



CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.
GENERAL
UNEP/CBD/NBSAP/WS-TI/1/2
30 April 2008
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

WORKSHOP ON NATIONAL/REGIONAL TARGETS AND INDICATORS AND THEIR INTEGRATION IN NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

FAO, Rome, Italy 16 February 2008
Room Philippines, Building "C-277 / 281"

REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON NATIONAL/REGIONAL TARGETS AND INDICATORS AND THEIR INTEGRATION IN NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

BACKGROUND

1. In decision VII/30 the Conference of the Parties (COP) decided to develop a framework to enhance the evaluation of achievements and progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan and, in particular, its mission, to achieve a significant reduction in the current rate of biodiversity loss at global, regional and national levels (paragraph 1)¹. The COP further agreed that a limited number of indicators be developed and used in reporting, noting that as far as is feasible, the indicators should be identified or developed in such a way that the same indicators may be used at the global, regional, national and local levels as tools for the implementation of the Convention and of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, where so desired by Parties (paragraph 3).
2. In the same decision the COP also decided to establish goals and sub-targets in order to clarify the 2010 global biodiversity target (paragraph 12) and invited Parties and Governments to develop national and/or regional goals and targets, and, as appropriate, to incorporate them into relevant plans, programmes and initiatives, including national biodiversity strategies and action plans (paragraph 15).
3. The workshop on national/regional targets and indicators and their integration in national biodiversity strategies and action plans was organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), with financial support from the European Commission, to facilitate the exchange of experiences made at national and regional levels with regard to the development of biodiversity targets and indicators.
4. NN participants from XX countries participated in the workshop. A list of participants is contained in Annex 1.

OPENING

5. Dr. Ahmed Djoghlaif, Executive Secretary of the CBD, welcomed the participants and emphasized the critical role of monitoring biodiversity at scales that are relevant for decision-making. He stressed the significance of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) as tools for

¹ The framework was updated in Decision VIII/15.

ensuring that biodiversity considerations are addressed as countries strive to achieve their development objectives. He thanked the European Community, through the Commission, for the financial support made available for this workshop.

6. Robert Höft, CBD Programme Officer for Monitoring and Scientific Assessments, reviewed the objectives of the workshop as follows:

(a) to learn from the experience in selected countries and regions with the development and use of biodiversity-related targets and indicators and their integration in national/regional biodiversity strategy and action plans;

(b) to encourage participants to start or pursue processes for target setting and indicator development in their countries/regions;

(c) to establish a network of expertise that could assist where questions and difficulties in the development of targets and indicators arise.

7. He suggested that, while the agenda for the day might best be handled flexibly, the morning session should focus on targets while the afternoon would be dedicated to indicators.

8. Anne Teller, DG Environment at the European Commission, emphasized the importance of biodiversity targets and indicators and welcomed the workshop as a means towards:

(a) creating a network of expertise across countries/regions;

(b) enforcing the knowledge base in general, and biodiversity in particular;

(c) communicating the policy to communities and decision-makers;

(d) implementing policy actions on the ground.

9. She reported that the action plan of the European Community has 10 objectives, 46 targets and over 150 actions with very few objectively measurable targets, which renders progress towards the objectives and targets of the EU Biodiversity Action Plan difficult to assess. Under the Streamlining European 2010 Biodiversity Indicators (SEBI2010) project, the European Community has developed 26 biodiversity indicators based on the CBD framework for monitoring implementation of the Convention and achievement of the 2010 target. During this process, it appeared that while there is an abundance of expertise it is challenging to interlink and integrate data in a coherent framework and improve information for policy-making. She considered networking activities, partnerships, collaboration across geographical levels (e.g. regional, national and subglobal) as a key component for improving information about biodiversity. The description of national terrestrial and marine monitoring schemes within Europe is available in the EUMON database (<http://eumon.ckff.si>).

TARGETS

10. David Duthie, UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit, facilitated the session on targets. Following a round of self-introductions he asked the following questions:

How many among the countries present in the room have...	Response
An NBSAP with quantified target(s)?	12
An NBSAP with timebound target(s)?	7
An NBSAP with 2010 targets (or targets beyond 2010)?	7
A national budget allocation for implementing their NBSAP?	7
Their NBSAP under revision?	7

11. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, Director of Biodiversity Conservation, Ministry of the Environment of Brazil, made a presentation on the Brazilian experience in setting national biodiversity

goals and targets for 2010. ² He reported that the CBD framework had served as a reference in developing the suite of targets for Brazil but not as a restriction. The objective was to identify targets that should be challenging yet feasible to achieve and should take into account the country's realities. As a first step a map of the major terrestrial biomes was developed.

12. To guide the formulation of realistic targets three scenarios were to be used as a guide: business as usual, optimistic, pessimistic, taking into account economic, social, and technology developments. It turned out that in many cases datasets did not exist to calculate current trends and in some cases there was not even a baseline. It was therefore initially decided to make public calls to contract biodiversity status, trends assessment and forecast for each biome as well as made public calls to contract biodiversity status, trends assessment and forecast for the whole country but no realistic offer was received.

13. In October 2006 a national seminar was organized with a series of roundtables involving 20-30 experts who were able to assess status and trends of selected biodiversity components, trends and response measures. The experts also extrapolated the current trends up to the year 2010 using the 3 scenarios outlined above. On the basis of this assessment the National Biodiversity Commission (CONABIO) adopted a set of 51 national biodiversity targets for 2010 including 14 targets for conservation, 13 targets for sustainable use, 7 targets for impact mitigation, 8 targets for access and benefit sharing, 3 targets for research, 3 targets for education and information and 3 targets for financing and technology transference.

14. The discussion following the presentation centred around the following issues:

- (a) the timeframe for implementation of the strategy and the consequences of the focus on 2010 for future monitoring beyond 2010;
- (b) the level of public consultation;
- (c) the need to limit the number of targets to maintain focus and concentrate efforts;
- (d) the relevance of both process-oriented and outcome-oriented. Data-poor low income countries might want to focus initially on establishing an enabling policy environment and assessing progress primarily through process indicators. However, outcome-oriented targets are also required to permit an assessment of the effectiveness of policies and management measures;
- (e) successful approaches to communicate status and trends of biodiversity;
- (f) linkages to other assessment processes (for example Global Environment Outlook);
- (g) budget limitations in pursuing biodiversity targets;
- (h) the establishment of a Virtual Institute of Biodiversity as an approach to bring together and integrate data and information from a range of providers;
- (i) the need for trade-offs to address new challenges and pressures and the use of spatial planning and zonation to prevent encroachment into areas set aside for biodiversity conservation;
- (j) the management of ecosystems across national boundary and the challenges presented by different objectives, legislation and management regimes; and
- (k) the global footprint of national or regional policies and their possible impacts on the achievement of national or regional targets. For example, the biofuel blending targets set by the European Union has effects on agricultural production, land use and commodity prices worldwide.

² The full presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/nbsap/wsti-nbsap-01/other/wsti-nbsap-01-br-target-en.pdf>

15. Following the discussion of the Brazilian experience, participants were invited to report on progress made in their countries.

16. Croatia's NBSAP, adopted in 1999, included desirable actions but lacked a concrete and realistic plan to implement these. It was described as a wish list without time-bound targets and funding. The one area in which the plan was fully implemented was the setting of environmental/biodiversity legislation. In 2006 a new assessment of the status of implementation was carried out. It showed an improvement in the integration of biodiversity in different sectors: physical planning, forestry, and hunting. It had failed in water management because of a struggle about priorities among different stakeholders and sectors. While until a few years ago, biodiversity data were not readily available an information system on biodiversity is currently being established which will become functional in the course of 2008. This information system will also serve to ensure that the target of a functional national ecological network covering 47% of country to be established by 2010 will include all areas that are critical for biodiversity conservation. In other fields there is limited capacity and often too many targets and not enough or sufficiently clear indicators. Croatia is currently revising its NBSAP and will use the Fourth National Report to CBD to analyse priorities and determine how to achieve its objectives. It is also envisaged to include a budget allocation or at least an estimate of the cost for carrying out those priority activities and it would be desirable to include indicators for selected targets.

17. Turkey has indicators to monitor implementation of its NBSAP and these were developed on the basis of expert opinion. Unfortunately, however, implementation is hampered by a lack of coordination among institutions.

18. Serbia has adopted a resolution on biodiversity, followed by the establishment of a biodiversity target, and is now developing an NBSAP which is expected to be completed by the end of 2008. It includes targets on protected area coverage and a section on landscape diversity. In the forestry sector biodiversity is well integrated while cross-sectoral cooperation involving the agriculture sector needs to be improved. Spatial planning needs to take in account the conservation needs as well as the needs of different sectors. It is envisaged to also develop targets for access and benefit-sharing and traditional knowledge and to include these in the NBSAP.

19. The former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia developed a national environmental action plan in the 1990s. Its first NBSAP was completed in 2004, when also the First National Report to the CBD was submitted. The NBSAP includes targets which generally correspond to global targets. Several of these are quantified and have certain deadlines. However, an assessment showed that 70-80% of the activities planned in the NBSAP are not implemented. The main constraint thereby is the lack of financial resources, and there is no national budget allocated for biodiversity conservation. There is a national biodiversity committee and another one on implementation of the strategy. At the policy level FYR Macedonia has well established legislation and strategies including legislation on nature protection, clear targets and clear provisions and which have implications for national spatial planning. Data on biodiversity are generally scattered and in the ownership of scientific institutions and NGOs. Generally, NGOs play an important role in biodiversity conservation and monitoring and they could use their data to develop selected biodiversity indicators, as well as a national Red Data list and a new land cover map. With an unemployment rate of around 35%, biodiversity in itself is not a top priority and any conservation efforts need to be holistic and lead to better incorporation of biodiversity in relevant sectors and in strategies for rural development. The analysis that is due for the Fourth National Report to the CBD may demonstrate how to streamline activities in order to improve implementation.

20. Suhel al-Janabi (GeoMedia) introduced a poster tool, developed jointly with the UNDP Equator Initiative and the CBD Secretariat and supported by GTZ and the German Ministry for the Environment, to facilitate mapping project outcomes against Millennium Development Goals. This tool has recently

been adapted to map strategic objectives and activities of NBSAPs against the framework of targets adopted by the CBD (decisions VII/30 and VIII/15). ³ A demonstration of the tool was made. ⁴

INDICATORS

21. The afternoon session began with a brief introduction by Ms Ivonne Higuero (UNEP Regional Office for Europe) including a brief survey of the current status of indicators development:

How many among the countries present in the room have...	Response
adopted the CBD Global 2010 indicator set?	3
a national set of indicators relevant to the CBD?	3
a different set of indicators?	4
initiated the technical design procedure to national indicators?	5
established a monitoring system for national indicators?	4
produced and the indicator?	5
are using the indicators for communication to policy-makers, others?	6

22. Following the survey, three presentations were made.

23. Philip Bubb (UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre) introduced one of the component of the GEF-supported project on the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (2010BIP; <http://www.twentyten.net>) focusing on capacity development and the linkages between global and national monitoring and indicators. ⁵ The project will seek to encourage national governments and regional organizations to both use and contribute to the improved delivery of global indicators. To achieve this it is foreseen to develop guidelines and other tools to facilitate the use of existing indicator methodologies and to increase the use of local, national, and regional datasets underpinning the global 2010 indicators, which would then allow disaggregating global information for regional and possibly national analyses.

24. A number of regional capacity-building workshops on the use of biodiversity indicators will be organized as part of the project and these should put countries in a better position to prepare the Fourth National Reports and to update their NBSAPs, including biodiversity targets and indicators.

25. Richard Odongo (Kenya Wildlife Service) reported on the process that led to the development of indicators for wetlands in Kenya. ⁶ He introduced existing national biodiversity and targets which provided the framework for indicator development. The wetlands indicators were developed as part of the project on Biodiversity Indicators for National Use (BINU ⁷) but were integrated into a larger set of projects and activities assessing linkages between biodiversity and poverty and identifying areas of particular importance for biodiversity conservation. Links were also established to activities that could contribute to the indicator development such as the Lake Victoria Environmental Management Programme.

26. The process then undertook a national consultation to identify and engage stakeholders for biodiversity management in each sector to lead certain aspects of the development of a wetlands monitoring programme. Several difficulties were encountered including:

³ The presentation is accessible from <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/nbsap/wsti-nbsap-01/other/wsti-nbsap-01-gtz-fmecd-cbd-poster-en.pdf>. Examples of posters are available from <http://www.cbd.int/meetings/wgri-02/poster-session.shtml>.

⁴ Guidelines are available from <http://www.cbd.int/meetings/wgri-02/poster-guidelines.shtml> and the online poster generation tool as accessible at <http://nbsaps.onlinegeneration.com/>.

⁵ See <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/nbsap/wsti-nbsap-01/other/wsti-nbsap-01-unep-wcmc-bip-en.pdf>

⁶ See <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/nbsap/wsti-nbsap-01/other/wsti-nbsap-01-kws-ind-en.pdf>

⁷ A presentation on the agricultural indicators in the Ukraine as part of the BINU project is accessible at <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/nbsap/wsti-nbsap-01/other/wsti-nbsap-01-wcmc-ind-en.pdf>

- (a) some stakeholders were only interested in the outcomes and not the process;
- (b) it was difficult to maintain stakeholder participation over longer periods of time;
- (c) catering for a different levels and types of stakeholders required a range of approaches;
- (d) private sector stakeholders were difficult to mobilize; and
- (e) education, communication and awareness are critical for maintaining the participation of key institutions throughout the process.

27. By focusing on questions for which answers could be found easily but with were of greatest importance and impact on the other hand and by mapping indicators and data sets to these key questions it was possible to concentrate and agree on a limited number of indicators that could effectively detect ecosystem change and that could be included in a long-term monitoring programme. Not all the indicators that were developed turned out to be effective however. Especially those that did not take into account human livelihoods and well-being were considered to be of limited relevance. For engaging the wider public and ensuring that the indicators feed into reporting processes it was found to be critical to align a number of recognized personalities to champion the findings.

28. Tor-Björn Larsson (European Environment Agency) reported on the process of Streamlining European 2010 Biodiversity Indicators (SEBI 2010). ⁸ The indicators adopted for Europe largely match the set of headline indicators adopted by the CBD (decisions VII/30 and VIII/15). ⁹ The process which started in 2005 is still continuing and involves a large number of institutions and over 100 experts. In the course of two years 26 indicators were selected by the Coordination Team from amongst more than 80 possible indicators and fact sheets with methodologies and data sources developed and published. ¹⁰ In the second phase three working groups consider (i) interlinkages between the indicators; (ii) climate change as a cross-cutting issue; and (iii) effective means of communication of indicator information. Further thinking goes into the development of storylines to underpin and complement the indicators; data gaps and improvements needed as well as the sustainability of data flows. The information will feed into three major reports including a report based on the indicators expected for 2009, the State of Europe's Environment report in 2010 and a European assessment called EURECA which is based on the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and its conceptual framework. The work on mapping the occurrence of known "worst" invasive alien species was presented as an example.

29. The discussion following the presentation centred around the following issues:

- (a) the use of data versus expert opinion in underpinning indicator information. Expert opinion can help to overcome data gaps and inconsistencies but the credibility of the indicator depends on the credibility of the process/organization behind the development of the indicator. If an indicator is promoted only by a conservation group it is less likely to be "believed" than when it is endorsed by a wide range of stakeholders;
- (b) the use of environmental indicators (indicators on water, air, transport, tourism) as proxies for biodiversity rather than specific biodiversity indicators. Macedonia, for example, established specific working groups to develop targets, indicators and generate new data;
- (c) the use of disaggregated indicators as opposed to complex indices and which may provide better arguments for policy makers. Indicators which can point to the driving forces that sustain/reinforce undesired trends and point to solutions are particularly powerful;
- (d) the challenge to effectively communicate indicators information;

⁸ <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/nbsap/wsti-nbsap-01/other/wsti-nbsap-01-sebi-2010-en.pdf>

⁹ Further details are available at <http://biodiversity-chm.eea.europa.eu/information/indicator/F1090245995>

¹⁰ See SEBI 2010 technical report: http://reports.eea.europa.eu/technical_report_2007_11/en

(e) the use and credibility of data generated by NGOs. In some countries these may be considered of limited value while in others, for example the UK, a majority of data may come from NGOs and their acceptance by the public is high because data are derived from scientifically rigorous and transparent processes;

(f) the difficulties of up-scaling and down-scaling information (minimum resolution requirements; incompatibility of data sets etc.): the methodology needs to undergo expert validation;

(g) dangers of mixing process and outcome-based targets, mixing indicators and targets, up-scaling and down-scaling information needs an expert validation process;

(h) the quest for the perfect indicator: even imperfect indicators can generate useful discussion and dialogue that can raise awareness and actually generate progress towards goals. Attention was drawn to the outcome of a CBD expert meeting, which provided a stepwise approach towards the development of national-level indicators and a large amount of background information and information sources; ¹¹

(i) access to, and the decision to use, data: for example GBIF (www.gbif.org) commissioned a paper to explore the use of museum records in current conservation planning- (“How global is the GBIF?”).

30. Participants agreed that it would be critical to share information on the topics that were discussed, for example by drawing attention to relevant websites and making available the information that was presented in the workshop. It was also agreed that the personal contact among participants should be encouraged by making available the list of participants (see Annex 1).

31. David Cooper, Chief, Planning and Programme Coordination at the CBD Secretariat, made a presentation on the preparation of the Fourth National Report and how the information from national reports would be used to assess the achievement of the 2010 biodiversity target and reported through the third edition of Global Biodiversity Outlook. ¹² He reminded participants that the submission of national reports is one of the few mandatory provisions under the Convention (Article 26) and how critical the information to feed progress in national implementation into the CBD policy development process, which in turn would impact on national implementation. But the process of preparing and the findings of national reports are equally critical for national level planning, prioritization and resource mobilization. He introduced the format and structure of the Fourth National Report which is due on 31 May 2009 consisting of (i) an assessment of status and trends of and threats to biodiversity, (ii) and review of progress made in the implementation of the NBSAP, (iii) and an analysis of progress achieved in mainstreaming biodiversity into economic sectors, which collectively provide the basis for (iv) a conclusions of the achievement of the 2010 biodiversity target and the Strategic Plan of the Convention at the national level. The report should be prepared in consultation with a wide range of stakeholders.

32. He drew attention to guidance developed by the CBD Secretariat to assist Parties in preparing their Fourth National Report including the guidelines ¹³, a suite of training modules ¹⁴, as well as funding provided to eligible countries by the Global Environment Facility. ¹⁵ In response to questions on the format he said that there was a lot of flexibility to add hyperlinks, graphics and refer to other materials and if the product was useful to the Party it would be useful for the Secretariat analysis. While findings from the Fourth National Report may not allow for a comprehensive global analysis it will be used to draw case studies, examples and lessons learned and to incorporate these into GBO-3. Indeed,

¹¹ <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/nbsap/wsti-nbsap-01/other/wsti-nbsap-01-sbstta-09-inf-07-en.doc>

¹² <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/nbsap/wsti-nbsap-01/other/wsti-nbsap-01-scbd-nr4-en.pdf>

¹³ <http://www.cbd.int/reports/guidelines.shtml>

¹⁴ <http://www.cbd.int/nbsap/guidance-tools/training-modules.shtml>

¹⁵ Country request template available at: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/nr/nr-04/country-request-en.doc> and model endorsement letter available at <http://www.cbd.int/doc/nr/nr-04/endorsement-letter-en.doc>

Parties might consider their Fourth National Report as the national complement to GBO-3, and thus as a major communication tool about the implementation of NBSAPs and the achievement of the 2010 biodiversity target and the Strategic Plan of the CBD at the national level.

44. Before closure of the workshop participants were requested to complete an evaluation form which was handed out. Results are included as Annex 2.

Annex 1
List of Participants

CBD Parties

Brazil

Dr. Bráulio Ferreira de Souza Dias
Director of Biodiversity Conservation
Secretary of Biodiversity and Forests
Ministry of the Environment

Croatia

Kruzic Kristina
Croatian Environment Agency

Ms. Andrea Stefan
Head of Department
Nature Protection Directorate

Ethiopia

Dr Kassahun Embaye
Deputy Director General
Institute of Biodiversity Conservation

France

Ms. Sophie Condé
Chef de projet biodiversité et information
Centre Thématique Européen / Biodiversité
Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle (France)

Georgia

Mrs. Anna Rukhadze
Main Specialist
Biodiversity Protection Service
Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources

Germany

Mr. Suheil Al Janabi
Consultant, GEO Media GbR
GeoMedia Consult

Guinea

Mr. Maadjou Bah
Coordonnateur du Projet Diversité Biologique/SBSTTA Focal Point
Direction Nationale de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie
Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Environnement

Kenya

Mr. Richard Odongo
Technical Officer - BINU Project – Kenya
Kenya Wildlife Service

Kyrgyzstan

Bactybek Koychumanov
State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry

Mexico

Ms. Gael Almeida
Coordinator of international affairs
Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad

Netherlands

Mr. Ben Ten Brink
Co-ordinator Biodiversity
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality

Niger

Ms. Manou Aï Kassomou
Conseillère
Unité Technique Diversité Biologique, Eau et Développement Durable
Conseil National de l'Environnement pour un Développement Durable
(CNEDD)

Thailand

Dr. Chaweewan Hutacharem
Senior Advisor
Office of Natural Resources and Environmental
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Robertina Brajanoska
Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

Turkey

Mr. Mehmet Gölge
Environment & Forest Expert
Ministry of Environment and Forestry

Ms. Hüsniye Kiliçarslan
Biologist
General Directorate of Nature Protection and National Parks
Ministry of Environment and Forestry

Mrs. Burçak Kocuklu
Environment and Forestry Deputy Expert
Dept. of Nature Conservation
Ministry of Environment and Forestry

Mrs. Ergül Terzioğlu

Biologist, Dept. of Nature Conservation
General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks
Ministry of Environment and Forestry

Mr. Ümit Turan
Chief of Section, Biologist
Ministry of Environment and Forestry

Ukraine

Vasiliy Kostushyn
Head of Department of Monitoring and Conservation of Animals
Institute of Zoology

**United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland**

Mr. Paul Rose
International Adviser
Joint Nature Conservation Committee

United Nations and Specialized Agencies

**Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the
Global Environment Facility**

Mr. Paul Ferraro
Department of Economics, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies
Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the Global Environment
Facility

**United Nations Environment Programme, Regional
Office for
Europe (UNEP/ROE)**

Ms. Ivonne Higuero
Programme Officer, Biodiversity

**United Nations Environment Programme, Global
Environment Facility (UNEP/GEF)**

Mr. David Duthie
SCBD Liaison Officer

Inter-Governmental Organizations

Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF)

Ms. Beatriz Torres
Senior Programme Officer
Outreach and Capacity Building

Indigenous and Local Community

Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact

Mr. Mrinalini Rai
Assistan Coordinator
Collaborative Management Learning Network for Indigenous
Peoples and Protected Areas in Southeast Asia

Observers

**Agenzia per la Protezione dell'Ambiente e per i
Servizi Tecnici (APAT)**

Ms. Claudio Piccini

Agency for the Protection of the Environment

Carlo Jacomini

SCBD

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif
Executive Secretary

Mr. David Cooper
Senior Programme Officer
Implementation and Technical Support

Mr. Robert Höft
Environmental Affairs Officer, Scientific Assessment
Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters

Ms. Sandra Meehan
Programme Assistant
Implementation and Technical Support

Annex 2

Evaluation Form: Targets and Indicators and their integration into NBSAPs (February 16, 2008)

Question 1: Did the overall workshop meet your expectations?

Yes : 12 No : 2 No Response: 1

Comments:

- I think it was a very useful workshop
- There was no mention to the presentations that were sent as docs for this workshop
- But we mostly discussed general issues. Not enough good examples of practical implementation of indicators.
- I expected more opportunity to exchange views with a broader range of countries & clearer up front objectives for the day.
- Good work

Question 2: Please describe very briefly how useful you found the exchanges

Very good: 2 Good: 11 Fair: 1 Poor: No Response: 1

Comments:

- Good presentations from different perspectives & geographical areas.
- Especially on targets
- Excellent mixture of experiences & stakeholders

Question 3: Was enough time allowed for discussion and interaction between workshop?

Yes: 11 No: 3 No Response: 1

Comments:

- It might give much more time
- Partly

Question 4: Do you feel that this experience will enhance your ability to make progress on national targets and their integration in your NBSAP?:

Yes: 13 No: 1 No Response: 1

Comments:

- Not really
- But not much. I didn't expect this though.
- Hopefully, I'll do my best.

Question 5: Do you feel that this experience will enhance your ability to make progress on indicators and their integration in your NBSAP?:

Yes: 10 No: 4 No Response: 1

Comments:

- Yes, but need more specific indicators to carry out at national level that should be explained.
- Yes, to a certain extent.
- Yes, share of different experiences.
- No, it was not clear enough on how indicators are or can be incorporated to NBSAP.
- Not sure, exchange was valuable but not enhancing the ability.
- Yes, partly.
- No, already done.
- Yes, I'll take this shared experience as a new start.

Question 6: Do you have other comments or suggestions for improvement for future workshops of this kind:

Comments:

- Additional workshops needed to develop common understanding of indicators and related concepts. No other way!
- Breaks are required, and thank you.
- Thank you for arranging this workshop
- More hands on country presentations to have a basis for comparison.
- To do it more narrow/precise.
- More active broader exchange of views - less presentations. Brazil and Kenya were very good.
- Try and involve all participants as a new start. (even the 'frustrated' ones!)

Question 7: Please state one thing that you will take away from this workshop and apply in your work

Comment:

- Use participants for further contacts!
- Experience in developing indicators.
- C.D.
- Thinking indicators how I can integrate in my experience of national level applications.
- Kenya experience – involvement and consultation with different stakeholders.
- Collection of other regional experiences.
- Considering country experiences in further work.
- Implementation indicators in national monitoring programme.
- Linking national reporting more explicitly to CBD.
- Enthusiasm, commitment, determination.