can limit the extent to which Parties are able to implement the programme of work. Capacity constraints can also limit reporting and monitoring capabilities.

11. Institutional capacity constraints can include:

- (a) Poorly defined institutional roles and unclear mandates;
- (b) Inadequate human resources; and
- (c) Weak governance structures and legislative frameworks.

12. Weak technical capacity can present obstacles as a result of:

- (a) Lack of appropriate training programmes; and
- (b) Poor access to technology and technological solutions.

13. Poor financial capacity to implement the programme of work can arise from an overall lack of financial resources or poor prioritization of dry and sub-humid lands biodiversity during the assignment of financial resources. Weak financial capacity also results from limitations in the ability of institutions and programmes to manage financial resources.

*Weak collaboration and coordination*

14. The lack of clear pathways and methods for collaboration and coordination has been identified as an obstacle on many levels including between and amongst:

- (a) National agencies/ministries;
- (b) Different sectors;
- (c) National Governments and regional/global organizations;
- (d) The Rio conventions and other environmental conventions; and
- (e) Local communities and institutions and other levels of implementation.

15. Weak collaboration has also resulted, in some cases, in a disconnect between the needs of Parties and the assistance provided to them by donors and international institutions.

*Gaps in scientific and technical knowledge*

16. The in-depth review identified a number of obstacles related to scientific and technical knowledge including:

- (a) Weak baselines;
- (b) Poorly defined criteria;
- (c) A lack of indicators, gaps in available information; and
- (d) Weak mechanisms for the collection and sharing of data and knowledge.

*Other constraints*

17. The in-depth review of implementation highlighted a number of additional barriers to the full implementation of the programme of work. They include:

- (a) Limited political support for the Convention at all levels;
- (b) Poor attention to issues of sustainability and replicability; and
- (c) Ongoing conflicts related to resource access and use rights.

### **III. OBSTACLES IDENTIFIED DURING THE GABARONE REGIONAL SYNERGY WORKSHOP ON DRY AND SUB-HUMID LANDS AND AGRICULTURAL BIODIVERSITY**

18. The Regional Workshop for Africa on Synergy among the Rio Conventions and Other Biodiversity-related Conventions in Implementing the Programmes of Work on Dry and Sub-humid Lands and Agricultural Biodiversity was held in Gaborone from 13 to 17 September 2004.

19. Although the Regional Workshop did not specifically discuss obstacles within the framework of the 2010 target, the workshop report did identify a number of constraints to the implementation of synergistic activities.

20. The Workshop identified the following constraints to achieving synergies between the conventions at national level. They were divided into short- and long-term constraints. All were thought to be a priority and no ranking of priority is intended here.

21. Short term-constraints include:

- (a) Lack of coordination between sectors, stakeholders, and experts;
- (b) Inadequate participation of the civil society in the management of projects;
- (c) Inadequate information management systems; Inadequate information exchange between focal points and implementing agencies;
- (e) Lack of linkages and information flow at the local level between key actors;
- (f) Conflict at local level between organizations;
- (g) Inadequate recognition of local and indigenous knowledge;
- (h) Inadequacies in the provision of timely and accurate information to convince policy makers to make right decisions based on sustainable livelihoods; Difficulty in accessing multilateral funds;
- (j) Weak local funding capacity;
- (k) Mainstreaming national priorities into regional initiatives;
- (l) Few case-studies demonstrating synergy that include coordinating, implementing, and demonstrating impact on the ground;
- (m) Financial constraints identified as a problem as funding for one activity may not be used for another one e.g. desertification funds cannot be used for activities of the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- (n) The obligations of conventions not properly mainstreamed in national policies and legislation; and
- (o) Inability of countries to tap resources of different conventions.

22. Long term-constraints include:

- (a) Mainstreaming national priorities into regional initiatives (also regarded as a short-term constraint);
- (b) Inadequate capacity particularly at local government (district and lower) levels to manage synergy;
- (c) Inadequate articulation of environmental concerns in poverty-reduction strategies and other development initiatives;
- (d) Lack of support at the political level to catalyse the synergistic process;
- (e) Lack of a proper legal framework in some countries;

- (f) Differences in legal system to mainstream the objectives of the conventions;
- (g) Socio-economic constraints, e.g., difficulties in involving the rural community in activities in line with the conventions;
- (h) Lack of expertise to address the issue of synergy;
- (i) Access to technology;
- (j) Conflicts (wars, internal and external) which breakdown the implementation of conventions;
- (k) Lack of human resources (qualitative and quantitative);
- (l) Political instability leading to change of leadership and objectives; and
- (m) Land-tenure system as related to the strategies of the conventions.

#### **IV. OBSTACLES TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MULTIPLE PROGRAMMES OF WORK OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**

23. The appendix to decision VI/26 of the Conference of the Parties revealed a number of constraints to implementation. Although these constraints are not specific to biological diversity of agro-ecosystems within dry and sub-humid lands or the 2010 target, there are a number of obstacles which may be useful to consider.

24. Obstacles identified in decision VI/26 include:

- (a) *Political/societal obstacles*
  - (i) Lack of political will and support to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity;
  - (ii) Limited public participation and stakeholder involvement;
  - (iii) Lack of mainstreaming and integration of biodiversity issues into other sectors, including use of tools such as environmental impact assessments;
  - (iv) Political instability; and
  - (v) Lack of precautionary and proactive measures, causing reactive policies;
- (b) *Institutional, technical and capacity-related obstacles:*
  - (i) Inadequate capacity to act, caused by institutional weaknesses;
  - (ii) Lack of human resources;
  - (iii) Lack of transfer of technology and expertise;
  - (iv) Loss of traditional knowledge; and
  - (v) Lack of adequate scientific research capacities to support all the objectives;
- (c) *Lack of accessible knowledge/information:*
  - (i) Loss of biodiversity and the corresponding goods and services it provides not properly understood and documented;
  - (ii) Existing scientific and traditional knowledge not fully utilized;
  - (iii) Dissemination of information on international and national level not efficient; and
  - (iv) Lack of public education and awareness at all levels;

- (d) *Economic policy and financial resources:*
  - (i) Lack of financial and human resources;
  - (ii) Fragmentation of financing from the Global Environment Facility (GEF);
  - (iii) Lack of economic incentive measures; and
  - (iv) Lack of benefit-sharing;
- (e) *Collaboration/cooperation*
  - (i) Lack of synergies at the national and international levels;
  - (ii) Lack of horizontal cooperation among stakeholders;
  - (iii) Lack of effective partnerships; and
  - (iv) Lack of engagement of scientific community;
- (f) *Legal/juridical impediments:* Lack of appropriate policies and laws;
- (g) *Socio-economic factors*
  - (i) Poverty;
  - (ii) Population pressure;
  - (iii) Unsustainable consumption and production patterns; and
  - (iv) Lack of capacities for local communities.
- (h) *Natural phenomena and environmental change*
  - (i) Climate change; and
  - (ii) Natural disasters.

## V. OVERVIEW OF OBSTACLES TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON AGRICULTURAL BIODIVERSITY AS IDENTIFIED IN THE THIRD NATIONAL REPORTS

25. Parties were asked, in their third national reports, to: “elaborate on the implementation of this programme of work and associated decisions specifically focusing on (...) constraints encountered in implementation”. <sup>1/</sup> A review of the third national reports revealed the following main obstacles.

26. The most commonly identified constraints include the lack of adequate financial resources, poor collaboration and knowledge sharing and the lack of political will to implement the programme of work. Other constraints can be classified as: (i) lack of adequate assessments; (ii) capacity constraints, (iii) inadequate mainstreaming; and (iv) other constraints.

### A. *Lack of adequate assessments*

27. The lack of comprehensive assessments was identified as an obstacle to implementation. Obstacles to the development of assessments include:

- (a) Lack of national programme for assessment;
- (b) Lack of economic assessments of the goods and services agricultural biodiversity;
- (c) Lack of good and widely used agro-environmental indicators; and
- (d) Lack of coordinated monitoring of status and trends of agricultural biodiversity.

---

<sup>1/</sup> Box LXVI of the third national reports.

**B. Capacity constraints**

28. Capacity constraints include:

- (a) Lack of institutional and technical capacity;
- (b) Inadequacies in policy, legal and regulatory frameworks;
- (c) Lack of recognition in politics of the role and contributions of local agricultural practices in conservation of biodiversity; and
- (d) Lack of coordination amongst responsible agencies.

**C. Inadequate mainstreaming**

29. Mainstreaming of the links between agriculture and biodiversity conservation was identified as an important component of the successful implementation of the programme of work. Identified obstacles to mainstreaming include:

- (a) Lack of synergy between the legislation on plant protection products, the seeds legislation and the legislation on genetically modified organisms;
- (b) Lack of a long term vision within government agencies;
- (c) Slow progress in implementation of policies; and
- (d) Difficulties in integrating policies across different agricultural sectors.

**D. Other constraints**

30. Parties also identified a number of additional encountered during the implementation of the programme of work on agricultural biodiversity. These include:

- (a) Illegal cropping;
- (b) Lack of effective national regime on access and benefit-sharing in conservation with potential for food and agriculture;
- (c) Lack of incentives for stakeholders (farmers, communities, community based organizations and the private sector);
- (d) Limited access to environmentally sound technology;
- (e) Difficulties in transfer of technology, experience and knowledge; and
- (f) Lack of consideration of traditional knowledge.

**VI. CONCLUSION**

31. Workshop participants may wish to use the above list of obstacles as a guide in the development of a specific list of obstacles towards the achievement of the 2010 target in agro-ecosystems within dry and sub-humid lands.

32. In proposing ways to overcome the identified obstacles participants may wish to recommend specific activities for: (i) Parties; (ii) the secretariats of the conventions; and (iii) regional and international organizations.

33. Workshop participants may also wish to propose a framework for assessing progress towards the alleviation of the identified obstacle including relevant indicators.

*Annex*

**OBSTACLES IDENTIFIED IN THE IN-DEPTH REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON THE BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY OF DRY AND SUB-HUMID LANDS**

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Progress by parties</i>	<i>Progress by organizations</i>	<i>Identified obstacles</i>
<b>1: Assessment of status and trends of the biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands and the effectiveness of conservation measures</b>	This activity is one of the most widely nationally implemented activities however, few comprehensive assessments are available that address all of the following: habitat extent, abundance and distribution of selected species, coverage of protected areas, and threats to biodiversity.	Organizational assessments of particular relevance include the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment biodiversity and desertification syntheses, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment subregional assessments and the LADA stocktaking of dryland biodiversity issues.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Lack of attention to the sustainability of project-based funding for assessments</li> <li>b) Weak technical and institutional capacity</li> <li>c) Lack of biogeographical data compiled over longer time periods and at multiple scales</li> <li>d) Weak framework for the coordination of assessment activities</li> <li>e) Lack of guidelines to facilitate the engagement of regional and global agencies in the assessment processes</li> </ul>
<b>2: Identification of areas of particular value for biodiversity and/or under particular threat</b>	24 countries reported that they have identified areas of particular value in dry and sub-humid lands, with 19 identifying specific, targeted activities to conserve biodiversity and support the sustainable management of identified areas.	6 regional and global agencies are involved in the identification of areas of particular value and/or under threat. The World Heritage Centre, in particular, has supported the delineation of 154 natural and 23 mixed (natural and cultural) sites of particular value worldwide of which approximately 25 per cent are in dry and sub-humid areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Poorly defined boundaries of identified areas</li> <li>b) Weak institutional, technical and financial capacity</li> <li>c) Lack of well defined criteria to identify areas of value and/or under threat and weak supporting data to evaluate those criteria</li> <li>d) Insufficient information on the local importance of biodiversity</li> <li>e) Weak linkages between regional and global and national and local-level institutions</li> <li>f) Poor coordination of efforts between and among agencies</li> </ul>
<b>3: Further development of</b>	16 Parties have developed relevant indicators however,	The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and LADA are	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Lack of technical and financial capacity</li> <li>b) Limited availability of comprehensive biodiversity</li> </ul>

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Progress by parties</i>	<i>Progress by organizations</i>	<i>Identified obstacles</i>
<b>indicators of biological diversity</b>	no indicators were mentioned to measure linguistic diversity or the extent of development assistance provided in support of the Convention.	significant contributors through; <i>inter alia</i> , the LADA Stocktaking of Dryland Biodiversity Issues and Millennium Ecosystem Assessment indicators, such as the biodiversity intactness index.	data c) Incomplete suite of biodiversity indicators
<b>4: Building knowledge on ecological, physical and social processes that affect biodiversity</b>	10 Parties reported that they are collecting and mainstreaming information on processes that affect biodiversity through: the integration of process information within national policies and decision making processes and the implementation of specific projects and programmes.	Of particular interest, the Global Dryland Initiative published a report on climate change in drylands and a review of drylands biodiversity while the World Resources Institute (WRI) prepared the report <i>Drylands, People and Ecosystem Goods and Services</i> .  Through the implementation of the joint work programme between the CBD and the UNCCD, knowledge is being built on the relationship between land degradation and biodiversity loss. In addition, technical series No 10 and No 25 have been published on the interlinkages between biodiversity and climate change.	a) Limited technical and financial capacity b) Weak and inconsistent collection of baseline information. c) Inefficient use of available knowledge d) Gap between top-down investments and bottom-up needs; e) Disconnect between desertification, climate change, biodiversity and natural disaster policies
<b>5: Identification of local and global benefits, including soil and water conservation, derived from biological</b>	Very little has been done by Parties in support of this activity	Publications, reports, or projects exist as follows:  (a) <i>Information on local &amp; global benefits</i> – FAO, IIED, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, UNEP-WCMC, Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Dry and Sub-Humid	a) Lack of technical and financial capacity (including difficulties quantifying benefits, weak understanding of complex upstream–downstream relationships, and poor access to planning and management technologies) b) Limited mainstreaming of biodiversity considerations across multiple sectors

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Progress by parties</i>	<i>Progress by organizations</i>	<i>Identified obstacles</i>
<b>diversity</b>		Lands; (b) <i>Economic valuation</i> – World Bank; (c) <i>Assessment of the socio-economic impact of biodiversity loss</i> – ADB/IUCN, UNDP/EC, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment; (d) <i>Case-studies on biodiversity loss and poverty</i> – FAO (LinKS), World Bank.	c) Weak scientific base d) Difficulties defining how much biodiversity returns the highest overall benefits
<b>6: Identification and dissemination of best management practices</b>	Only 3 Parties reported on the implementation of activity 6	At the regional and global level, the identification and dissemination of best practices has been implemented by 6 agencies.	a) Lack of prioritization at the national level of best-practice identification and dissemination given limited resources; b) The need to develop local specific solutions to biodiversity loss; c) Lack of agreement on the criteria for defining best practices; d) The need to institute a long-term approach to the review and collection of best-practice case-studies; and e) Weak reporting processes for the collection and dissemination of local and small scale best practices.

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Progress by parties</i>	<i>Progress by organizations</i>	<i>Identified obstacles</i>
<b>B. Targeted actions in response to identified needs</b>			
<p><b>7: Promotion of specific measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity</b></p>	<p>Strong implementation was reported for:</p> <p>(a) 7a: management, funding, establishment, and description of extent and coverage of protected areas</p> <p>(b) 7b: projects in support of the rehabilitation and/or restoration of degraded habitat and the identification of priority areas for rehabilitation</p> <p>(c) 7d: sustainable management of production systems</p> <p>(d) 7i: training, education and public awareness</p> <p>(e) 7k: promotion of research and development programmes on habitat restoration, sustainable management, and alternative livelihoods</p> <p>(f) 7m: cooperation with relevant conventions particularly the UNCCD</p> <p>Weak implementation was reported for activities 7c (prevention and control of invasive alien species); 7h (case-studies on plant and animal biomass); 7j (information and knowledge sharing on</p>	<p>At the regional and global level, 33 different agencies were noted for specific contributions particularly with regards to activities 7 (d) (on sustainable management of production systems); 7 (e) (on sustainable water resources management); 7 (f) (on <i>in situ</i> and <i>ex situ</i> conservation); 7 (g) (on economic valuation and the identification and adoption of adaptive technologies); 7 (i) (on training, education and public awareness raising on biodiversity); and 7 (l) (on integrated catchment management and the conservation of endangered species).</p>	<p>a) Insufficient financial resources</p> <p>b) Lack of scientific and technical information</p> <p>c) Weak institutions</p> <p>d) Continued conflicts over resource use and access</p> <p>e) The perpetuation of perverse incentive frameworks</p> <p>f) A disconnect between global and regional efforts and national-level implementation</p>

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Progress by parties</i>	<i>Progress by organizations</i>	<i>Identified obstacles</i>
	sustainable use); and 7l (integrated catchment management & conservation of endangered species).		
<b>8: Promotion of responsible resource management, at appropriate levels, applying the ecosystem approach, through an enabling policy environment</b>	<p>Strong implementation was reported for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) 8d: transboundary issues and collaboration and</li> <li>(b) 8e: policies and instruments for collaboration and cross-sector integration in NBSAPs and NAPs</li> </ul>	<p>Implementation is strongest with regards to activities 8a (strengthening of local institutional structures) and 8d (transboundary issues and collaboration).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Lack of appropriate enabling environments to facilitate the decentralization processes</li> <li>b) Weak political commitment regarding the resolution of resource-use conflicts</li> <li>c) Disconnect between the extent to which the assistance being provided to parties is adequately and appropriately addressing needs</li> </ul>
<b>9: Support for sustainable livelihoods</b>	<p>Strong implementation was reported only for 9d: market development in support of sustainable livelihoods;</p>	<p>Strong implementation was reported for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) 9d: market development in support of sustainable livelihoods; and</li> <li>(b) 9e: fair and equitable benefit-sharing concerning the use of the genetic resources of dry and sub-humid lands.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Weak integration of economic-development objectives within biodiversity conservation and sustainable-use objectives, policies and activities</li> <li>b) Lack of financial and technical capacity</li> <li>c) Weak economic incentives for local populations to alter their livelihoods</li> <li>d) Absence of legal and institutional frameworks conducive to the integration of biodiversity conservation within sustainable livelihood programmes</li> <li>e) Limited exchange of investment information and experiences</li> </ul>