

**Convention on
Biological Diversity**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/CBW-NBSAP/EUR/2/2
13 July 2011

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR EUROPEAN COUNTRIES ON
UPDATING NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND
ACTION PLANS**

International Academy for Nature Conservation, Isle of
Vilm, Germany, 15-19 April 2011

REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP**INTRODUCTION**

1. In decision X/2, the Conference of the Parties adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and other Governments to develop national and regional targets, using the Strategic Plan as a flexible framework, and to review, update and revise, as appropriate, their national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) in line with the Strategic Plan and the guidance adopted in decision IX/9. The Conference of the Parties also urged Parties and other Governments to support the updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans as effective instruments to promote the implementation of the Strategic Plan and to use the revised and updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans as effective instruments for the integration of biodiversity targets into national development and poverty reduction policies and strategies, national accounting, economic sectors and spatial planning processes.

2. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties also emphasized the need for capacity-building activities and the effective sharing of knowledge to support all countries – especially developing countries, in particular the least developed countries, small island developing States, and the most environmentally vulnerable countries, as well as countries with economies in transition, and indigenous and local communities – in the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

3. In response, the Executive Secretary is organizing a series of regional and subregional workshops on updating national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) in 2011 and 2012. The workshop for Europe was held on the Isle of Vilm, Germany from 15 to 19 April 2011 and was organized with financial support from the Government of Japan through its Japan Biodiversity Fund and the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Germany, and in collaboration with the International Academy for Nature Conservation on the Isle of Vilm, a division of the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN).

4. The specific objectives of the workshop were to:

(a) Facilitate national implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including by assisting Parties in developing national biodiversity targets in the framework of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets;

(b) Assist Parties in reviewing, updating, revising and implementing the national biodiversity strategy and action plan, with consideration given to how it can serve as an effective tool for mainstreaming biodiversity into broader national policies;

(c) Raise awareness to stimulate early actions to implement other Aichi-Nagoya outcomes, in particular, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising From Their Utilization and the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

(d) Support countries in making use of the findings of the third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-3) and The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) study, and in considering how the findings could be integrated into updated and revised NBSAPs;

(e) Facilitate active learning opportunities and peer-to-peer exchanges for National Focal Points and persons in charge of implementing and revising NBSAPs.

5. The workshop format featured a mix of presentations with question and answer sessions, discussion in small working groups, plus facilitated interactive sessions to introduce relevant tools, and a field study visit. The key outcomes emerging from each working session were captured on cards and flip charts so that they could be used for further discussion and analysis later.

6. The workshop was attended by government-nominated officials, responsible for the development and/or implementation of NBSAPs from: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Malta, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Switzerland, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Additionally, an Indigenous and Local Community (ILC) representative from the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East (RAIPON) attended. Four resource persons from the region contributed their expertise in mainstreaming biodiversity, local implementation, stakeholder engagement, Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA), synergies with other Conventions, and resource mobilization. The list of participants for the workshop is appended to this report and can be accessed at <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=CBWNBSAP-EUR-02>. The workshop was conducted mostly in English, with Russian interpretation.

7. The workshop was facilitated by Natasha Walker of Natasha Walker Associates (NWA) which had previously facilitated the German NBSAP development process.

8. The following report sections provide an overview of the workshop agenda sessions, and discussions, the conclusions of the meeting, and the next steps going forward. Annexes to this report present more detailed information on the outcomes of the workshop.

1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

9. The workshop was formally opened on Thursday evening, 14 April. During the opening ceremony, Ms. Gisela Stolpe, Head of Unit, International Academy for Nature Conservation in Vilm, welcomed workshop participants on behalf of the International Academy for Nature Conservation introducing them to the Isle of Vilm, one of the oldest nature reserves in Germany, and thanked the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for the opportunity to host the workshop. Following that, Ms Natasha Walker, the facilitator of the workshop, invited participants to introduce themselves.

10. Mr. David Duthie welcomed participants on behalf of the Secretariat to the Convention on Biological Diversity. On behalf of the Executive Secretary, Mr. Duthie thanked the Government of Germany for hosting the workshop. He stressed on the importance to revise NBSAPs and informed participants that Japan has established a Japan Biodiversity Fund to assist eligible countries in translating the Aichi Targets into NBSAP before the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties and that additional funds for national biodiversity planning have been made available through GEF-5. He also emphasized the importance of ratifying the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing and the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on

Biosafety, now opened for signature. He finished by saying that this workshop is the second of a series of subregional workshops.

11. The objectives and programme of the workshop were introduced by Mr David Duthie before the end of the short opening session (for all workshop presentations, see <http://www.cbd.int/nbsap/workshops2/europe.shtml>).

12. On the second day, Friday, 15 April, Ms. Natasha Walker outlined the goals for the day and facilitated the identification of expected outcomes of the workshop by participants, which were broadly consistent with the objectives listed above in paragraph 4. After covering the agenda of the day, Ms. Natasha Walker asked participants to share their expectations and commitments towards this workshop. The most common ones included:

- (a) Getting the necessary skills and processes to develop and revise NBSAPs;
- (b) Integrating NBSAPs into planning processes at international, regional and national levels and sharing examples of strategies on reaching out to different ministries;
- (c) Strengthening the top-down/bottom-up processes at the governance level;
- (d) Getting insights from the countries on the ways to get biodiversity on the political agenda and exchange of experience and examples of actions on the ground for the NBSAP process;
- (e) Establishing key networks and partnerships;
- (f) Sharing experiences through a small group setting in dialogue-oriented processing;
- (g) Good examples of the NBSAP formulation;
- (h) How to improve the NBSAP strategy in line with Nagoya outcomes; and
- (i) How to coordinate the multi-stakeholder process of updating NBSAPs.

2. REVIEW OF FINDINGS OF GBO-3 AND OVERVIEW OF THE AICHI-NAGOYA OUTCOMES

13. Following the group exercise, Mr. David Duthie of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity presented the findings of GBO-3 and provided an overview of the Aichi-Nagoya outcomes, outlining the decisions of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, including on the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS), the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, as well as the Strategy for Resource Mobilization. He also explained the different mechanisms available to support implementation and the next steps to follow.

14. Mr. David Duthie made a second scene-setting presentation, this time on the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization, linking it to the third objective of the Convention. He mentioned the history of the negotiations, its objective and the advantages for users and providers of genetic resources as well as for indigenous and local communities. He also referred to the funds available to support the early ratification and implementation, through briefing sessions for decision makers and capacity-building workshops for national focal points and indigenous and local communities. He concluded the presentation by explaining the necessary steps for signature and ratification of the Protocol.

15. Mr. David Duthie, in his final presentation of the day introduced the Kuala-Lumpur Supplementary Protocol which originated in response to Article 27 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety: Liability and Redress. He spoke about the negotiation process and some of its main articles: use of terms, response measures and the implementation and relation to civil liability. He completed the presentation by mentioning the signature, ratification and entry into force, the steps of the Supplementary

Protocol. Briefly after the presentations, participants shared thoughts on how they felt about the introduction to protocols. Some identified difficulties with the ABS Protocol such as the need for changes in laws and the lack of legislation for indigenous and local communities. In his responses, Mr. Duthie highlighted that the balance must be ensured between international norms and national processes.

16. A comment was made that the Parties are at different stages of the NBSAP process with considerable variations among countries in various aspects of NBSAPs and these experiences will be shared throughout this workshop. Switzerland was used as an example where there are a number of current efforts in mainstreaming biodiversity into various national policies under a new and overarching National Biodiversity Strategy.

3. REVIEW AND UPDATING OF NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS: LESSONS LEARNED AND NEXT STEPS

17. This agenda item was first introduced by Mr. Christian Prip who presented a study performed by the United Nations University Institute for Advanced Studies (UNU-IAS) on the assessment of NBSAPs. He first talked about the objective of the study, methods and obstacles of implementation. Some of the main conclusions of the assessment are presented below:

- (a) Most countries prepared NBSAPs with the participation of stakeholders, but indigenous communities, women, and industry are largely missing in the participation on NBSAP formulation;
- (b) Newer NBSAPs are approved at a parliamentary level;
- (c) CEPA is featured prominently in most NBSAPs but often as an “add-on”;
- (d) Not all NBSAPs place biodiversity in a broader development policy context, some NBSAPs may have strong emphasis on development, but Millennium Development Goal (MDG) plans have no focus on biodiversity;
- (e) Most NBSAPs highlight the need to value and create economic incentives for biodiversity, but few move beyond general statements;
- (f) Mainstreaming with climate change and other biodiversity-related conventions is rather weak, although some positive signs are emerging with recent National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs);
- (g) Only very few countries in very new NBSAPs include time bound and measurable targets;
- (h) Generally there are very few NBSAPs with mechanisms for monitoring and review at country level; and
- (i) Some countries have reported full implementation of their first NBSAPs, but gaps and constraints to implementation are reported in nearly all other countries.

18. Following the presentation, Ms. Natasha Walker led a discussion on what makes a good NBSAP revision process. The following points were noted by the participants:

- (a) Participatory process – ownership;
- (b) Coordination structures for implementation (management);
- (c) High-level political ownership (Cabinet/Parliament);
- (d) The right knowledge to act and convince;
- (e) Mainstreaming in broad (development) plans;

- (f) Balance conservation, sustainable use + ABS (sophisticated valuation, incentive mechanisms);
- (g) Mobilization through CEPA;
- (h) SMART-targets and prioritisation and monitoring;
- (i) Secure funding;
- (j) Legislation in place.

19. To set the stage for the next group exercise on countries' self-assessment of their respective NBSAP processes, Ms. Vanessa Nuzzo shared France's experience in the NBSAP revision process which will be announced in July 2011 and includes the integration of the Aichi Targets. Their independent assessment demonstrates the following weaknesses in the process:

- (a) Weak ownership of the targets by ministerial departments and local stakeholders;
- (b) Partial implementation of the initially agreed governance system;
- (c) Results difficult to grasp; and
- (d) Lack of monitoring and assessment schemes.

20. Some comments were received from the floor, acknowledging the lack of definitive evidence of biodiversity loss which impedes the process of convincing others to act. A participant from Georgia commented on lack of funding being a priority issue for most countries at the time of the strategy development, suggesting that a strategic document should be oriented more towards financial needs. In response, based on the UNU-IAS assessment, Mr. Christian Prip emphasized the importance of prioritization, distinguishing between what can be done with financial resources available at the time, and what needed to be done with additional resources.

21. The remainder of the morning session was devoted to a self-assessment by countries of their experience in NBSAP development, implementation and revisions process. The working groups were asked to draw a NBSAP process graph from 2008-2012 based on their previous experience and project their hopes and fears for the upcoming NBSAP process, identifying possible success factors and challenges. Participants reported the following conclusions:

| NBSAP Implementation: Process Success Factors | NBSAP Implementation: Process Weaknesses |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected areas have increased, including the whole coastal line • Improved legislation put in place and adoption of relevant laws at national level • Establishing monitoring process, set national and sub-national targets, indicators and analysis of NBSAPs • NBSAP helped in mainstreaming biodiversity into other sectors' plans • Ownership by all sectors and regions, and integrating other sectors and other international processes, awareness and political will • International support and regional cooperation (exchange of important information on projects, funds, etc.) • Broad communication (International Year for Biodiversity as an example) combined with local action | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak, inconsistent mainstreaming of biodiversity into other sectors and policies and lack of coordination between sectors and of government continuity • Inadequate financial resources – resource mobilization – and human capacity (knowledge) • Low level of awareness of biodiversity in public and decision makers • Monitoring of biodiversity is not adequate • Time lag between actions and outcomes |

22. The representatives of several countries shared their countries' achievements and challenges in NBSAP implementation in comparison to others in the group. Some of the examples are outlined below:

(a) Moldova: The country's NBSAP is very optimistic; however with no financial support most actions can never be fully achieved. Hence, in any revision of the NBSAP, there was a need to be more realistic and make a distinction between the results we wish to achieve and those that we are capable of attaining.

(b) Georgia: NBSAP implementation requires sufficient resources for project implementation, improved communication, education and public awareness (CEPA), monitoring, and so on, to be self-sustained.

23. In preparation for the workshop, participants were requested to complete a questionnaire about their plans for updating and revising their NBSAPs and for mainstreaming biodiversity into broader policy frameworks. Further group discussions, as well as one-on-one discussions with staff from the Convention on Biological Diversity were held on this matter during the course of the workshop. The results of the questionnaire and subsequent discussions are summarized in annex II.

4. SETTING NATIONAL AND REGIONAL TARGETS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE AICHI-NAGOYA BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

24. This agenda item was addressed through a number of different exercises spread over four days of the workshop. Mr. David Duthie made a presentation on setting National Biodiversity Targets, stressing that targets must be appropriate for each country and relate to the biodiversity and socio-economic aspects of the country. He mentioned that targets were needed to move from words to action and the results had to be measurable. He covered the five goals of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the different targets under each goal. Mr. Duthie also provided some examples of current national targets set by countries such as Switzerland and Australia.

25. As an example in target setting, the workshop addressed Target 11 (protected areas), outlining the following: (a) extent of protected areas at the time (b) areas of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services not protected at the time (c) effectiveness on existing protected areas (d) opportunities and constraints to expand them, (e) involvement of stakeholders, (f) and additional resources required to reach the national targets.

26. After the introduction of Target 11, participants were asked to work in groups and to formulate targets for their country, or group. The facilitator, Ms. Natasha Walker, emphasized that the targets should be in the framework of Goal C, and that these should be time-bound, quantified, legally secured, well-managed and ecologically representative. Some of the possible targets created were as follows:

Target 11

(a) By 2015, 70% of all protected areas will have a management plan implemented, developed with stakeholder participation and integrated with management measures in adjacent areas. By 2015, a national monitoring centre and standard monitoring methods [Germany]

(b) By 2020, at least 20% of nature areas, especially valuable and vulnerable ecosystems and areas of particular importance for biodiversity, 10% of which are terrestrial, inland waters and marine protected areas, are conserved through an effective and equitably managed ecological network [Ukraine]

(c) By 2020, at least 17% of terrestrial areas and 10% of marine areas are included into an integrated, representative and coherent network of protected areas at national and transboundary level covering at least 10% of each habitat types in each ecoregion [Belgium].

(d) By 2020, 30% of the national territory is dedicated to the establishment of a green infrastructure of protected areas and connectivity areas to secure space for the long-term conservation of biodiversity [Switzerland].

(e) By 2020, at least 17% of territorial and inland-water areas and 10% of coastal and marine areas are conserved through effectively and equitably managed systems with regional ownership and management in place (including the transboundary area); economic areas ensured, and other effective area-based conservation measures, including in all plans, programmes and projects [Croatia]

(f) By 2020, establish a network of protected areas that covers about 10% of country to ensure protection and conservation of biodiversity and ecosystems, conserving of terrestrial and inland water, as well as coastal and marine areas through geological corridors, including protective areas. At least 60% of protected areas are managed according to management plans with qualified personnel and are financially sustainable [Georgia].

27. As a result of this group exercise, some participants shared their observations during the exercise on Target 11 formulation:

(a) Ukraine had an existing ecological network in place; consequently, there was no need to establish a new system, but rather to build on existing practices for protected areas. There was also a need for more financial and human resources to better manage the existing network of protected areas.

(b) For Belgium, the starting point was the existing NBSAP. At the time, there were no specific targets adopted in the revised Belgian Strategy as these will be generated by relevant stakeholders in the framework of the implementation process.

28. Next, participants identified the benefits of Target 11 formulation:

- (a) Building on good experience and available basis for protected areas;
- (b) Time-bound and more ambitious;
- (c) Qualitative improvement (management);

- (d) Recognize relevance of adjacent areas;
 - (e) In line with country development plan;
 - (f) Focus on most important aspect (strategic target); and
 - (g) Politicians understand and like the term “green infrastructure”.
29. The following steps/milestones to achieve the formulated targets were also identified:
- (a) Integration into spatial planning;
 - (b) Land owners on board;
 - (c) Financial and science basis for management plan – secure financial fund;
 - (d) International support; and
 - (e) Stakeholder participation to make progress towards target – strategic communication and economics.
30. Lessons learned from the day shared by some participants included:
- (a) The apparent lack of systems for monitoring and indicators for the NBSAP process where many participating countries expressed the concern of struggling with gaps in data.
 - (b) The scientific community needs to be approached as they are willing to take on the urgent and much needed task of systematic monitoring and elaborating the indicator sets as well as its integration.
 - (c) A need for a common strategy for transboundary community (for example, countries sharing Alps).
 - (d) There should be an awareness of how our ways of living affect the biodiversity, for example, even a country that doesn't have a coast can have a negative impact on coastal biodiversity through indirect action.
 - (e) The wide knowledge of expertise at such workshops was another opportunity to remind ourselves of a need for such processes.

5. INTEGRATING BIODIVERSITY INTO RELEVANT NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING PROCESSES

31. On Saturday, 16 April, after some participants shared their impressions of the Nagoya meeting, Mr. David Duthie provided an overview of Strategic Goal A and the four targets that are under this goal. He presented the key results of a recent survey published by the United Kingdom Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (UK Defra) on attitudes and knowledge relating to biodiversity and the natural environment.
32. Next, Mr. Duthie made a presentation on the advantage of economic valuation of biodiversity and associated ecosystems, focusing on Aichi Target 2 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. He reviewed key conceptual issues and approaches to valuation, with an emphasis on economic valuation, such as the Total Economic Value (TEV) approach. Mr. Duthie further provided a brief overview of strengths and limitations of economic valuation, and concluded by presenting a pragmatic step-wise approach to valuation.
33. Mr. Duthie delivered a presentation on the development and application of positive incentive measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, focusing more specifically on Aichi Target 3.

34. Before breaking into groups for an exercise on valuation and Aichi Target 2, Ms. Barbara Niedeggen, representing the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN), presented a case study of Germany's experience with economic valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services. She highlighted a need for economic resources to stop the loss of biodiversity in Germany. Furthermore, Ms. Niedeggen demonstrated the results of "Nature Capital Germany" proposal which was modelled on the global TEEB study. This initiative presented the economic argument showing the benefits of nature (ecosystem services) and nature conservation for the specific situation in Germany. Ms. Niedeggen provided findings of two case studies from Germany: (i) dyke-shifting and restoring natural flood plains; (ii) mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions through carbon sequestration, demonstrating the cost-benefit analysis of both studies.

35. Some questions were received from the floor, enquiring into how the "Nature Capital Germany" initiative would be communicated to a wider audience. Ms. Niedeggen responded that the results would be communicated through a public campaign and that the main target audience would be politicians and policy makers. Some participants acknowledged that there were other studies that at the time were being completed in several European countries on how to monitor ecosystem services, for example, studies on the willingness to pay for biodiversity (e.g., Belarus's large study on payments for ecosystem services and the Ukraine's restoration project for old-growth beech forests at a World Heritage Site in the mountains).

36. After participants had time to reflect on the valuation presentations, they worked in break-out groups and translated Aichi Targets 1, 2 and 3 into national targets, milestones, and possible activities. A compilation of this work is provided in annex III.

37. On Saturday afternoon, participants had a brief excursion around the Isle of Vilm. The first steps to protect its ancient forest from logging were taken back in 1812. In 1936, the Isle of Vilm was set aside as a nature reserve. Since 1990, it has been one of the core areas of the Southeast-Rügen Biosphere Reserve. For more information – see http://www.bfn.de/0608_insel_vilm+M52087573ab0.html. The excursion provided the participants a chance to observe firsthand, how a woodland ecosystem recovers from past logging.

6. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION

38. After the walk around the Isle of Vilm in the afternoon, Ms Wiebke Herding, from the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Commission on Education and Communication (CEC), gave a presentation on stakeholder engagement and strategic communication. She started by showing a short video, "Love. Not loss." (see <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BvIdwOEzreM>) on the challenges of communicating environmental messages to the general public and the importance of public awareness of biodiversity issues. The main focus of the presentation was a discussion about what works when communicating, what could work better, how we can capture this and what steps we can take to increase public awareness. Ms. Herding introduced a five-step process to achieve the targets (purpose, target audience, message, tactics, and results) and conveyed that communication, education and public awareness (CEPA) played an important role in developing the needed collaboration and change in society. Developing and implementing effective CEPA programmes was an integral part of the NBSAP process. Following the presentation, there were some general comments stressing the need to communicate well (CEPA), engage all stakeholders (private and public) and ensure monitoring and evaluation on the programmes.

39. Mr. Magnus Wessel from the German Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union (NABU) delivered a presentation on a stakeholders' perspective on the German NBSAP process. He started by presenting the status of the Germany's NBSAP adopted in 2007 and on the achievements, lessons learned, and challenges, such as the lack of information on financial instruments or necessary budgets to achieve the aims. Among the achievements Mr. Wessel highlighted the following: good and ongoing stakeholder involvement, cross-sectoral strategy adopted by government, with generally agreed aims, and good

facilitation for the ongoing implementation. Despite the evident successes in the NBSAP implementation, Mr. Wessel indicated that in general there was a small commitment in Germany for strategy development. Successful implementation in Europe does not only require availability of finances or necessary instruments, but also strong partnerships, involvement of all relevant stakeholders, capacity-building activities that contribute to better coherence and build synergies. He concluded that in order to change the current situation, the work needed to be done at the local level and must be demonstrated by best practice examples such as the Federal Agency initiative in Germany “Cities and Communities Biodiversity Declaration”, or NABU regionalized handbooks that provide the necessary information on the NBSAP implementation locally.

40. A representative of indigenous and local communities (ILC), Ms. Polina Shulbaeva (RAIPON), presented on the role that indigenous communities can play in stakeholder communication for the NBSAP process. Ms. Shulbaeva noted that it was difficult to define a single approach to engage stakeholders due to the variety of indigenous populations within the Russian Federation. She commented that in order to reach out to the majority of stakeholder groups, at the time there were 14 ILC regional information centres that were used as the communication tools with a number of stakeholders, donors, and media. There was a question from the floor about the engagement of civil society by ILC in the Russian Federation. Ms. Shulbaeva responded that the civil society involvement was quite vast and ILC worked with all stakeholders who were interested in achieving common goals.

41. After these scene-setting presentations, the facilitator introduced an exercise for the next session on stakeholder engagement and strategic communication. Participants were asked to work in groups and to map out stakeholders, sectors and interest groups and identify their interests for a chosen Target using a specific country as an example, and to identify any steps or milestones to achieve a Target. For the final step of the exercise, participants were invited to:

- (a) develop a message for the stakeholders;
- (b) describe means of getting this message across;
- (c) identify obstacles in achieving communication success;
- (d) define resources that are required.

Participants continued to work in groups until the end of the day.

42. On Sunday morning, the results of the working groups on stakeholder engagement and strategic communication exercises were presented to the plenary by members of each working group. The results from the working groups on creating political will, effective multi-stakeholder engagement/mobilization of resources, and public awareness were discussed in plenary and compiled in annex IV.

SETTING NATIONAL AND REGIONAL TARGETS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE AICHI-NAGOYA BIODIVERSITY TARGETS: STRATEGIC GOALS B AND D

43. Returning to agenda item 4, following the exercise, Mr. David Duthie provided an overview of Strategic Goal B and the six targets under this goal. He presented a chart, which he distributed later, on threats and vulnerable ecosystems. Mr. Duthie also introduced Strategic Goal D and the three targets that are under this goal. He spoke of the targets related to other biodiversity-related conventions such as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), World Heritage Convention (WHC), among others, and introduced the next speaker.

44. Mr. Christina Prip, representing the CMS Secretariat, presented the CMS perspective on the Strategic Plan and covered different tools for synergies between all the biodiversity-related conventions pursuant to decision X/II which emphasized the importance of such collaborative work across the conventions. Mr. Prip spoke of the role played by the CMS family of instruments. He further proceeded to mention that the CMS has initiated the process of drafting guidelines on NBSAPs for the conservation of migratory species to integrate them into NBSAP revisions. In response to a question concerning the meaning of synergies, Mr. Prip explained that it implied synergies with other conventions and that it was a question of how much one partner can bring from a strategy document and how much one wished to cross-link, noting that the Convention on Biological Diversity had established a liaison group for the biodiversity-related conventions (see <http://www.cbd.int/blg/>).

45. Mr. Thierry Lucas from the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Regional Office for Europe delivered a presentation on the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy (PEBDLS) demonstrating examples of cooperation to reduce direct pressures and promote sustainable use. Mr. Lucas mentioned the GBO-3 document alluding to the reason why we, as the biodiversity community, failed to achieve the 2010 Biodiversity Target was due to the fact that indirect pressures were inadequately addressed. He then stressed the importance of having coherence between Europe's ecosystems and habitats, mentioning that the future work would include the methods of how to create such coherence. The results of the Pan-European cooperation also included the progress made with the designation of sites in the Pan-European Ecological Network (PEEN) and the European Union's Natura 2000, and highlighted the PEEN pilot projects implemented in Belarus and Poland, Croatia and Hungary and along the border of the former East Bloc with the Green Belt initiative. He continued by describing a number of capacity-building activities, and listed other UNEP initiatives, one of which was on the development of guidelines for countries with legally binding agreements to sustain forest biodiversity. Mr. Lucas concluded by outlining the ways in which UNEP, RAMSAR, CBD donors and others can work in a more coherent way to increase synergies, improve efficiency of implementation of platforms for exchanges of best practices. It was essential to map and look at biodiversity issues on an international scale, thus improving cooperation on transboundary ecosystem services. There was also a great need for identification of Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEA) information needs and better information flow between different stakeholders through a Clearing-House Mechanism (CHM), etc.

46. Some comments were received from the floor, acknowledging that the Pan-European process contributed greatly to the NBSAP process of some countries and the need for increased synergies was very clear. In response to the question on sharing of activities between European Union countries, Mr. Lucas mentioned that the European Commission was looking into improving the Clearing-House Mechanism (CHM) as there was little exchange of information at the time. There was another question on the purpose and main objectives behind the development of more conventions. Mr. Lucas responded that there was a need for good legally binding agreements and indicators as, at the time, the biodiversity issues were not being adequately addressed, though it was not certain yet whether PEBLDS would evolve into a Convention. Generally participants supported the Pan-European Strategy as being a good initiative that provided a common platform for creating coherence between European countries. Participants further commented that there were a number of different initiatives in place around the world that many biodiversity planners were not aware of, thus it was imperative to have good synergy between relevant actors and a database accessible to the public to strengthen this synergy. Often the needed resources existed, but sometimes we tended to look in wrong places for information.

47. For the last session of the morning, Mr. David Duthie explained the next exercise on Goal B and introduced the matrix on threats and vulnerable ecosystems assessment. Participants were invited to list habitats in their countries and the major threats to them, and then rank the threats in a matrix. The groups reported the following ecosystems as vulnerable across all countries: woodlands, wetlands, forest, fresh water, international waters and mountains, marine ecosystems, dry grasslands, coastal ecosystems, caves and canyons, inland water, urban ecosystems, flood meadows, and petrophyte ecosystems (those

associated with natural rock formations). As for the common threats, the following were identified: invasive species, overexploitation, climate change, nutrient and pollution, habitat change, floods, and development.

48. After this exercise, participants were asked to indicate stakeholders, sectors and interest groups in the framework of Strategic Goal B, identifying any steps or milestones to achieve the selected target (Aichi Target 5). The groups identified the following main partners: a number of relevant Ministries (e.g., forestry, environment, energy, etc.), NGOs, local communities, forest enterprises. The group then identified the following milestones: state strategy for development, cross-analysis of sectoral strategies and entity strategies, mainstreaming (incorporation of strategic targets into sectoral strategies), and monitoring by an environment agency.

49. As part of the exercise, participants acknowledged that identifying the threats would help prioritize and choose the targets. It is clearly beneficial to develop a similar threat matrix with stakeholders in order to get acceptance from them. While sharing their experience in threat matrix development, France noted that the matrix approach was not suited for identifying milestones and methods of getting to the selected targets. On the other hand, another observation was that the matrix was a good source to determine research targets and to identify the threats' causes and mitigation measures. There was also a remark that sometimes the scientific view of the priorities were not necessarily the priorities that were politically acceptable for implementation. Participants concluded that in order to distinguish between the direct threat and indirect pressures (i.e., climate change) we needed to have a systematic approach, defining first at which level it was more appropriate. Although science can set priorities, there is a question of implementation and this instrument does not tell us where, who and what the political priorities are. Generally participants felt that this is a useful instrument to create transparency as to which scientific priorities there are.

50. As a continuation of the previous discussion, the afternoon session began with plenary discussion on Strategic Goal D which was covered by a presentation from Mr. David Duthie. He covered Aichi Target 14 explaining the importance of protecting ecosystem services and stressed the fact that human well-being was directly linked to ecosystem goods and services.

51. After the presentation, Mr. Duthie invited participants to the next exercise on the Strategic Goal D and asked them to create an example of Aichi Target 14 and to discuss the ecosystem services that contribute to human well-being, identifying the ecosystems that provide these services. The workshop facilitator invited participants to a panel discussion on (good) practice in restoration or resilience in their counties to identify success factors and barriers.

52. After an intense working phase in the three working groups, some examples of restoration projects reported by panelists are captured below:

| Countries | Ecosystems | Ecosystem services | Success Factors | Barriers |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Germany, Montenegro, | 1. Flood plains 2. Peatlands | 1. Flood control; water purification; pasture; recreation; carbon storage 2. Carbon storage; water purification and storage; recreation | (1-2) climate change momentum; economic interest (e.g. advertising, economic benefit) | (1-2) bad image; reputation; agriculture; hunting; loss of available land |
| Poland, Republic of | Steppe | Pasture; recreation; hay-making; | Getting public/political will | Difficult to convince land |

| Countries | Ecosystems | Ecosystem services | Success Factors | Barriers |
|--------------------|--------------|---|--|--|
| Moldova, Ukraine | ecosystem | bird-watching; hunting; medicine plants | (by demonstrating short-/long-term benefits); transboundary approach | owners (most steppe lands are converted into arable lands) |
| Belgium, Malta, UK | Costal areas | Recreation/tourism; aesthetic; cultural; salt/food production | Getting the scale right; public/political will; evidence; funding | working with nature and not against it |

53. During discussions, participants from the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, and Poland explained that the results of the project were as follows: (i) identified steppe territories with high biodiversity to be integrated into Regional Ecological Network; (ii) established a steppe protected area; (iii) created steppe seed bank which can be used in steppe restoration. (Finland gave an example where tourist companies are paid for partially restoring forests for eco-tourism and also where wetlands/fishponds were restored under a World Wildlife Fund (WWF) initiative.

7. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION FOR NBSAP IMPLEMENTATION

54. Mr. Duthie delivered a brief introduction on Resource Mobilization. He also covered Aichi Target 20, presenting means, activities, and possible indicators.

55. Mr. Maxim Vergeichik, from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)-GEF, made a presentation on funding availability for the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 for GEF-eligible countries. He elaborated the process of accessing GEF funding (direct access to GEF Secretariat or through UNEP, UNDP) for the new generation of Biodiversity Enabling Activities. Then he proceeded to explain that enabling activities could be provided for: revising NBSAPS in line with the new Strategic Plan, implementation of guidance to CHM, Biosafety Second Report, and Convention on Biological Diversity's Fifth National Report. Mr. Vergeichik further continued to demonstrate the impact of GEF projects in mainstreaming biodiversity management in production sectors. He highlighted the fact that the main focus though is not mainstreaming, but rather protected areas (PA), and then described various financing instruments and an assessment of the successful main instruments for example, third-party PA trust funds such as those that exist in Armenia and Georgia, debt-for-nature swaps such as those in France, Switzerland and Germany, and biodiversity offsets in the European Union. He also highlighted unsuccessful examples such as innovative financing instruments for example, multi-donor projects in the Russian Federation.

56. The last exercise of the Sunday session was on innovative opportunities for funding that were or could have been available to develop and implement NBSAPs for countries. Participants were tasked with identifying a mechanism, a source of funding for NBSAP implementation and possible trade-offs and barriers to obtaining these funds. The following synthesis of the groups' discussions emerged:

(a) Financial mechanisms: national and regional/local budgets; EU, IPA, SF; GEF, State, Agency; donor countries; donor organizations; business sector; offsetting; tax breaks; environmental funds; lottery

(b) Source/offer: money + technical assistance/expertise; trusts + legacies to NGOs; general tax offers for donations (e.g., Belgium, Switzerland)

(c) Reasons to fund: legal requirement/compliance; job opportunities; increased knowledge; reference (glory); profit; creating good links between countries; development opportunity; visibility; possible return (tax gain); job opportunity

(d) Trade-offs/barriers: complex administration/bureaucracy; lack of expertise to tap on funds; lack of information/communication; competition; lack of political will; track record; double standards country vs. donor; less tax to central government

57. Later that day, participants had the opportunity to have one-on-one discussions with Mr. David Duthie of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity on their process of revision of their NBSAPs. They also had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Maxim Vergeichik (UNDP-GEF) to discuss the process of applying for GEF funds.

58. Monday was devoted to a field study visit in the Federal State of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern which provided valuable insights on the links between biodiversity conservation, sustainable energy production and climate change mitigation and adaptation measures, as well as in relevant instruments and approaches to achieve and strengthen such linkages.

(a) The first visit was the Stralsund University of Applied Sciences and its Institute for Institute for Renewable Energy Systems (IRES) where the novel techniques to use wind power, solar power and especially the thermal use of biomass and forms to store energy were demonstrated by Prof. Ahlhaus and Dr. Fischer.

(b) On the way to the next stop - Lake Richtenberg - the examples of spatial planning approaches were demonstrated (gas pipeline North Stream and Interstate Highway A20).

(c) The visit to the Fermentation/Biogas Plant in Rothenkirchen concluded the field trip demonstrating the different stages of the biogas production.

Further information is provided in annex V.

59. On Monday evening participants had another opportunity to have one-on-one discussions with Mr. David Duthie on their process of revision of their NBSAPs and to see how the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity can assist with information on the access to GEF funding.

8. STRENGTHENING SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION IN THE REGION

60. On the last day, a discussion on science-policy interfaces for biodiversity was opened by Mr. David Duthie, who gave a brief introduction into the issue of science and policy-making as part of Strategic Goal E which addresses the scientific and technical cooperation to stimulate discussions on what were the technologies that were appropriate for the three objectives, what were the technologies that you need for biodiversity conservation and those associated with a more sustainable use of biodiversity as well as with approved access and benefits sharing for the use of genetic resources. Mr. Duthie also introduced Article 17 on exchange of information and of results and repatriation of information, and he also spoke about the Clearing-House Mechanism (CHM) and technology transfer which promoted and facilitated scientific and technical cooperation, knowledge sharing and information exchange to support the implementation of the Convention. He also mentioned the value for policy of the South-South and triangular (South-South-North) cooperation that are the catalysts for capacity-building in the regions and the opportunity for the European region to do both.

61. The presentation was followed by Mr. Axel Paulsch's talk on the science and policy interfaces within the context of the German experience. He first spoke of policy cycle, identifying various phases where science played a role in enriching the decision-making related to the sustainable use of biodiversity. Mr. Paulsch then introduced the project he was working on at the time – Network-Forum for Biodiversity Research in Germany – which aims at inter-connecting scientists in different disciplines to

feed into policy-making and at trying to mainstream the knowledge to other sectors. The Network-Forum also assists with facilitation of experts, translation to scientists of any major biodiversity-related topics, for example decisions from the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, public relations work for biodiversity research and public relations training for researchers. Mr. Paulsch also mentioned the examples of science-policy interfaces at the global (IPBES) and European (EPBRS) levels as well as at the national level such as the Belgian Biodiversity Platform, the Swiss Biodiversity Forum, and the Foundation for the Research on Biodiversity in France. After describing the challenges faced by the Network-Forum, Mr. Paulsch spoke of Germany's NBSAP which was finalized in 2007 in collaboration with scientists and accepted by the whole Parliament. He concluded by emphasizing that even though the science-policy interfaces (SPI) were a great tool, what was needed was the societal and political willingness to listen to scientific advice.

62. The experience on SPI was shared by some participants: a similar structure on science-policy interface which includes a consortium of partners has been a successful practice in the United Kingdom; Belgium offered a different structure for their Biodiversity Platform where the NGOs are not part of it (except for receiving newsletters), though with a recent multi-stakeholder discussion driven by the scientific platform; in France, the platform is an independent body which includes scientific and stakeholder councils, and SPI is included in all the projects. France shared that they were launching a project on modelling scenarios in biodiversity; the two-year European project "Biodiversa" was an example of a coordinated effort to achieve trans-national research co-operation in the field of biodiversity research funding; in Macedonia, there is an obligation to the state's budget to support some research projects in cooperation with NGOs, local communities, etc.

63. In response to a question on whether there was SPI experience in Germany, Dr. Paulsch explained that new research programmes increasingly had an obligation to include both scientific and policy papers (e.g., Germany's programme on sustainable land management had a scientific coordinator responsible for disseminating results and outreach, linking them with relevant conventions). In terms of resources needed to set-up and run a project such as the Network-Forum for Biodiversity Research in Germany, Dr. Paulsch revealed that the technical costs were not high; setting-up the platform was a lengthy process, and there was a group of scientists already engaged in building such a platform, those with existing interest in influencing policy makers, on a voluntary basis, adding that keeping a platform's independence is important to its integrity and long-term influence.

64. The remainder of the Tuesday agenda was based on exploring the participants' needs expressed throughout the workshop. The first plenary session on the capacity-building process was opened by Mr. Tristan Tyrrell from the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) who introduced the work WCMC is doing on developing indicators at the global level in support of Aichi Targets, and described the monitoring process and ways to make it appropriate at the regional, national and global levels. He outlined the obstacles to successful indicator development and use (e.g., insufficient stakeholder consultation, lack of resources) and possible solutions (e.g., facilitating peer-to-peer capacity support). In response to the questions following the presentation, Mr. Tyrrell explained that for Eastern Europe, funding was expected for regional workshops to start building relationships through the peer-to-peer approach. For Western European countries however at the time there were no plans for a similar event, although there were resources available through the Streamlining European 2010 Biodiversity Indicators (SEBI2010) and Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP) processes.

65. The next plenary session was on the NBSAP process. Participants expressed the following expectations for this session:

- (a) defining targets (when, who, what and how);
- (b) how to coordinate the process (coordination and governance) of numerous stakeholders;
- (c) defining roles and agreeing, in developed states.

66. Mr. David Duthie made a brief presentation on the next steps in revising and updating NBSAPs. He presented the NBSAP indicative components and the enabling activities components. One of the remarks was that the training modules and the entire NBSAP revision process needs to be more visible (e.g., Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity website) for countries.

67. Two countries presented their recent NBSAP experiences, including the NBSAP revision process. France's case was presented by Ms. Vanessa Nuzzo who spoke about their NBSAP adopted in 2004 which includes four themes of action (involve all stakeholders; acknowledge nature's value; mainstream biodiversity within national policies; and develop scientific knowledge and monitoring) with 11 sector action plans. She also shared their NBSAP revision process that included a governance structure comprised of a steering committee with 110 permanent members, 8 working groups, as well as an administered public survey. The new 2011-2020 National Biodiversity Strategy (with 6 strategic goals and 20 objectives) is a cross-cutting and systemic approach aiming to make policies and actions more consistent and efficient, and includes increased participation of stakeholders in dialogue and decision-making at different levels with monitoring and assessment components to encourage action, support decisions and drive change.

68. Participants enquired about the approach taken by the steering committee to come to an agreement on the new National Biodiversity Strategy in a short period of time. Ms. Nuzzo explained that it is an existing committee, based on trust that comes together from lengthy discussions in a cooperative atmosphere.

69. The second country to present was the Republic of Belarus whose NBSAP was developed in 1997, and revised in 2010, a few weeks after the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Ms. Natalya Zharkina presented their processes, challenges, achievements and lessons learned, such as their success in engaging a broad spectrum of actors in scientific community, among politicians as well as other stakeholders. The Belarus 2011-2020 Strategy does not include many targets; however, those that were included are in line with the Aichi Targets.

70. Mr. David Duthie chaired the next plenary session on the knowledge hubs where participants were asked first to brainstorm about possible technologies or technological limitations for biodiversity within the three objectives of the Convention: conservation, sustainable use and access and benefit sharing.

71. Under South-South Cooperation, participants discussed three different issues: identified needs, examples of centres of excellence and their accessibility. With respect to biodiversity-related knowledge sharing mechanisms that exist in countries, the following examples emerged:

(a) A long-term socio-economic network in Finland, similar to the Long-Term Ecological Research (LTER) network, that brings private sector together and collects biodiversity-related data and markets it; the use of it will be for general biodiversity monitoring (LTER platform is a good example, when business is involved in biodiversity management).

(b) In Bosnia-Herzegovina, there is good biodiversity knowledge, but it is not shared among scientists and practitioners in the country. There is an opportunity for the NBSAP process to act as an attractor to bring all these people into one place to share information, which may be useful to a broader audience. If the mechanisms for sharing do not exist, then these should be built into the NBSAP planning process.

72. With regards to information, knowledge and technologies most needed for the NBSAPs revision and implementation, participants identified the following gaps:

(a) The lack of information on and better understanding of existing open-source technologies such as the Geographic Information System (GIS) that has a platform to map the species, the threats, the possible ecosystem service values (Israel).

(b) Ukraine expressed the challenge of converting biodiversity arguments to the arguments that are better understood by politicians. Mr. Duthie mentioned that the TEEB tools and CEPA for public awareness materials could be a useful resource. As for tools for economic valuation, Mr. Duthie offered to direct the country to relevant methodologies later on, highlighting the open source software package InVEST available at: <http://www.naturalcapitalproject.org/InVEST.html>.

(c) A need for a centre that identifies the information needed at the national level for the NBSAP process (possibly to be done by IPBES) (Iceland).

73. Participants agreed that there was a definite need for regional centres of excellence, and as demonstrated earlier in Mr. Axel Paulsch's presentation, at the time there were a lot of initiatives that try to collect and share information more broadly. With regards to regional biodiversity-related capacity-building training programmes, the following were mentioned by participants:

(a) UNEP-WCMC offers a number of capacity-building training programmes for the range of biodiversity-related issues.

(b) Belgium shared that there were training programmes given through CHM (see <http://www.biodiv.be/cooperation>).

(c) For Balkan countries that were small and were in economic transition, as well as Caucasus and Asian countries in the region, it was expensive to do training country by country – it was better to do it collectively through regional cooperation, in collaboration with other European Union countries.

74. Recommendation on the way to move forward: to include technical needs assessment in the NBSAP process and to add in a component on maintaining the activity quality of the CHM, as a place where this information can be made available. Both components can be supported within a GEF application for support for NBSAP revision.

75. Ms. Vicky Morgan presented the United Kingdom experience in knowledge management demonstrating various online tools such as the Habitat Management online search tool created by the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC); National Biodiversity Network (NBN) Gateway which allows retrieving hundreds of data sets for species; a prototype of Biodiversity Action Reporting System (BARS) which informs about progress with NBSAPs for all four countries (England, Scotland, Northern Ireland, and Wales), the status of species and habitats, and maps the conservation actions taking place in a specific local area; and the United Kingdom Marine Protected Areas Interactive Map created by JNCC and the United Kingdom conservation agencies to identify the new marine protected areas to create an ecologically coherent network. Ms. Morgan also introduced the United Kingdom National Ecosystem Assessment (NEA) analysis of the natural environment in terms of benefits it provides and economic prosperity (the first output of this analysis has been recently published online).

9. SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSION OF THE WORKSHOP

76. The facilitator compiled the workshop conclusions in plenary with participants and clustered the contributions the following way:

The NBSAP process should include the following elements:

(a) Strong mission of biodiversity, compact document, (note that a helpful range of guidance and material is available from the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (see <http://www.cbd.int/nbsap/training/>);

(b) Ongoing public consultation (different stages) and manageable dialogue (e.g., steering committee);

- (c) Continuous effort (consistency) of the NBSAP process;
- (d) Mutual plans having people exchange experience as the NBSAP process (learning process), and have a dialogue (cross sectors);
- (e) Increased awareness of the concept of biodiversity;
- (f) Building on previous practice when building a new strategy, and use free IT tools to support the work;
- (g) Select indicators, good measures and targets;
- (h) Management process behind mainstreaming is strategically important.

Shortcomings of the NBSAP Process:

- (a) Misunderstanding between participants of the NBSAP process;
- (b) The narrow focus on only 'my own' national targets (i.e., negative side-effects elsewhere);
- (c) Lack of funds (political priority);
- (d) An idea that the biodiversity has no value;
- (e) Lack of data is often an excuse for inaction;
- (f) Earlier NBSAPs have not been entirely implemented; hence, does it really make an impact? (impact assessment is needed);
- (g) Technical language (complicated technical language of Convention documents).

The following levers for change should be considered for the NBSAP process:

- (a) More emphasis on transnational targets;
- (b) Towards a stronger political will;
- (c) TEEB processes and other evaluation approaches which give biodiversity value;
- (d) More inter-linkages with other biodiversity conventions;
- (e) Cost-benefit of a lengthy NBSAP process (i.e., being critical of what we are doing);
- (f) Involve stakeholders from the beginning of the NBSAP process and call on stakeholders to develop their own action plans.

77. Participants reviewed the workshop outcomes against the expectations they had listed the first day. There was the broad agreement among participants that the workshop was very useful in facilitating mutual learning through the exchange of experiences (in small working groups with neighboring countries) among practitioners responsible for the implementation of the Convention and that they wished to continue this process of regional networking and information exchange. The workshop was well organized and took place in a welcoming atmosphere. The facilitation format of the workshop could be potentially applied for national level dialogues for the NBSAP process. As for the shortcoming of the workshop, some participants hoped to get more individual feedback on countries' revised NBSAPs – with the analysis of the country's main gaps provided by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity – to get more peer-to-peer process advice. Mr. Duthie replied that in addition to the existing training material (which is created for that specific purpose), as an organization that services the Conferences of the Parties, the Secretariat however would be happy to work with countries on a more bilateral basis for more detailed interaction. Participants were also invited to complete an anonymous evaluation form (see results in annex VI).

10. CLOSING OF THE WORKSHOP

78. Closing remarks were delivered by Mr. David Duthie of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, who thanked all for the active participation and for ideas shared throughout the workshop, the facilitator, and Germany for hosting the workshop. On behalf of the International Academy for Nature Conservation, Ms. Gisela Stolpe gave a closing statement, thanking the countries for their participation in the workshop and for the inspiring experiences shared throughout the past five days in Vilm. She also thanked her colleague, Mr. Ralf Grunewald, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the facilitator, Ms. Natasha Walker, and Ms. Natalia Chalaeva, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity programme assistant for her work on organisation of the meeting.

Annex I

INDICATIVE OUTLINE OF AN NBSAP

I. INTRODUCTION

A concise account of the necessary background, setting the scene for an updated NBSAP and providing the rationale for the strategy and actions therein. Where necessary, may be complemented by in-depth studies annexed to the main NBSAP.

1. **Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services in the country and their contribution to human well-being** - Importance of biodiversity for the country. Highlight contribution to human well-being, socio-economic development, including poverty reduction. Include analysis of economic and other values.
2. **Causes and consequences of biodiversity loss** - Main threats to biodiversity (and ecosystems) and their underlying causes. Impacts of threats on biodiversity and ecosystems and socio-economic implications of the impacts. Describe the impacts of declining biodiversity and ecosystems on human well-being, livelihoods, poverty reduction, etc. Link the threats (direct drivers) with the underlying causes (indirect drivers) and relate these to the relevant economic sectors.
3. **Constitutional, legal and institutional framework** - Overview of the biodiversity policy and planning framework and relevant broader policy and planning processes (national development plans; poverty reduction strategies; climate change adaptation plans, etc.). Include an outline of any relevant constitutional, legal and institutional elements.
4. **Lessons learned from the earlier NBSAP(s) and the process of developing the updated NBSAP** - A brief account of progress in implementing earlier NBSAPs (where relevant). Summary results of any evaluation of the effectiveness of earlier NBSAPs. What challenges and gaps need to be addressed, and main priority areas for a revised NBSAP. Might also develop scenarios of biodiversity futures. Might also include brief reflections on the process of developing the previous NBSAP and how it may have influenced its effectiveness. Briefly outline the process of updating the NBSAP, including stakeholder consultations.

II. NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY: PRINCIPLES, PRIORITIES AND TARGETS

The main high-level elements of the Strategy that provides the framework for the NBSAP as a whole:

5. **Long term vision** - Outline the long-term vision for the state of biodiversity in the country. This should be an inspirational statement that reflects the importance of biodiversity for people and is broadly shared across the country. This may be for 2050 (as is the case for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 or may be aligned with other long term national development plans).
6. **Principles governing the strategy** - Core values and beliefs underlying the NBSAP.
7. **Main goals or priority areas** - The most pressing issues that are addressed by the NBSAP. Among these should be goals to ensure the mainstreaming of biodiversity (i.e., the integration of biodiversity into broader national policies, strategies and plans).
8. **National Targets (SMART)** - National biodiversity targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. These should be strategic, specific, measurable, ambitious but realistic targets that are time-bound (usually for 2020). They maybe grouped under the main goals or priority areas.

III. NATIONAL ACTION PLAN

The details of the Strategy and the Action Plan:

9. **National actions to achieve the strategy, with milestones** - The actions needed to achieve the targets. These should consist largely of strategic actions such as institutional, legislative, economic or other policy and institutional actions that will provide the enabling conditions and incentives necessary to achieve the goals or priority areas and the targets of the NBSAP. More specific actions would be indicative, acknowledging that approaches will need to be adapted in light of experience of implementation. The Plan should determine who does what, where, when and how.
10. **Application of the NBSAP to sub-national entities** - How the NBSAP will be implemented at state/provincial level (particularly important for federal countries, or quasi-federal countries which devolve territorial management to these entities) and at local or municipal levels (including cities). The national strategy and action plan might be complemented by LBSAPs developed separately.
11. **Sectoral Action - mainstreaming into development, poverty reduction and climate change plans** - Actions and steps that will be taken to integrate biodiversity into broader national policies, strategies and plans (such as national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, climate change adaptation plans, etc.) and into sectoral policies, strategies and plans, across government, the private sector and civil society.
12. **Plan for capacity development for NBSAP implementation, including a technology needs assessment** - The human and technical needs to implement the NBSAP and how they may be mobilized.
13. **Communication and outreach strategy for the NBSAP.** - How the NBSAP will be promoted in the country among decision makers and the public at large (this is distinct from the CEPA activities of the NBSAP – which would go into the national and subnational actions sub-sections).
14. **Plan for resource mobilization for NBSAP implementation** - The financial resources needed to implement the NBSAP and how they will be mobilized through all sources including the domestic budget, external assistance (where relevant) and innovative financial mechanisms.
15. **National Coordination Structures** - What are the national structures, institutions, and partnerships that will guide, coordinate and ensure implementation of the NBSAP (e.g., national committees, inter-ministerial committees, and the Secretariat or unit to support these) with clear identification of roles and responsibilities of various institutional actors. Where relevant, establishment of coordination mechanisms with local authorities in the development and implementation of LBSAPs or with regional partners in the case of regional strategies.
16. **Clearing-House Mechanism** - Including the development or enhancement of the national CHM and how it is being used to support the development and implementation of the NBSAP; development of national (and where relevant regional) institutional network for biodiversity.
17. **Monitoring and Evaluation** - How the implementation of the NBSAP will be monitored and evaluated, including provisions for reporting and the identification of indicators to track progress towards national targets.

Annex 2.1

**PLANS FOR THE UPDATING AND REVISION OF NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY
STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS**

ALBANIA

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed in 1999

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Biodiversity law - wild fauna (2006), protected areas (2008)
- Biodiversity elements in cross-cutting strategy for environment (2007)

Plans for revision and target setting:

- Plan to start revising and updating the NBSAP in 2011
- Will use the Aichi Targets to develop National Targets
- NBSAP should be revised by the time 2006-2013 National Strategy for Development expires
- Plan to apply for GEF funds

ARMENIA

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed in 1999

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- NEAP (2008)
- Special Protected Areas Strategy and Action Plan of RA (2003)
- Law on Special Protected Areas of RA (2006)
- Law on Fauna of RA (2000)
- Law on Flora of RA (1999)

Plans for revision and target setting:

- Review of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of Armenia, Analytical Report (2010)
- DPSIR Analysis of the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of Armenia (2010)
- Clear parallels, comparing and assessing the Aichi Biodiversity Targets Convention goals and target issues with those of NBSAP
- Application for GEF funds - planned activity by the Armenian GTZ office (May, 2011)

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- The Poverty Reduction Strategic Papers (PRSP) (adopted in 2003), where the overexploitation of natural resources and the problems of Lake Sevan are mentioned as serious environment problems.
- Second PRSP - 2008-2021 Sustainable Development Programme of Armenia – also refers to the role of forests in biodiversity conservation.

BELGIUM

Status of NBSAP:

- First NBSAP (2006-2016) was adopted by the Inter-ministerial Conference for the Environment in 2006

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- There are several levels of biodiversity policy development
- The Federal Plan for the Sectoral Integration of Biodiversity in four key sectors (transport, economy, development cooperation and science) 2009-2013 (adopted in 2009)
- Flemish region: In 2010, a new Policy Plan for Environment and Nature 2011-2015 was prepared and biodiversity is considered in the various chapters of the plan
- The Strategic Plan 2008-2013 of the administration in charge of agriculture, natural resources and the environment in the Walloon Region includes biodiversity objectives
- The biodiversity policy of the Brussels-Capital Region is partially guided by the Regional Development Plan (adopted in 2002). A new framework for nature policy translates the EU Habitats directive and foresees a better policy planning, including elaboration of a Regional Plan for Nature (adoption by the Regional Parliament is expected by late 2011).

Plans for revision and target setting:

- The mid-term evaluation of the NBS has started in March 2011
- The revision of NBS in 2011-2012 will be guided by the result of the ongoing evaluation, decisions of COP-10 on the new Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the *new EU Strategy for biodiversity*. The project of revised NBS will follow a public consultation.
- Neither specific actions nor targets will be adopted in the revised Strategy itself as this will be done in the framework of the implementation process by the relevant Regional and federal administrations. Specific actions that need to be coordinated at national level will be identified and included in the revised Strategy for inter-regional follow-up.

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- A better integration of biodiversity into development aid is foreseen in the Federal Plan for the Sectoral Integration of Biodiversity into Development Cooperation.
- Integration into regional and federal plans can occur in the course of next years (Aichi target is by 2015):
 - (a) In the Walloon Region a nature action plan is under development (no deadline);
 - (b) In the Brussels-Capital Region a regional plan nature (NAPLAN) is foreseen (the plan should be adopted 2 years after the adoption of the new nature ordinance);
 - (c) At Federal level, the preparation of a Third Federal Plan for Sustainable Development will start in 2011. The Second plan expired in 2008.
 - (d) In the Flemish Region, the new Policy Plan for Environment and Nature 2011-2015 (MINA-plan 4) is under finalization

CROATIA

Status of NBSAP:

- Adopted in 1997; revised in 2008

Plans for revision and target setting:

- The strategy is revised every five years, if necessary (as per the Nature Protection Act)

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- The draft National Strategic Reference Framework (2012-2013) includes general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund. Nature protection and biodiversity preservation is defined as one of priorities for investments in Croatia.

FINLAND

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed in 1999, revised in 2006

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- There are some related policy instruments that touch on biodiversity, but nothing significant
- Biodiversity communication strategy for NBSAP (modified in 2006)

Plans for revision and target setting:

- The 2010 plans to revise NBSAP were deliberately delayed until after COP-10; NBSAP revision process started in January 2011; January 2012 – to be approved by government
- Delegation believes that COP-10 is a significant step forward and the issue of setting national targets should be taken seriously
- Plans to map the current action plan to Aichi Target 5 (at national level), and will shift to Goals A&D

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- NBSAP could be better integrated by government work programme and major sectors

FRANCE

Status of NBSAP:

- Strategy adopted in 2004, being revised in 2010-2011; sectoral Action Plans adopted between 2006-2008 and revised in 2009

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Two laws were passed: loi Grenelle 1 (2009) and loi Grenelle 2, defining the framework for action for different issues:
 - (a) set up of a green infrastructure by 2012

- (b) national strategy for the creation of terrestrial protected areas
- (c) development of a national strategy for the integrated management of the sea and coastal areas
- (d) creation of marine protected areas
- (e) transposition in the law of the EU Framework directives for Water and for the Marine Strategy

Plans for revision and target setting:

- The Strategy is currently being revised, with the process being launched in July 2010
- Working groups (identified by the Steering committee) started its work by discussion and prioritization of the Aichi biodiversity targets. The outcomes of the various working groups were fed into the drafting of the overall strategy, the Aichi targets are covered by the revised NBS.

GEORGIA

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed in 2005

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- The Second National Programme for 2011-2015 of the Environmental Action Plan (NEAP 2) contains a Chapter on Biodiversity Protection describing the current problems, short-term objectives and the appropriate measures to solve them.

Plans for revision and target setting:

- The Ministry of Environment is planning to revise and update the NBSAP with support of GIZ through the Natural Resources Sustainable Management in Georgia project. The working version of the document should be finalized in September of 2012.
- The Aichi Targets are partly reflected in the NBSAP (particularly, further development of Protected Areas, protection of the Red List species, public awareness and education).
- Special attention should be paid to the capacity of the country for its implementation, taking into account the current financial, human resources, political and social conditions.

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- The main challenge is poverty eradication and the occupation of the part of the country's territory. Biodiversity protection is weakly reflected in the main development plan of the country (Country Document on Main Data and Directions). Attention is paid only to the development of protected areas (mostly to the development of tourism infrastructure within the protected areas).
- The Biodiversity Monitoring System is still not developed in the country, hence no clear ground for submitting arguments to the decision makers in favour of biodiversity issues.
- The awareness on biodiversity and ecosystem services is very low. No research in this field is conducted till now (except for Kulevi case).

ICELAND

Status of NBSAP:

- Strategy completed in 2008; Action Plan completed in 2010

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Nature Conservation Strategy 2009-2014
- Plant Protection Law is currently under revision with more biodiversity components
- Forest and Soil Legislation has been revised to better reflect biodiversity issues

Plans for revision and target setting:

- No plans for NBSAP revision, but the Ministry of Environment attended the COP-10 and wishes to become Aichi Targets-compliant, possibly by 2013
- Unlikely to adopt a full set of targets; Parliament is discussing "green economy"

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- Law on Physical Planning requires land use plan, though not certain how biodiversity is reflected in this work (geo/hydro powers, etc. must take nature conservation into consideration)
- Have started mainstreaming biodiversity into other sectors

ISRAEL

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed in 2009; Strategy adopted by the Ministry of Environment and will go to Parliament with Action Plan

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Law for Protection of Wild Animals (2010)
- National Monitoring Programme
- Israel Taxonomy Initiative (scholarships, surveys/research)
- Black book of invasive species
- Master Plan for road crossings for wildlife and also for ecological corridors
- New 2010 Fund for farmland leasing 1% for open landscapes
- Project on economic tools and renewables with Milken Institute (stakeholder mapping and ways to mainstream even within the Ministry of Environment)

Plans for revision and target setting:

- Strategy will stay as is, but Action Plan will be updated in the light of the new Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- National Masku Plan 35 (due in 2011) – PES was to be added, but questioned

MACEDONIA

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed (2004-2008); revised in 2010 as 4th National Report

Plans for revision and target setting:

- National target setting (2014)
- New strategy and action plan (2015-2020), including nature conservation
- NBSAP is currently under revision. In the 2015 strategy, there will be more targets (Aichi Targets 10-15)

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- Master Plan 2008-2020
- NEAP 2006-2014 (will harmonize NBSAP with NEAP)
- Sustainable Development Plan (2008-2020)
- Intend to submit a proposal to UNDP for GEF funding

MONTENEGRO

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed in 2010

Plans for revision and target setting:

- Will start with preparation of revised NBSAP on 2012, in line with Aichi Targets.

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- During 2012 we will start with screening of NBSAP. After that we will include all stakeholders in the country and prepare application for GEF funds for revision of the Strategy.

NORWAY

Status of NBSAP:

- Strategy adopted in 1997; Action Plan adopted in 2001. Revised in 2004, 2006.

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Nature Diversity Act (2009) which applies to all biological diversity
- Biodiversity issues are also covered in other key legislation, including the Marine Resources Act, the Svalbard Environment Act and the Planning and Building Act

Plans for revision and target setting:

- The current NBSAP will be revised and updated based on the framework of new Strategic Plan and its goals and targets.
- There will be a cross-sectoral process including all relevant Ministries in integrating biodiversity in their plans, programmes and policies. All targets will be evaluated to assess their relevance at a national level. Indicators relevant for the Norwegian setting will be developed in order to assess progress towards reaching the defined targets.

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- The targets will be included in all relevant policies and plans that will be developed in the coming years in order to mainstream the biodiversity aspect in all planning and management.

SWITZERLAND

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed in 2006; currently being revised (2011)

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Agriculture Policy 2014-2017 (in consultation)
- Restoration of functionality of rivers and creeks: new policy to be implemented as of May 2011

Plans for revision and target setting:

- COP-10 decisions are being integrated as NBS is currently being written
- In the process of setting national targets in line with Aichi Targets
- Achieving the consensus on 17% protected areas conservation

UKRAINE

Status of NBSAP:

- Strategy completed in 1998

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- The 2000 Programme on Ecological Network will include two clusters on biodiversity (by 2015): environment and protected areas system (is underway)

Plans for revision and target setting:

- The current Strategy includes only Aichi Target 11; plans to incorporate other Targets

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- The Programme for Social and Economic Development (2010-2030) which also includes protected areas and species

UNITED KINGDOM

Status of NBSAP:

- Revised in 2006

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Natural Environment White Paper (DEFRA) in May/June 2011
- "Making Space for Nature: review of England's wildlife sites and ecological networks" Lawton report
- Scotland Land Use Strategy 2011
- New Wales Natural Environment Framework 2011

Plans for revision and target setting:

- England NBS to be completed in 2011
- Northern Ireland Strategy is being updated (2011)
- All of the Strategies are mapped and compliant with Aichi Targets; have mapped Aichi targets against existing indicators (AHTEG Indicators). Not likely to use targets, but will make use of indicator sets

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- Looking at ways to promote mainstreaming; will incorporate global footprint into future work
- Interest in other Nagoya outcomes (ABS, RM)

Annex 2.2

TABLE 1: LIST OF MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES IN THE PROCESS OF UPDATING NBSAP

| Cluster | Component | ALB | ARM | BEL | CRO | FRA | GEO | ICE | ISR | MAC | MON | NOR | SWI | UKR |
|--|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| I. Preparation | 1. Rapid stocktaking and review of relevant plans, policies and reports | X | | X | | | | | | | X | X | | X |
| | 2. Identifying stakeholders; consultations, and awareness | X | | | | | | X | | | X | X | | |
| | 3. Supplementary studies (e.g., threats, economic value, etc) | X | X | X | X | | | X | | | X | | | |
| II. Setting national priorities and targets | 4. Setting national targets, principles, & main priorities of the strategy (national consultations) | X | X | X | X | | X | | | X | X | X | | |
| III. Developing the strategy and action plan | 5. Developing the strategy and actions to implement the agreed targets through national consultations | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | X | X | | |
| | 6. Application and implementation of the NBSAP at sub-national levels (consultations with sub-national authorities) | | | X | X | X | | X | | | X | X | | |
| | 7. Sectoral integration including mainstreaming into development, poverty reduction and climate change plans (sectoral consultations) | X | X | | X | | | X | | X | X | | | X |
| IV. Development of Implementation plans and related | 8. Developing a plan for capacity development for NBSAP implementation | X | X | | | | | | | X | X | | | |
| | 9. Conducting a technology needs assessment alternative: developing a plan for increasing technical capacity. | X | | | | X | | | | | X | | | |

| Cluster | Component | ALB | ARM | BEL | CRO | FRA | GEO | ICE | ISR | MAC | MON | NOR | SWI | UKR |
|---|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | 10. Developing a communication and outreach strategy for the NBSAP | X | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| | 11. Developing a plan for resource mobilization for NBSAP implementation | X | X | X | | | | X | | X | X | | X | |
| V. Institutional, monitoring, reporting and exchange | 12. Establishing/strengthening of national coordination structures | X | | | X | | | | | X | X | | | |
| | 13. CHM development. | | X | | | X | | | X | | X | X | | |
| | 14. Development of indicators and monitoring approach | X | X | | | | | | X | X | X | X | | |
| | 15. Fifth national reports | X | X | | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | | X |
| VI. Adoption by the government | 16. Adoption | X | X | | X | | X | X | | | X | X | | |

Annex III

RESULTS OF THE EXERCISE ON VALUATION AND INCENTIVE MEASURES

The participants worked in groups to translate Aichi Targets 1, 2 and 3 into national targets, milestones, and possible activities. Below are the results of this exercise.

Aichi Target 1 Activity

1. Take a country example where Target 1 could apply
2. What components of biodiversity are valued?
 - a. how to measure them
 - b. how to conserve them and use them sustainably
 - c. how to communicate them
3. Attempt to formulate Target 1

Under the Aichi Target 1 Activity, the working group chose Georgia as a country example and formulated the following potential target: *By 2020 each proposed protected area will have one pilot community where awareness is raised around heritage knowledge and sustainable use. By the end of 2012, the results of ecosystem evaluation of protected areas are known and understood by top politicians and measured by decisions.*

Aichi Target 2 Activity

1. To share the most important ecosystem services in your countries where valuation could be useful
2. To identify stakeholders
3. Possible main aim of valuation by using a country's example
4. To develop a possible Target 2
5. To define the possible milestones to implement the Target

Under the Aichi Target 2 Activity, both working groups reported the following ecosystem services and one group also identified differences in services that need to be evaluated.

The first group with the following participating countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Republic of Moldova, and Ukraine chose peatland ecosystems as an example. The most important ecosystem services were identified as followed: water purification (regulating services), fresh water and food (provisioning), nutrient cycling (supporting) and recreational (supporting). The group identified the following stakeholders: politicians, government, industry/agriculture, local communities, public, NGOs, and donors. The main aim of the valuation identified was awareness-raising, emphasizing the project's integration into economic decision-making tools, as well as its importance at the policy level. The possible target developed by the group: *By 2020, develop an instrument for economic assessment of peatland ecosystems and economic mechanisms for stimulating conservation and sustainable management of biodiversity and apply such instruments in national planning process.*

The second group comprised of the following countries: Israel, Malta, and Norway, among others, ranked food (provisioning services) and recreational (cultural) as priority ecosystem services. They mapped the following three categories for stakeholder engagement: (i) programme/policy level; (ii) awareness-raising; and (iii) project level: integration into economic decision-making tools. The group highlighted the following milestones to get to the Target by

identifying (a) services, (b) programme/project, (c) local values, 'green banking'; and by creating (d) markets, and (e) academics as consultants. The target developed by this group is as follows: *Biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting and reporting systems.*

Aichi Target 3 Activity

1. To share information on positive incentives for biodiversity conservation and/or sustainable use in your countries (benefits/impact on biodiversity/winners/losers/costs)
2. To choose a country example and to examine how existing incentives could be improved (new incentives could be introduced and why) or which harmful incentives could be stopped

Under the Aichi Target 3 Activity, the participants from Switzerland, France and Germany formed the group working on Aichi Target 3. They identified the following stakeholders: Governments (Ministries of environment, defence, education, and agriculture), local communities, private sector, media and youth. Capacity-building was mentioned as one of the milestones, in addition to CEPA activities. The positive incentives and their impact on biodiversity: under CAP/Agricultural Reform abolishment of direct payments (subsidies) not linked to biodiversity/ecosystem services and measures. Two pillars were also identified: (i). Strengthening cross-compliance; and (ii) Increasing funding for agri-environmental schemes. Taxes as well as the Common Fishery Policy were also mentioned as part of reform of incentive measures. Germany shared information on incentive measures, such as the Renewable Energy Act that has an enhanced payment system for renewable energy generation. Such payments are conditional on ecological improvements (hydro power), and sustainability criteria (biofuels) to avoid negative side-effects, such as loss of natural habitats and grassland. There are also voluntary agri-environmental schemes in place in Germany.

*Annex IV***RESULTS OF THE EXERCISE ON STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION**

The results from the working groups on creating political will, effective multi-stakeholder engagement/mobilization of resources, and public awareness were discussed in plenary and compiled below.

Working group on Multi-Stakeholder Engagement, Aichi Target 9 (Invasive alien species)

Based on the chosen country example (France) the following methods of engagement of stakeholders identified by the group in the implementation of NBSAPs were mentioned: informing, consulting, involving, collaborating and empowering. There is a need for knowing who to engage, how and when. The challenges in engaging stakeholders and the opportunities for engagement at local, national, regional and international level were also identified by the group.

| | |
|--|---|
| Main message to stakeholders | Some invasive alien species (IAS) might be attractive, but they are destructive |
| Stakeholders | Tourists, citizens, and urban natural areas managers |
| Aim | To reduce IAS introduction by these stakeholders |
| Medium/format of the message to stakeholders | A commercial, posters, signs in airports, booklet with IAS (web-based), tourist information (flyer), education of relevant organisations |
| Required resources | Funds and people (communication/hunters/anyone can do it!) |
| Obstacles | Lack of financial resources, information overload, lack of political will, public opinion (if IAS are attractive to public, e.g., “Ladybird”) |

Discussion: Participants pointed out (i) that although promoting hunting may reduce numbers of invasive alien species, it could also stimulate introduction to maintain income from hunting and thus have a perverse outcome. (ii) we should have better linkages between science and eradication methods., and (iii) social networks (Facebook, etc.) have great potential for education and awareness raising even for “science” issues.

Working group #1 on Political Will, Aichi Target 16 (Access and benefits sharing)

Based on Armenia as a country example, the outcomes of this group’s discussion are summarized below:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Message to stakeholders | ABS protocol will promote poverty reduction, access to international markets, and attract donors. |
| Identified stakeholders | The Ministry of finance/agriculture/education and science/economy, local communities, NGOs, private sector, parliament |
| Resulting aim | To adopt and implement the ABS protocol |
| Medium to get the message across | To propose for consideration of Parliament and PM; public hearing; briefing session on the significance of the protocol |
| Obstacles | Low level of awareness, financial means, human resources |

/...

Required resources Highly skilled professionals, financial resources

Working group #2 on Political Will, Aichi Target 15 (Ecosystem restoration)

This group chose Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) as a country to work on. BiH currently has a very complex administration with three different administrative levels which makes it difficult to get political will to do anything, especially in the field of biodiversity. The first NBSAP in BiH was developed in 2008; however, it was never adopted due to the lack of political will. Moreover, there is no agency of environment in the country at the moment (yet to be formed – a pilot project), but rather most capacity for environmental issues exists in the scientific community.

| | |
|--|--|
| Identified stakeholders | State administration, mayors, Ministry of environment/tourism, mining companies, UNDP, WWF, RAMSAR, potential international partners, entrepreneurs, and recreational fishermen. |
| Message to the Ministry of environment/tourism | Your support of the wetland restoration project will lead to regional and economic development. |
| Resulting aim | The Minister attends the project launch; after two years, the Ministry dedicates one staff person to the project; to slowly place the biodiversity of the Ministry's agenda. |
| Medium to get the message across | Personal contacts, a joint event with regional partners that know the Minister, a steering committee for the project, a poster on buses. |
| Required resources | Funding for the pilot project, community involvement, human resources, and "some sort of organization". |
| Obstacles | Frequent changes of Minister; opportunities do not get materialised; funding insecurity; complex political situation no clear project ownership; and burnout. |

Discussion: Participants made the point that, in spite of the unfavourable grounds for outside funders, these investments from international partners are vital for action on environment/biodiversity and, in spite of the risks, returns on investment can be large.

Working group on Public Awareness, Aichi Target 13 (Genetic resources for agriculture)

The group selected Finland as a country example with the following results:

| | |
|---|---|
| Identified stakeholders | Consumers (elderly, children), farmers, home gardeners, artists, agricultural companies, traders, administration, European Union, scientists, and penal system. |
| Message to stakeholders | Keep your animal-cultural heritage alive: do not give up on your old friends. This message stems from the view point that people used to have very close connections to the animals before, and now we are at the brink to losing it all. |
| Resulting aim | To find new uses/markets, understanding of/raising cultural significance |
| Medium to get the message across | Popular culture, ambassadors (musicians, artists), campaign |
| Resources required to ensure economic viability | To look at existing examples and make a business case; subsidies; funding; as well as motivated ambassadors |
| Obstacles | Not economically viable, number of livestock left |

In the subsequent discussion, participants note that a key factor determining success was developing markets for regional products, especially exports to other countries (e.g., mango). In addition, in Finland, traditional livestock varieties are now conserved within some forms of protected area.

Annex V

FIELD STUDY VISIT

**HOW TO INTEGRATE BIODIVERSITY INTO THE ENERGY SECTOR IN GERMANY
– BENEFITS AND DRAWBACKS OF THE BOOM IN RENEWABLES AS WELL AS
ENERGY TRANSPORT**

(1) University for applied sciences in Stralsund

Prof. Ahlhaus and Dr. Fischer gave an overview of the **Institute for Renewable Energy Systems (IRES)** and presented a wide range of different technologies regarding wind power, solar power and especially the thermal use of biomass (wood and reed pellets) and forms to store energy (hydrogen) and efficient use in fuel cells (e.g., high temperature fuel cells). It was pointed out that the Institute cooperates in many fields with the industry in order to quickly feed their research results into commercial products.

Renewable Energy:

The German Federal Act on renewable energies (“Energieeinspeisegesetz”) from 2004 secures certain prices for renewable electric energy that is fed into the main electricity grid. It covers wind power, solar power, hydro power, geothermal power, and biomass. It provides investors with a secured price for their electricity for the next 20 years and power line operators must buy the electricity at this cost, which is much higher than the normal cost for electricity. This act created a large boom to invest into renewable energy because profits were quite high and the risk was very low. This leads to big investments (e.g., on- and offshore wind turbines and large solar power plants became financially feasible) and a run on land and space to put up these new facilities. It also made it attractive for small communities/municipalities to set up their own small scale power plants (wind, biomass, solar power).

Spatial planning is now playing a major role to manage land use and *inter alia* provides on a regional level a first level to identify potential sites for wind turbines – including a first stage environmental impact and feasibility assessment in order to speed up the later application and approval process as well as to block projects in sensible areas (e.g. bird and bat collisions).

(2) Energy transport: Risks and benefits

Several new large energy transporting infrastructure is being planned or being built at the moment in Germany. The gas pipeline “Nordstream” from Vyborg in Russia to Lubmin in the German Federal State of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern is currently being built. From the landfall there are two new pipelines being built to connect to the existing pipeline grid in Germany: OPAL and NEL. Besides regular mitigation measures and small scale compensation measures along the pipelines several large scale offsetting arrangements were included in the projects approval according to state and federal nature conservation law; however, since these measures have not been built so far, it was decided to look at a different offset arrangement for a large infrastructure project: The reestablishment of the former lake “Richtenberg” which was drained and used for grazing since 1936. This was being done to compensate for the large environmental impact from the construction of the new interstate highway A20. In the coming years there is a growing need to transport especially electricity from offshore wind turbines to areas onshore, where energy is needed (mostly southwestern Germany with its industrial regions).

(3) Bioenergy

During the excursion **the biogas plant “Rotenkirchen** (run by C4 ltd.) was visited and Mr. Reuter (responsible engineer for the biogas plant) led the group through the site which was still under construction. Biogas production has started already and the different stages of fermentation and biogas extraction were shown.

It was pointed out that there is mix of different forms of biomass that could be used, but at the moment corn (maize) and rye are mostly used. It is planned to also use more and more slurry and manure from the local farms. The longest distance from which material is being transported to the power plant was about 15 km away and biomass crops are being grown on well over 1000 ha for this plant. In order to raise the efficiency, electricity is not being produced on site, but a gas pipeline was built to the town of Bergen where the gas is used to run combined heat and electricity generators. The heat is used for local heating in Bergen.

Bioenergy: Risks and benefits

Bioenergy crops lead to more high intensive farming, the disappearance of grassland as well as more fodder/food imports and land speculation abroad (sugar cane, palm oil, cash crops). High energy costs e.g. lead to wood becoming a more and more popular source of heating (again) and for foresters it is now financially feasible to even take out dead or badly grown trees for wood pellet production - dead wood as an important habitat in forests is “disappearing” at an alarming rate. In the German Federal State of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern an evaluation of current land use showed that there it is likely that up to one third of the arable land could be used for biomass production in the near future. The main drawback of the biomass use is that not the “leftovers” from conventional farming are being used, but crops are being grown only for biomass production, because this generates the most income for the farmer as well as the biogas producer.

Annex VI

WORKSHOP EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS

REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR EUROPE ON UPDATING NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

Isle of Vilm, Germany, 14-20 April 2011 (Based on 21 filled in feedback forms)

| | Very Good (1) | Good (2) | Fair (3) | Poor (4) | Comments |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| THURSDAY, 14 April 2011 | | | | | |
| Opening | 6 | 2 | | | |
| Presentations by Secretariat and organizers | 12 | 2 | 1 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Well prepared introduction - Short general PPT + breaking ice with the tools reflection + list of hopes (Friday) - Fine tuning: ensure every speaker is introduced by name and role. Didn't happen: David |
| FRIDAY, 15 April 2011 | | | | | |
| Review of the findings of GBO-3 and overview of the Aichi-Nagoya Outcomes Scene-setting presentations | 7 | 10 | 2 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These didn't include new information for me and I suspect for any other either - It is worth to do it, PPT could be more illustrated (pictures & examples => speaks more and better than CBD wording!); and long text put in comments of slides and provided in the paper copies => ask feed back & feelings from participants to Nagoya |
| Review and updating of NBSAPs – lessons learned and next steps | 6 | 11 | 2 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Liked Christian's presentation a lot. Would have been good to have more time for that - Review seems backward-looking but I know other participants liked it. |
| Setting national targets in the framework of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets | 9 | 9 | 2 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I find that some of the introductory presentations were really too brief to be more than a reminder of the different targets under the goals. I would |

| | Very Good (1) | Good (2) | Fair (3) | Poor (4) | Comments |
|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| Introduction | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> have preferred fewer presentations in depth Wasn't too keen on the focus on target 11 (PA's) since it is the most conventional conservation issue (bigger challenges lie elsewhere in my country) Target II – group exercise, good |
| Setting national targets in the framework of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets: Goal A Group Exercises | 14 | 4 | 1 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the group exercises were good additions to the introductions and gave useful information from other countries firsthand Working in a group of four countries was good. got a chance to discuss in some detail The group exercises were all very good and useful, help to learn from approaches taken by other (neighbouring) countries |
| SATURDAY, 16 April 2011 | | | | | |
| Integrating biodiversity into relevant national and local planning processes | 6 | 10 | 4 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because they are very different, lesson learned are interesting but often not transferable Overall the group exercises were very good, sometimes the presentations less convincing-the work of facilitator was excellent with use of flipchart |
| Setting national targets in the framework of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets: Goal B | 11 | 9 | 1 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall the group exercises were very good, sometimes the presentations less convincing-the work of facilitator was excellent with use of flipchart |
| Stakeholder engagement and Strategic Communication | 13 | 7 | 1 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be beneficial to benefit from Communication experts Overall the group exercises were very good, sometimes the presentations less convincing-the work of facilitator was excellent with use of flipchart Communication pres by Wiebke was very good |
| SUNDAY, 17 April 2011 | | | | | |

| | Very Good (1) | Good (2) | Fair (3) | Poor (4) | Comments |
|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| Setting national targets in the framework of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets: Goals C and D | 9 | 11 | 1 | | - Overall the group exercises were very good, sometimes the presentations less convincing-the work of facilitator was excellent with use of flipchart |
| Resource Mobilization for NBSAP implementation | 8 | 6 | 6 | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too long and unfocused - We need clear structure - The presentation by UNEP was too abstract too quick and with low input for the states; Group work very good Resource mobilisation, should have been earlier! Money + stakeholder = priority - Presentation UNDP too fast, not participative talk, poor feedback from resource person into the rest of workshop, group work was fine but summary too fast |
| MONDAY, 18 April 2011 | | | | | |
| Field Study Visit | 9 | 9 | 2 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Off-set example wasn't very good; meeting with stakeholders at project site would be very useful! - Looked forward to this and did not let me down. Interesting and refreshing - Good to have foreseen such a field excursion+ site visit; feedback and discussion on the bus; do it on a Sunday, Lengthy technical presentations - The story about the lake was quite interesting, but it wasn't worth the long bus-trip to visit! Stralsund and Biogas very interesting - I loved Stralsund but longer (MORE LOOS) at the lake would have been more educational! |
| Synthesis and conclusions of the workshop Next steps Commitments of workshop participants for follow-up activities | 8 | 7 | 1 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I really loved the concrete examples (France, Belarus) - Presentations on science-policy interfaces + indicator + the French example were the best things in the workshop substance wise - Conclusion session very good, there was no real commitment from |

| | Very Good (1) | Good (2) | Fair (3) | Poor (4) | Comments |
|--|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| | | | | | participants nor roadmaps elaborated as stated in invitation |

| | Yes | No | Comments |
|---|-----|----|---|
| Did the Workshop overall meet your expectations? | 19 | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I did not expect it to be that interactive, but I think that was a good way of working - Workshop was full of interesting discussions - It was great to learn what is done. maybe next time combine more examples from participants of the process and implementation - Partly. Good to meet people and hear about national examples. on the work quite inefficient with long general presentation - Not really, I expected in more clarity more advice and actions which could help review NBSAP |
| Was there enough room for discussion and interaction? | 20 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small groups were very useful - Very good agenda, not packed giving those needed time - Sometimes it was too noisy but overall enough room - Plenty of time! Very good! |
| Was the field trip a useful demonstration of mainstreaming biodiversity? | 16 | 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Field trip inspire us to work hard, but you can choose another relevant site as well - Yes, because it showed practical realities on the ground; No, it is not these solution yet - Mostly the biogas and lake; university was too much technical and didn't speak on overall implication of the work; Long bus trip to the lake - Useful mainly in other ways |
| Were you satisfied with style and pace of presentations? | 20 | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excellent facilitation by David & Natascha - Besides from UNEP, yes. It would have been nice to know who is presenting what before these - Pace was ok. Some CBD presentations were too general or blurry. please don't have so much text in presentation and don't skip slides- adjust your presentation to the occasion - Sometimes, rather give info on paper and let the participants work together in group, interact + summarize the outcome with facilitator - Some slides had too much content-maybe enforce better discipline on speakers and encourage them |

| | Yes | No | Comments |
|---|-----|----|--|
| | | | to include supplementary info, as PPT notes for the CD! |
| Were you satisfied with the facilitation of the workshop? | 20 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Great! Wonderful! Useful! Driving and Motivating for a work! - Natasha was perfect! I think she did an excellent job! Well done! - As Natasha is very interactive facilitator, I had no doubt from the first day that everything will be well organised and interesting. Natasha was the heart and soul at the workshop. - Natasha was incredible! 1. time keeping; 2. synthesising; 3. energetic; 4 exercise building was good; 5. putting the results clearly on boards; 6. Very alert and more than coping words but truly understands the topic and what was said and putting it in simple words -> this has made me understand how important a facilitator/moderator is for workshop and maybe apply it also in my country. ☺ |
| Were you satisfied with the daily time schedule? | 18 | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I think we could start a little bit late and prolong at the end - Long days – can't take in that much unless its very well presented - The day with the after dinner session was to long! |
| Were you satisfied with the organisation of the workshop? | 18 | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too long - Excellent! It was very well organized - Clearer information, earlier and more detailed please - Practical arrangement were spotless |
| Were you satisfied with the venue, its facilities, service & food? | 19 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Venue=wonderful, facilities=very good, Service=5 Sterne, Food=4 Sterne - It was fine - Excellent; Very good service and amazing place - Will not forget the island. Room was good, food was not that great - The lunch package can be improved! Packed lunch was lower standard than the rest of the lovely meals! |
| Do you feel that this workshop will enhance your ability to prepare/update your NBSAP? | 19 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If some people are not involved in the processes of preparation of NBSAP, for these participants it was really helpful - It got me thinking more in a crucial time which momentum is important; also important to know that you are not alone and that you have the backup of different countries |

| | Yes | No | Comments |
|--|-----|----|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As the NBSAP is already in line with Aichi it was more useful for implementation and sharing experience - Many useful bits of information, but might have got these in two days if differently organised - It was very helpful to come from my national perspective to the international - More or less yes. Though there are issues which require another analysis. |

*Appendix I***LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

| No. | Name | Institution | Address | Country | Phone/Fax/e-mail |
|------------|--|---|--|---------------------------|---|
| 1. | Aarønæs, Maja Stade | Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management | Tungasletta 2, Postboks 5672 Sluppen 7485 Trondheim | Norway | Tel.: +47 73 58 0662 e-mail: Maja-stade.Aaronaes@dirnat.no |
| 2. | Ahmedzade, Vugar | Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources, Department Protection of Biodiversity and Development of Specially Protected Areas | B. Aghayev str. 100-A 1073 Baku | Azerbaijan | Tel.: +994 12/ 438 70 85 e-mail: volk@mail.az |
| 3. | Auvinen, Ari-Pekka | Finnish Environment Institute | BO Box 413 90014 University of Oulu | Finland | Tel.: +358 400/148 712 private Tel.: +358 504133 403 e-mail: ari-pekka.auvinen@ymparisto.fi |
| 4. | Prof. Barudanovic, Senka | Faculty of Science, University of Sarajevo Biodiversity Expert | Zmaja od Bosne, 33-35 71000 Sarajevo | Bosnia and Herzegovina | Tel.: +387 61/235 471 e-mail: sebarudanovic@gmail.com |
| 5. | Bereznoi, Viktor <i>Translator</i> | Interpretation | Olympiastrasse 3 82467 Garmisch-Partenkirchen | Germany | Tel.: +49 8821 73 28 40 Fax: +49 8821 73 28 41 e-mail: victor.bereznoi@t-online.de vic.ber@gmail.com |
| 6. | Blanc, Cécile | French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity National SBSTTA co-focal point | 195, rue Saint Jacques 75005 Paris | France | Tel.: +33 1 80 05 89 32 Fax: +33 1 80 05 89 59 cecile.blanc@fondationbiodiversite.fr |
| 7. | Bondarenko, Yuliya | Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine, Directorate of Biodiversity, Land Protection and EcoNet | 35, Uritskogo str 03035 Kyiv | Ukraine | Tel.: +380 44/2063153 Fax: +380 44/2063153 e-mail: bondarenko@menr.gov.ua |
| 8. | Borg, Duncan | Malta Environment and Planning Authority Environment Protection Officer | St. Francis Ravelin Floriana, FRN1230 | Malta | Tel.: +356 2290/0000 |
| 9. | Chalaeva, Natalia <i>Organisation</i> | CBD Secretariat | 413, Saint Jaques Street, Suite 800 H2Y 1N9 Montreal, QC | Canada | Tel.: +1 514/652 8173 e-mail: natalia.chalaeva@cbd.int |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|---|
| 10. | Davoyan, Araksya | Ministry of Nature Protection Head of First Division | Republic sq., 3 Government building 10 Yerevan 0010 | Armenia | Tel.: +374 10/540856 Fax: +374 10/585469 e-mail: araksd@gmail.com |
| 11. | Duthie, David <i>Chair</i> | CBD Secretariat | 413, Saint Jaques Street, Suite 800 H2Y 1N9 Montreal, QC | Canada | Tel.: +1 514/549 3917 e-mail: david.duthie@cbd.int |
| 12. | Eladii, Lilia | Ministry of Environment Adviser officer, Natural Resources and Biodiversity Division | 9, Cosmonautilor str. of. 625 Chisinau | Republic of Moldova | Tel.: +373 22/20 45 28 Fax: +373 22/22 68 58 e-mail: eladii@mediu.gov.md eladiililia@yahoo.com |
| 13. | Fyshko, Nataliia | Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine, Directorate of Biodiversity, Land Protection and EcoNet | 35, Uritskogo str 03035 Kyiv | Ukraine | Tel.: +380 44/206-3153 Fax: +380 44/206-3153 e-mail: ecosys@menr.gov.ua |
| 14. | Gevorgyan, Hasmik | Ministry of Nature Protection of RA Division of Biodiversity Policy | Republic sq., 3 Government building 10 Yerevan 0010 | Armenia | Tel.: +374 10/585326 Fax: +374 10/585469 e-mail: artvemlilit@yahoo.com |
| 15. | Dr. Grunewald, Ralf | Consultant | Schulstraße 18 18581 Putbus | Germany | Tel.: +49 152 /01704893 e-mail: ralf_grunewald@gmx.de |
| 16. | Herding, Wiebke | ON:SUBJECT, Worldchanging Communications, CEPA Expert | Brussels | Belgium | Tel.: +32 485 424 661/ e-mail: info@onsubject.eu |
| 17. | Hoxha, Sajmir | Ministry of the Environment Director of Biodiversity Directorate | Durrësi Str. 27 Tirana | Albania | Tel.: +355 682086565/ +355 42239849 Fax: +355 42239849 e-mail: shoxha@moe.gov.al |
| 18. | Kapa, Milena | Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism Senior Advisor | IV Proleterska 19 Podgorica | Montenegro | Tel.: +382 20 446 239 Fax: +382 67 263 5 e-mail: milena.kapa@mrt.gov.me |
| 19. | Kartsivadze, Ioseb | Ministry of the Environment, Office of the CBD National Focal Point in Georgia Head of Biodiversity Protection service | Gulua str. 6 0114 Tbilisi | Georgia | Tel.: +995 32 727232 Fax: +995 32/727231 e-mail: biodepbio@moe.gov.ge s.kartsivadze@moe.gov.ge |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| 20. | Kobakhidze, Natia | Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH Project: Sustainable Management of Biodiversity, South Caucasus | 6, Gulua St. 0114 Tbilisi | Georgia | Tel.: +995 32/201827 e-mail: natia.kobakhidze@giz.de |
| 21. | Kobaslic, Ana | Ministry of Culture, Nature Protection Directorate, Head of Department for Strategic Planning in Nature Conservation and European Integration | Runjaninova 2 HR-10000 Zagreb | Croatia | Tel.: +385 1 4866 125 Fax: +385 1 4866 100 e-mail: ana.kobaslic@min-kulture.hr |
| 22. | Lucas, Thierry | UNEP, Regional Office for Europe | 15, Chemin des Anémones 1219 Châtelaine, Geneva | Switzerland | Tel.: +41 22 917 8771 Fax: +41 22 917 8024 e-mail: thierry.lucas@unep.org |
| 23. | Mészáros-Horváth, Tilla | Ministry of Rural Development | Kossuth Ter 11 H-1055 Budapest | Hungary | Tel.: +36 302684419 Fax: +36 13064646 e-mail: tilla.meszaros@vm.gov.hu |
| 24. | Morgan, Vicky | JNCC Monkstone House | City Rd PE1 1JY PETERBOROUGH | United Kingdom | Tel.: +44 01733/866830 Mobile: +44 07718/749363 e-mail: Vicky.morgan@jncc.gov.uk |
| 25. | Mullova, Ludmila <i>Translator</i> | Interpretation | Melsungerstrasse 17A 60389 Frankfurt | Germany | Tel.: +49 069/59 79 07 11 Fax: +49 069/59 79 07 12 e-mail: mullova@t-online.de |
| 26. | Mutafova, Neli | Ministry of Environment and Water EU Affairs & IC Directorate, Senior Expert, International Cooperation Department | 67 W. Gladstone St., 1000 Sofia | Bulgaria | Tel.: +359 2 940 62 58 Fax: +359 2 987 38 67 n.mutafova@moew.government.bg |
| 27. | Nastov, Aleksandar | Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning Head of Division of Biodiversity, Environment Administration | Bul. Goce Delcev, bb, MTV X (1127) 1000 Skopje | Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia | Tel.: +389 2 3251 446 Fax: +389 2 3213 651 e-mail: a.nastov@moepp.gov.mk |
| 28. | Niedeggen, Barbara | German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation | Konstantinstr. 110 53179 Bonn | Germany | Tel.: +49 228 8491-1744 Fax: +49 228 8491-1719 e-mail: Barbara.Niedeggen@bfn.de |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|---|
| 29. | Nuzzo, Vanessa | Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development, Transport and Housing Head of National Biodiversity Strategy updating project | Arche Sud 92 055 La Défense cedex | France | Tel.: +33 1 40 81 31 52 Fax: +33 1 40 81 37 76 e-mail: vanessa.nuzzo@developpement-durable.gouv.fr |
| 30. | Dr. Paulsch, Axel <i>Speaker</i> | Centre for Environmental Research UFZ - Helmholtz-Zentrum für Umweltforschung | Permoserstr. 15 04318 Leipzig | Germany | Tel.: +49 (0)341/235-1650 e-mail: axel.paulsch@ufz.de |
| 31. | Perret, Sarah Pearson | Federal Office for the Environment Head of Section Species, Habitats, Ecological Networks | 3003 Bern | Switzerland | Tel.: +41 31 322 68 66 e-mail: sarah.pearson@bafu.admin.ch |
| 32. | Prip, Christian | Ministry of Environment Senior International Adviser | Haraldsgade 53 2100 Copenhagen Ø | Denmark | Tel.: +45 72544851 Mobile: +45 256742 e-mail: chp@nst.dk |
| 33. | Rotaru, Alexandru | Ministry of Environment Deputy chief of the Biodiversity office within the Ministry of Environment | Mitropolit Dosoftei str. 156a of 303 Chisinau | Republic of Moldova | Tel.: +373 22/ 84-31-01/ 24-20-22 Fax: +373 22/ 84-31-01/ 24-20-22 e-mail: a.rotaru@gmail.com alexandru.rotaru@undp.org |
| 34. | Schlesser, Marianne | Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences Assistant to the CBD National Focal Point | 29 rue Vautier 1000 Brussels | Belgium | Tel.: +32 2 627 45 25 Fax: +32 2 627 41 41 Mobile: +32 479 840 714 marianne.schlesser@naturalsciences.be |
| 35. | Shulbaeva, Polina | RAIPON-Russian Association of indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and Far East | P.O. Box 169 119415 Moscow | Russian Federation | Tel.: +7 495/7483124 Fax: +7 495/7483124 e-mail: polinashu@yandex.ru |
| 36. | Steiner, Noa (Angel) | Ministry of Environmental Protection, Landcape and Biodiversity Coordinator | POB 34033 Jerusalem | Israel | Tel.: 00972 2-6495846 Fax: 00972 2-6495893 e-mail: NoaS@sviva.gov.il |
| 37. | Stolpe, Gisela <i>Organisation</i> | Federal Agency for Nature Conservation International Academy Isle of Vilm | Insel Vilm 18581 Putbus | Germany | Tel.: +49 38301/86-113 Fax: +49 38301/86-117 e-mail: gisela.stolpe@bfn-vilm.de |
| 38. | Thrainsson, Sigurdur | Ministry for the Environment | Skuggasundi 1 . | Iceland | Tel.: 00354 5458600 Fax: 00354 5624566 sigurdur.thrainsson@environment.is |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|---|--|------------------------|---|
| 39. | Tyrrell, Tristan | UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) | 219 Huntingdon Road Cambridge, CB3 0DL | United Kingdom | Tel.: +44 1223/277-314 Fax: +44 1223/277-136 e-mail: Tristan.Tyrrell@unep-wcmc.org |
| 40. | Vergeichik, Maxim | UNDP Biodiversity and ecosystem management specialist for Europe and CIS | Grosslingova 35 81109 Bratislava | Slovak Republic | Tel.: +421 2/59337-152 Fax: +421 2/59337 -450 e-mail: maxim.vergeichik@undp.org |
| 41. | Walker, Natasha | Consultant | In der Neckarhelle 124 69118 Heidelberg | Germany | Tel.: +49 172/6256486 e-mail: natashantwalker@yahoo.de walker@natashawalker.eu |
| 42. | Wessel, Magnus JK | NABU e.V., Headquarters Policy Officer for Nature Conservation and Species Protection | Charitéstr. 3 10117 Berlin | Germany | Tel.: +49 30/28 49 84-16 18 mobile: +49 172/94 22 694 e-mail: Magnus.Wessel@NABU.de |
| 43. | Wojciechowska, Krystyna | Ministry of Environment Department of Nature Conservation | Ul. Wawelska 52/54 00-922 Warszawa | Poland | Tel.: +48 22/5792-284 Fax: +48 22/5792-750 krystyna.wojciechowska@mos.gov.pl |
| 44. | Zharkina, Natalya | Ministry of Natural Ressources and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Belarus | 10 Kolektornaya Street 220048 Minsk | Republic of Belarus | Tel.: +375 /172005113 Fax: +375 /17200511-11 e-mail: garkina_nat@mail.ru |
