



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/INF/5
9 June 2014

ENGLISH ONLY

AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

Fifth meeting

Montreal, 16-20 June 2014

Item 6 of the provisional agenda*

EXPERIENCES IN APPLYING THE PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK

Compilation and analysis of information received from Parties

Note by the Executive Secretary

1. In paragraph 5 of decision XI/4, on review of implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization, including the establishment of targets, the Conference of the Parties, at its eleventh meeting, welcomed and decided to use the preliminary reporting framework and methodological and implementation guidance contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/11/14/Add.1 as a flexible and preliminary framework to report on and monitor resources mobilized for biodiversity at national and global level, and invited Parties to build on this flexible framework at national level as part of monitoring, including in the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, as appropriate, and to report prior to the fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention on successes and barriers encountered in reporting on and monitoring resources mobilized for biodiversity, in view of the review foreseen in paragraph 23 of the same decision.
2. Paragraph 6 of the same decision invited Parties and other Governments to submit their information through the preliminary reporting framework referred to in paragraph 5, using average annual biodiversity funding for the years 2006-2010 as a preliminary baseline, and to report on their experiences of applying the preliminary reporting framework prior to the fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention in a timely manner for their consideration by the Working Group.
3. In paragraph 7 of decision XI/4 the Conference of the Parties resolved to achieve preliminary targets as enumerated in subparagraphs 7 (a) to 7 (d) of this decision. Paragraph 23 of the same decision requested the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, at its fifth meeting, to further review the preliminary reporting framework and baseline information for each of the targets, including the role of collective action, including by indigenous and local communities, and non-market-based approaches to achieving the objectives of the Convention, and requested the Executive

* UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/1.

/...

Secretary to prepare a note based on information received from Parties on the application of the preliminary reporting framework.

4. Pursuant to this request, the Executive Secretary sent notification 2013-050 (Ref. No. SCBD/TSI/RS/ML/lz/82040) dated 25 June 2013, inviting submission of pertinent information by Parties and other Governments by 28 February 2014. Notification 2014-019 (Ref. No. SCBD/TSI/RS/ML/GD/82040) was sent 4 February 2014 as a reminder, and notification 2014-41 (Ref. No. SCBD/TSI/RS/ML/GD/82040), sent 18 March 2014, granted an extension of the deadline for submissions to 6 April 2014.

4. As of 1 May 2014, submissions were received from 31 Parties, namely: Austria, Bolivia, Bulgaria, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, India, Japan, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, and Uganda. These submissions found entry into the analysis and synthesis provided in document UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/4 (section III). In addition, the present document also includes the submission from Australia, which was received after the date above.

5. The following sub-sections provide a compilation and analysis of the information received. The comments and other information provided by Parties are taken verbatim from submissions. The complete submissions can be retrieved under <http://www.cbd.int/financial/statistics.shtml>. In order to facilitate the further review of the preliminary reporting framework and baseline information for each of the targets, as requested by decision XI/4, section II of this note is organized in accordance with the individual targets contained in paragraph 7 of decision XI/4. Section III provides a compilation and analysis of general comments received, including on the role of collective action, including by indigenous and local communities, and non-market-based approaches to achieving the objectives of the Convention, as well as on successes and barriers encountered in reporting on and monitoring resources mobilized for biodiversity. Section IV provides conclusions.

II. REVIEW OF THE BASELINE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK FOR EACH OF THE TARGETS CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPH 7 OF DECISION XI/4

6. Each of the following sub-sections provides (a) a tabular overview on the extent of which the pertinent sections of the preliminary reporting were completed, including, as applicable, the average degree of confidence assigned; and (b) a compilation of the additional comments provided by Parties. For the applicable sections of the preliminary reporting framework that seek qualitative information, a compilation of responses provided by Parties is also included. Document UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/4 provides a synthesis and succinct analysis of the information provided under the pertinent sections of the preliminary reporting framework.

A. *Double total biodiversity-related international financial resource flows to developing countries (paragraph 7(a) of decision XI/4)*

(a) Tabular overview

Target as per decision XI/4	Paragraph 7 (a): Double total biodiversity-related international financial resource flows to developing countries , in particular least developed countries and small island developing States, as well as countries with economies in transition, by 2015 and at least maintaining this level until 2020, in accordance with Article 20 of the Convention, to contribute to the achievement of the Convention's three objectives, including through a country-driven prioritization of biodiversity within development plans in recipient countries, using the preliminary baseline referred to in paragraph 6.
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Relevant section of PRF	1. Information on international flows of financial resources						
Type of flow	ODA	OPF/OOF	Private/market	Non for profit	Overall confidence level		
					H	M	L
	Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia (multi, direct), EU, Finland, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan (direct), Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, Norway, New Zealand, Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia (direct), Spain, Sweden, Thailand (direct), Uganda, United Kingdom (direct)	Australia, Czech Republic, New Zealand, Thailand, United Kingdom		Denmark (included in ODA)	Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Maurit., New Zealand, Spain, Sweden, Thailand	Australia, Estonia, EU, Czech Republic, India, Namibia, Netherlands, Uganda, United Kingdom	

Not reported	China, Greece, Switzerland	Austria, Bulgaria, China, Croatia, Ethiopia, Estonia, EU, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, India, Japan, Maurit., Namibia, Netherlands, Italy, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Uganda	Austria, Bulgaria, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, EU, Estonia, EU, Finland, France, Greece, India, Italy, Japan, Mauritius, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom	Austria, Bulgaria, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Estonia, EU, Finland, France, Greece, India, Italy, Japan, Mauritius, Namibia, New Zealand, Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Spain , Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom	Norway		
--------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	--	--

(b) Comments

Australia: Table 1 establishes a baseline for average annual international biodiversity-related financial flows from Australia to developing countries for the period 2006-2010 of AUD\$98 million per annum. Data included in Table 1 was extracted from official Australian Government reports.

The Australian Government has adopted a phased approach to reporting implementation of the resource mobilization strategy of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Private sector funds, including from business and non-government organisations will be reported in future years.

The Australian Government is working with the newly established CBD Australian Business and Biodiversity Initiative to develop an appropriate framework to report on private sector implementation of the resource mobilization strategy in Australia and will commence reporting to the CBD once this framework has been established.

Australia's financial year runs from July 1 to June 30. Data reported for the 2006 – 2007 financial year are reported here as 2006. This reporting process is repeated for every subsequent year (i.e., 2006 – 2010). No distinction has been made between direct or indirect impacts on biodiversity.

Austria: Data for Austrian ODA, commitments; Overall Total calculated using an adjustment factor = 50% for indirectly related amounts.

Bulgaria: ODA-bilateral directly related only.

Croatia: In addition to ODA funding flows provided to support the biodiversity of the Country, as outlined in this part of the report, we would like to inform you that Croatia was economy in transition in the reporting period (2006 - 2010) and has received significant ODA funds for the biodiversity activities.

The amount and type of financial flows are integrated in the data under the second part of this Preliminary Reporting Framework.

Czech Republic: The data presented in this section have been evaluated using the methodology of OECD-DAC – by using the Rio Markers by the team of experts assessing individual activities and projects within ODA. For the activities directly related to biodiversity 100% of the total project amount was taken. For those activities significantly but only partially relevant to the objectives of the CBD (Rio Marker 1), only 40% of their total amount was taken into account.

The category related to multilateral ODA includes contributions and payments to international conventions and to GEF. This part does not include the financial flows provided through the GEF that might be indirectly related to biodiversity. The amount of financial flows in this category provided to the GEF contains only amount provided through the GEF directly to biodiversity related activities.

The category related to other official flows contains contributions and payments to other international agreements such as the Bern Convention or Carpathian Convention and also partially those activities, which are co-financed under the LIFE+ projects (partly co-financed by the EU).

Data for other categories are not currently available.

Denmark: Sources of information are the MFA CRS-forms 2001-2012, the Danida Annual Reports 2001-2012, DANIDA's Programme and Project Database as well as information published in the Foreign Ministry's Annual Programme and Project Orientation (PPO) and other official reports from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The statistical summaries are compiled in the report "The Danish assistance in relation to the Rio Conventions 2001 – 2010".

Total Danish multilateral contributions of relevance to the CBD objectives. Include contributions to World Bank, AfDB, AsDB, IDB, UNDP, UNEP, UNEP/DHI, GEF. Not included is biodiversity related support to IUCN, IIED, WWF, IISD, IWGIA, WRI with a total average of 48 million DKK pr. year for the years 2006-2010.

Assistance through Danish NGOs working on development issues has also been examined and analyzed using the definitions of the OECD/DAC markers on aid targeting the objectives of the CBD. Resources used by NGO's are included in 1.1.2 and not in 1.4 and does include the contribution from Danida as well as other sources of finance if so exist.

Biodiversity related aid is defined as activities that promote at least one of the three objectives of the CBD: the conservation of biodiversity, the sustainable use of its components (ecosystems, species or genetic resources), or the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits of the utilisation of genetic resources.

All funding of bilateral projects within the water, energy, agriculture, forestry and environment sectors has been examined. Both aid activities reported to OECD-DAC as targeting the Conventions as a "principal objective" and as "significant objective" have been fully included in the assessment. Source 'The Danish Assistance in relation to the Convention on Biological Diversity', The Ministry of Foreign affairs.

EU: The indirectly-related activity category includes projects for which biodiversity is a significant but not primary objective, and the internal methodology of applying 40% to Rio Marker 1 projects has been applied to projects in this category.

The EU Member States and the European Commission have their own individual methodology for accounting resources. The methodology differs across Member States. This makes it difficult to compile and compare data across the EU. Details are provided on the methodology at EU and Member State level for the sake of transparency and to account for possible differences. There are in particular differences in the way funding linked to Rio marker 1 projects for OECD DAC countries is treated (often this is referred to as indirect flows). Most Member States account for these projects/flows only partially, either by:

- using a common reduction rate (equal or close to 40 %)
- using different rates according to sectoral categorization;
- identifying on a case by case basis the sectoral component of the project which contributes to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity significantly, and accounting for this component at a 100 % rate.

However, some Member States still account for indirect flows which contribute significantly to biodiversity objectives in full. In addition, some EU Member States are not OECD DAC members, and therefore do not use the Rio marker methodology.

Overall, at the current stage of reporting, the difference in approaches does not allow for full comparability or for aggregation of contributions from Member States in a meaningful way. However, the European Commission and EU Member States are active in exchanging best practices and discussions on the best way forward and on methodologies are ongoing, to improve the reporting of progress towards the achievement of the Hyderabad global commitment, to which the EU and Member States resolved to contribute, together and for which it does not imply any specific burden-sharing agreement between Member States and/or the EU.

There are a number of initiatives in EU Member States and at EU level, including capacity-building and training of relevant officials, to improve monitoring and reporting international biodiversity-related flows, for example to improve the use of Rio markers. There are also several efforts to engage the private sector, although there is not sufficient progress at this stage to translate this into quantitative data, and reported flows focus on ODA. In that context, the EU welcomes the ongoing initiatives in OECD DAC which should help make progress both in improving the use of Rio markers and on measuring private flows.

Progress compared to the 2006-2010 baseline is positive in the EU budget and in many EU Member States. For example in Italy, financial resource flows to developing countries has increased by 60% and Germany has more than doubled its contributions to biodiversity compared to the 2006-2010 baseline; and France has also made an important increase. It is worth highlighting that several Member States had already made important efforts during the baseline period. The Hyderabad commitments have been translated into formal national strategies in many Member States, such as for example in France, with the adoption by the French Development Agency (Agence Française de Développement) of its crosscutting framework of action on biodiversity.

Mainstreaming biodiversity in development sectors is an effective way to increase financial resource flows to developing countries. This is reflected in the relative increase of indirect flows in the EU budget and in many EU Member States.

France: Conformément à ces engagements, la France a commencé un travail de comptabilisation des ressources mobilisées en faveur de la biodiversité à l'international. Les données communiquées dans le cadre de ce questionnaire constituent un premier ensemble de données synthétiques en cours de construction. En raison de la nouveauté du cadre de rapportage, ces premières données n'ont pas vocation à constituer une compilation chiffrée exhaustive de référence. S'agissant des lignes "Bilateral ODA" (Aide publique au développement bilatérale ou APD), ces lignes compilent des données de l'Agence française de développement et du Fonds français pour l'environnement mondial mais ne comprennent pas les actions financées par les instituts de recherche dont la comptabilisation est en cours ; La méthodologie de comptabilisation des activités directes et indirectes est incluse dans l'onglet (Méthodologie) joint au formulaire "Données France". S'agissant des lignes "Multilateral ODA" (Aide publique au développement multilatérale ou APD), celles-ci comptabilisent la contribution française au volet biodiversité du Fonds pour l'environnement mondial (FEM). S'agissant des autres fonds multilatéraux qui financent des projets biodiversité, il n'est pas possible d'évaluer la part française affectée à la biodiversité sur la période. Parallèlement à l'Aide publique au développement (APD), la

France verse des contributions obligatoires aux principales organisations internationales et accords multilatéraux environnementaux en lien avec la biodiversité (environ 10 millions d'euros par an). Pour information, le Fonds français pour l'environnement mondial (FFEM) est un fonds public bilatéral créé en 1994 par le Gouvernement français à la suite de la conférence des Nations unies pour l'environnement et le développement qui s'est tenue à Rio (1992). Il est une composante de la politique de coopération bilatérale entre la France et les pays en développement. Comme le Fonds pour l'environnement mondial, qui lui a servi de modèle, le FFEM a pour mandat de cofinancer des projets de développement à forte composante environnementale, comportant des enjeux de portée mondiale, en particulier relatifs à la biodiversité. Le cofinancement, sous forme de dons, est destiné à la mise en œuvre de projets ou programmes pilotes dans les pays pouvant bénéficier de l'APD, en priorité en Afrique et en Méditerranée. Les objectifs généraux du FFEM pour 2014 s'inscrivent dans sa programmation pluriannuelle déclinée en objectifs sectoriels et géographiques comme mentionnés dans son cadre de programmation stratégique couvrant la période 2013-2014 (http://www.ffem.fr/webdav/site/ffem/shared/ELEMENTS_COMMUNS/U_ADMINISTRATEUR/5-PUBLICATIONS/CPS/FFEM_CPS_2013_2014_fr.pdf)

Germany: The above figures only represent ODA contributions. Thus they do not represent a comprehensive assessment of Germany's overall financial contribution in support of the three objectives of the CBD. For measuring the relevance of ODA with regard to biodiversity each project is being assessed whether its main focus and principle objective is to support at least one of the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (protection and sustainable use of biodiversity and the fair sharing of benefits) and thus can strike Rio Marker Biodiversity 2 (BTR 2). Until the year 2011 only projects with the main focus on biodiversity (marked BTR 2) have been taken into account when internally assessing the increase of BMZ funding toward biodiversity. To take into account the concrete positive impact on biodiversity also of projects that have conservation of biodiversity as a significant but not as the main focus (Rio Marker Biodiversity 1, for example a sustainable land management project) so called sectoral components are integrated into BTR 1 projects and will be monitored with a specific related indicator. This biodiversity sectoral component contributes 100 % to at least one of the three objectives of the CBD (e.g. striking CRS-code 41030) and will be accounted 100 % as a contribution towards biodiversity (and for this reason is listed in the category "directly related" contributions). The other components of the project are not reported as a contribution to Biodiversity. This methodology ensures that only that part of a project which clearly supports one of the objectives of the CBD is measured and reported. The percentage of the biodiversity sectoral component of the overall project might vary from project to project.

Non for profit organisations (NGOs): Many German NGOs, foundations and church foundations are providing international financial support with relevance to biodiversity. It was not possible to make a reliable assessment of all the institutions involved and the respective overall amount of resources. In the following only some selected examples of internationally active NGOs is given (source: annual reports). This list is far from being comprehensive. It has to be considered that part of the international funding of the NGOs is provided by public/governmental funds.

* Society for Nature Conservation Germany (NABU): 2,32 Mio. € for international projects to support nature conservation and environmental protection in 2012 (2010: 1,48 Mio €)

* WWF Germany: 65,5 Mio. € for nature conservation and environmental protection, campaigns, education and awareness building worldwide (including Germany) in 2012 of which 16,6 Mio. € come from public sources. (2010: 45,4 Mio. € of which 10,9 Mio. € from public sources).

* Frankfurt Zoological Society: 10,54 Mio. € for nature conservation and awareness building worldwide in 2012 of which 6 Mio come from public sources. (2010: 8,28 Mio. of which 3,9 Mio. € from public sources)

India: Since values are not available for each year, we have used pro rata method to calculate the ODA fundings for each year. Total amount of funding has been divided into the number of years for which the

funding was given, and an average amount has been used. Multilateral ODA has been taken to be the sum of allowance by the World Bank and the EAP. JICA and World Bank figures have been taken from MoEF Annual Report of 2008-09. EAP figures have been taken from MoEF demand for grants data.

Japan: ODA/Bilateral: Total amount of Official Development Assistance, bilateral is calculated by using the figure recorded as Rio Marker in OECD-DAC. ODA/Multilateral: Total amount of Multilateral ODA covers contributions to projects on multilateral environmental agreements, including GEF contribution, capacity building or other grant project and support for developing countries to participate in intergovernmental conference. Regarding NGO and private sector, no appropriate figure is available.

Namibia: Approximately 71% of all bilateral ODA came through the Millennium Challenge Account Namibia programme which was calculated from support to infrastructural development and improved management of Etosha National Park, support to communal conservancies (eco-tourism) and indigenous natural plant sector. Most not for profit organisations acquire their funding through bi-lateral ODA.

Netherlands: For the categories 1.2 (Other Public funds), 1.3 (Private/Market) and 1.4 (Not for profit Organizations) no reliable estimates are available for 2006-2010. Data source: Dutch input to the EU Accountability Report on Financing for Development 2013: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/development-policies/financing_for_development/accountability_report_2013_en.htm . Since 2010 the Netherlands has shifted to a new ODA information management system. In 2014 this new system will be checked for the use of the Rio Markers for biodiversity.

Norway: The figures for international expenditure are somewhat different from our submission in 2010. The information provided is based on the OECD/DAC reporting system, which uses a policy-marker for biodiversity.

Poland: NOTE: Average annual biodiversity funding for the years 2006-2010, preliminary baseline for international flows, equals to 1 497 489, 40 USD per year (7 487 447,00 : 5 = 1 497 489,40)

Slovenia: The information on international flows/development assistance programmes has been extracted from the databases of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Agriculture and the Environment. Data covers the period from 2006 - 2012 and includes voluntary contributions to GEF and through IUCN and CITES. The contribution for biodiversity devoted to GEF is estimated to 40% of the total amount.

Switzerland:¹ International financial contributions/Bilateral ODA: Switzerland put a lot of effort into the assessment of the bilateral public financial flows in favour of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in developing countries. All Swiss bilateral ODA flows reported to OECD-DAC marked as biodiversity relevant (Rio-Marker "biodiversity" significant or principal), were considered for the assessment. However due to the following challenges, Switzerland can to date not report a sound baseline (and may not be the only OECD-DAC Party in this position). The experts involved identified the following barriers to the establishment of a sound baseline for bilateral ODA disbursements:

- Lack of common international understanding on eligibility criteria to apply the Rio-marker "biodiversity";
- Lack of common international understanding on how to apply multiple Rio-markers (including biodiversity);
- Lacking basics for the quantification of the principal/significant Rio-markers "biodiversity"

Conclusions and recommendations: In the light of the methodological barriers identified above, Switzerland welcomes the ongoing efforts to further develop the Rio-markers within the OECD-DAC and recommends the elaboration of a list of clear, easy to use eligibly criteria (a proposal is included in Table

¹Note: Switzerland submitted a single document providing comments as well as conclusions and recommendations on international flows as well as domestic expenditures. For the sake of the present compilation, the relevant sections of this document were reproduced under the pertinent sections of this document, while the introductory section of the Swiss document was reproduced under general comments below.

8). Further, Switzerland recommends defining the Rio-marker “significant”, which indicates the indirect biodiversity benefits of a project, and the Riomarker “principal”, which indicates the direct biodiversity benefits of a project, as a percentage of the total project costs. If possible the same percentage should be used by all parties and it should be assured that the same percentage is used by each party for the assessment of the baseline and future reporting activities in order to improve the comparability and quality of the financial flows monitored and reported by all parties.

Multilateral ODA and other public funds: Switzerland put a lot of effort into the assessment of the multilateral and other public financial flows in favour of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in developing countries. Due to several challenges, Switzerland can to date not report a sound baseline of multilateral ODA and other public funds. The guidance provided by the preliminary reporting framework on how to calculate expenditures for multilateral ODA and other public funds is very vague. The methodology tested provides a potential approach to be further discussed during WGRI, taking the following issues into account:

- There is a need to provide further information about the supported multilateral organizations

In order to establish a global framework to monitor the financial contributions spent through multilateral ODA and other public funds in favour of biodiversity it is necessary that all parties report to which biodiversity relevant multilateral organisations they have provided support.

- Biodiversity marker needs to be included into the accounts of multilateral organisations

Only a part of the financial flows disbursed through multilateral channels (core contributions) contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. In order to estimate the relevant national financial flows disbursed through multilateral channels, the share of biodiversity relevant spending per organisation would need to be determined. So far, this share is only known for the Global Environment Facility.

Conclusions and recommendations The methodology for assessing biodiversity relevant financial flows disbursed through multilateral channels, as depicted in the preliminary reporting framework, does not allow for a sound establishment of a 2006-2010 baseline. There is a lack of consensus on the financial flows and the organisation, which can be considered. In addition there is a clear information gap concerning the biodiversity relevant activities and investments of multilateral organisations and therefore a lack of information about the spending of the core contributions on biodiversity relevant activities.

Switzerland recommends that all Parties of the convention report to which multilateral organisations with relevant activities related to biodiversity they have provided support and how high the support was. This would allow to have more comparable figures, since currently there is no common understanding of which organisation can be accounted as biodiversity relevant. Further, it would be very helpful, if all multilateral organisations would report their share of biodiversity relevant expenditures in order to estimate the relevant national financial flows disbursed through multilateral channels. Switzerland is aware of the efforts conducted by the OECD and multilateral development banks and strongly supports the ongoing work.

International flows: Private / market, not for profit organisations

Private / market methodology: To assess the investments and financial contributions for biodiversity and ecosystem services (BES) of the private sector, a survey by the Swiss Government was conducted. According to the survey, an assessment of financial contributions for BES is very complicated for the companies.

Results: Due to the limited availability and specificity of data, in particular historical data, the surveyed companies were not able to report their investments for BES in detail, especially the distinction between national and international flows was impossible for them. Due to the high international business activities of multinational companies, Switzerland estimates that their international investments are higher than their domestic investments for BES, but no detailed numbers can be provided. It is estimated that companies with a focus on the Swiss market and mainly national and European supply chains do not invest internationally into BES.

Conclusions and Recommendations: Before a detailed assessment of the private sector financial flows for biodiversity and ecosystem services is possible, specific methods to value biodiversity and ecosystem services for different business sectors with respect to the size and complexity of the companies, need to be advanced. The methods should also include the assessment of supply chains.

Not for profit organisations (NPOs) methodology: The annual reports and public annual financial statements of Swiss NPOs were consulted to determine their international flows for BES. To get a more in depth view, some NPOs were contacted and interviewed individually.

Results: Due to the limited availability and specificity of data, in particular historical data, the NPOs were not able to report their investments for BES in detail. The individually contacted NPOs stated that the effort to determine the international flows for BES would be very large, as they do not have any standardized marking of biodiversity relevant projects and / or finance flows. In addition the Swiss national branches of most NPOs with activities in the biodiversity and ecosystem conservation domain are predominantly active on a national level. Their investments for BES are therefore mostly national. The NPOs, which are predominantly active in the area of poverty alleviation and development in developing countries, are also active in the field of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of ecosystem services, but they have not monitored the biodiversity specific investments.

Conclusions and Recommendations: Switzerland will seek an enhanced dialogue with the NPOs to increase the availability and specificity of data for the future and to collaborate with them to jointly live up to the decision XI/4 until 2020.

Activity classification: As mentioned above, Switzerland recognises the need to define a clear, easy to use list of eligibility criteria to increase the data accuracy and international data comparability. To do so, Switzerland proposes to organise eligible activities according to categories as proposed by the European Union in its information note on "The Multilateral Environmental Agreements and the Rio-Markers". A proposal for categories is provided in Table 8.

Table 8: Methodology for the classification of activities for bilateral ODA as implemented by the EC.

Protected areas, protection of ecosystems & species

- Support for the creation and management of protected areas
- Preservation of endangered species, reintroductions
- Anti-poaching activities, fight against illegal trade of endangered species
- Development of legislative framework for the protection of species and sites
- Support to sustainable development activities in the buffer zones of protected areas
- Capacity building of authorities and personnel in charge of protected areas
- Research activities in protected area management
- Fight against invasive species
- Establishment and operation of the structure of ex-situ conservation (zoos, botanical gardens and conservatories, seed banks, gene banks ...)
- Research activities for ex-situ conservation

Water and sanitation

- Protection of water resources, improvement of water quality (when beneficial effects on fauna & flora expected)
- Fight against water pollution (rivers in particular)
- Integrated management and protection of watersheds
- Integrated management of wetlands

Agriculture

- Activities to reduce land use change and expansion of agriculture at the expense of natural areas
- Promotion of environment-friendly agricultural practices (including agro-forestry, organic farming),
- Promotion of practices limiting chemical inputs (fertilizers, pesticides), IPM: integrated pest management
- Activities on soil conservation, fight against erosion

Forests

- Preservation of forests
- Sustainable forest management (in part. community forestry)
- Fight against illegal logging, against deforestation for agriculture or livestock

- Rehabilitation of areas affected by desertification
- Forestry and agroforestry with high biodiversity value (promotion of natural forest / multi-species plantations)
- Institutional support, awareness

Training, research and teaching in taxonomy, biodiversity, ecology etc.

Awareness and public information

Fishing, hunting, gathering

- Promotion of sustainable fisheries (marine, coastal or lakes/rivers)
- Fight against overfishing, illegal fishing, destructive fishing practices
- Inventories and research on the status of stocks, fishing capacity
- Preservation of nursery areas, including mangroves
- Preservation of coral reefs
- Promotion of sustainable hunting practices, Antipoaching
- Promotion of sustainable harvesting (include. Non timber forest products)
- Development of the legislative framework for the activities of fishing, hunting and gathering
- Institutional support, awareness

Business and Economy

- Fight against trade in endangered species, including awareness (of the authorities, consumers), training of personnel (customs etc.).
- Fight against illegal trade in animal products / plants (bush meat, ivory, orchids etc.)
- Activities to prevent importation of invasive species
- Sustainable ecotourism, vision tourism, tourism
- Valuing biodiversity
- Research on economic valuation of biodiversity
- Establishment of mechanisms for equitable access & benefit sharing (ABS) of genetic resources
- Capacity building and awareness

Institutional Support / Obligations under the convention

- Preparation of inventories of biodiversity
- Preparation and implementation of national plans and strategies for biodiversity conservation
- Development of legislative frameworks relating to species, ecosystems (including issue of invasive species)
- Mainstreaming biodiversity in national strategic frameworks and local policies in land use
- Development of innovative, long term, financing mechanisms (trust funds, ecological taxes...)
- Capacity building,
- Development of tools for decision support (databases, information systems)

Thailand: Global Environment Facility is the main source of Funding for programmes /projects related to biodiversity conservation, funding has been provided through three main categories; 1) Star Allocation, Non Star Allocation and Small Grant Programme. Detailed information pertaining to the GEF Funded projects from 2006-2010 is attached herewith in Attachment 1(GEF funded project).

Uganda: Between 2006 and 2010, Aid allocated to multi-sector cross-cutting activities such as environmental management was 4.2% (US\$ 266.4 million), giving an average of US\$53.4 million per year to environmental related sectors. Since 2006 ODA has supported watershed management, tree planting, protected area management, tourism and climate change activities which are on/or related to biodiversity conservation and management.

United Kingdom: Flows above reported as '1.1.1. ODA - bilateral' are in fact a mixture of bilateral and multilateral ODA flows, they include direct expenditure on biodiversity and forests. '1.1.2. ODA -

multilateral' captures only one aspect of total multilateral funding for biodiversity, which is one third of the UK contribution to the GEF which is attributed to biodiversity for these purposes (total contributions to the GEF were £35m/yr 2006-2009 and £52.5m/yr 2009-2011). Indirectly related ODA is not reported at this stage as complete data is not available. The entries listed as 'Other Public Funds' are the UK's contributions under the Darwin Initiative. The Darwin Initiative was established by the UK in 1992 to assist countries that are rich in biodiversity but poor in financial resources to meet biodiversity objectives. It funds collaborative projects, many of which are in biodiversity hotspots, which draw on UK expertise. Please note that these figures are per UK financial year (1st April - 31st March) and each stated calendar year is the year in which that financial year began. NOTE: DATA AS REPORTED ABOVE CANNOT BE SUMMED AS THE TOTAL WOULD CONSIST OF FIGURES IN A MIXTURE OF CURRENCIES.

**B. Inclusion of biodiversity in national priorities or development plans by 2015 and making appropriate domestic financial provisions
(paragraph 7 (b) of decision XI/4)**

(a) Tabular overview

Target as per decision XI/4	Paragraph 7 (b): Endeavour for 100 per cent, but at least 75 per cent, of Parties to have included biodiversity in their national priorities or development plans by 2015 and have therefore made appropriate domestic financial provisions ;	
Elements of target	Inclusion of biodiversity in national priorities or development plans	Appropriate domestic financial provisions
Relevant sections of PRF	3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies.	3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets. ²
Reported	China, Croatia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Estonia, EU, France, Germany, India, Japan, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom	Australia, Croatia, Estonia, EU, India, Japan, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, New Zealand, Italy, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom
Not reported/insufficient information	Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Greece, Italy, Norway, Slovenia	Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, China, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden

(b) Responses provided

3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies

China: Biodiversity has been integrated into some national development strategies, plans and budgets.

Croatia: Considerations of biodiversity and ecosystem services are mainly integrated as a part of NBSAP, within Chapter VI Sustainable use of natural resources (a strategic objectives and action plans for cooperation with the sectors of agriculture, forestry, hunting, fishing, water management and tourism).

² Noting that section 2 of the preliminary reporting framework, seeking information on the availability of financial resources in each country, is also relevant in this context.

NBSAP is the fundamental document of the nature protection which serves as a set of recommended guidelines for development plans and strategic management processes. Also, since 2003 Nature Protection Act provides a legislative basis for integration of nature protection measures and conditions in all sectorial natural resources management planning documents and spatial planning documents. Additionally, for all plans, programs and projects, which individually or in combination with other plans, programs and projects may have significant effect on conservation objectives and integrity of ecological network Natura 2000, ecological network impacts assessment mechanisms (appropriate assessment) has to be performed. This system will ensure long term conservation of ecological network and preservation of target habitat and species in favourable conservation status. Since 2007, Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is one of the key instruments for integrating environmental, including biodiversity, concerns and sustainable development principles into the strategic planning and decision-making. It is an internationally recognized tool for participatory planning used to analyze and incorporate environmental and health concerns into proposed policies, plans and programs. Also, the new Croatian strategic documents (marine strategy, rural development programme, strategies for water management, national strategic plan for development of fisheries), developed within the EU policy framework, enable consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services concept by applying an ecosystem-based approach to the management of human activities while enabling a sustainable use of ecosystem goods and services.

Additionally, the Strategy of Sustainable Development takes the biodiversity into consideration (Chapter VI Themed Indicators of Sustainable Development) whose outputs serve as an insight to whether Croatia has the answers to the major problems that prevent further progress. In addition, Croatian Environment Agency, in accordance with the Sustainable Development Strategy, is developing action plans for the protection of the Adriatic Sea, coastal area and islands.

Denmark: Biodiversity and nature is an integrated part of the Danish government's development strategy, 'The right to a better life. Denmark seeks to support activities which combat poverty and create sustainable development based on principles of sustainable management and use of natural resources. Biodiversity related aid is defined as activities that promote at least one of the three objectives of the CBD: the conservation of biodiversity, the sustainable use of its components (ecosystems, species or genetic resources) and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits of the utilization of genetic resources.

Estonia: * Biodiversity and ecosystem services topics are dealt in draft Nature Conservation Development Plan until 2020. * Biodiversity issues are also included in Environmental Strategy until 2030 and Action Plan until 2013. * Proposals are made to incorporate the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services into several other state strategies and development plans (e.g. agriculture). Unfortunately not all proposals are taken into account.

Ethiopia: Poverty reduction strategy and Growth and Transformation Plans are prepared and approved and under implementation.

EU: Biodiversity is highlighted as a priority within the EU resource efficiency roadmap, one of the flagships of the EU 2020 strategy, and in the 7th European Environmental Action Plan.

Biodiversity and ecosystem services are integrated across sectors in most countries. In some cases, some specific initiatives help support such integration, such as the Natural Capital Committee in the United Kingdom.

Finland: In line with the biodiversity policy in Finland and the revised NBSAP in Finland 2012-2020 our aim is to continue and strengthen mainstreaming of biodiversity into all sectors of society. The aim of integrating biodiversity in plans and strategies has been since 1996 and sector integration has been reported as well in our national reports to the CBD. The legal framework also supports an integrated approach such as the water, mining, building, nature conservation acts which aims to preserve biodiversity. Safeguarding ecosystem services is part of plans and strategies such as the Ministry of the Environments strategy and the Government's report on the Future (Valtioneuvooston

tulevaisuuslonteko). As part of the implementation of the Development Policy Programme and by taking the equality perspective into account, Finland seeks to support development cooperation projects aimed at reducing poverty in developing countries, through the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and with the objective of safeguarding and strengthening ecosystem services. In addition, Finland seeks to promote opportunities for young experts to participate in development cooperation projects and programmes under this theme.

In development cooperation, Finland takes into account the goals and obligations of the Convention on Biological Diversity and other international biodiversity agreements. Viewpoints concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services will be highlighted in bilateral relations with developing countries, encompassing development cooperation projects and political influence.

France: La biodiversité est intégrée de manière transversale à plusieurs politiques sectorielles dont l'eau, l'agriculture, le littoral et la montagne.

Germany: National: biodiversity forms an integral part of the German public planning system (e.g. spatial planning, landscape planning, riverbasin planning, coastal and marine planning, urban planning, road planning) on various levels (national, federal state, regional, local); biodiversity is also integrated into the national strategy for sustainable development. International: Biodiversity Finance Initiative - BIOFIN: Germany together with the European Commission and Switzerland is supporting the global BIOFIN initiative which is managed by UNDP (as of January 2014 overall amount 15 Mio USD). The aim of BIOFIN is to support Parties in the following endeavours: a. Determine the current investment in biodiversity; b. Analyse the integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in sectoral and development policy, planning and budgeting; c. Assess future financing flows, needs and gaps for managing and conserving biodiversity and ecosystem services; d. Develop comprehensive national Resource Mobilisation Strategies to meet the biodiversity finance gap; e. Initiate implementation of the Resource Mobilisation Strategy at national level. BIOFIN actually is implemented in 19 countries. At the same time the BIOFIN methodology is also fed into the NBSAP Forum process for wider application by all interested Parties. Further information: www.biodiversityfinance.net.

India: Possibility of integrating Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 for biodiversity conservation activities (ongoing) - Rs. 17621.35 crores (2010-2011).

Japan: As an example of integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in strategies, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) of Japan developed a biodiversity strategy at the agricultural sector. MAFF implements comprehensive agricultural policies and measures focusing on biodiversity based on the strategy.

At regional level, the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) of Japan supports local governments with formulating regional biodiversity strategies. By the end of March 2013, 22 statutory plans such as local biodiversity strategic plan and invasive alien species control plan were formulated. Besides, as of March 2013, the MOE provided financial support to 55 local organizations to promote on-the-ground biodiversity conservation activities through Biodiversity Conservation Promotion Programs. Even after completion of financial support, the organizations are still continuing their various activities with their own resources.

In the urban area, Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (MLIT) developed “the Technical Guidance for Conservation of Biodiversity in Basic Plan of Greenery” in October 2011 and “the Rough Draft of the City Biodiversity Index (Japan Version)” in May 2013 for the purpose of actions for the conservation of urban biodiversity.

Malawi: The Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II identifies biodiversity as one of the key areas under the theme Environment and Climate Change. The Environmental Affairs Department in the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Management now has a Biodiversity Division.

Mauritius: In the revised NBSAP.

Netherlands: Biodiversity Policy Programme of the Netherlands 2008-2011: Biodiversity Works For Nature, For People, Forever: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/world/nl/nl-nbsap-v3-en.pdf>

In 2013 the Dutch cabinet presented the Uitvoeringsagenda Natuurlijk Kapitaal (Natural Capital Agenda, 2013). A number of 16 concrete actions have been agreed in order to integrate the value of biodiversity and natural capital into general and some specific policies. With these initiatives the Agenda underlines the mutual dependence between biodiversity and economy.

Natural resources have been identified as an element in the national policy Green Growth for a strong and sustainable economy (Policy brief, 2013). In this policy the sustainable use of natural resources and sustainable sourcing are the conditions for a transition to a circular economy.

Government and Provinces agreed to a Nature Pact in 2013: Provinces are responsible to realize the NEN in cooperation with relevant organizations. In 2027 80.000 hectare of new nature will be realized. Land bought by the government will be handed over to the provinces. A total amount of 800 mln Euro is available until 2017 and after that 200 mln euro per year.

New Zealand: Biodiversity values have been incorporated in New Zealand's principal legislation governing the use of natural resources and the environment, the Resource Management Act (RMA) since 1991. The RMA takes a whole ecosystem approach to the sustainable management of resources including for biodiversity. The key themes are: sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects on the environment. It is managed through local councils and requires them to actively develop a policy framework to control actual or potential effects on maintenance of indigenous biological diversity. This has led to the development of local plans to manage areas of habitat for important for biodiversity. This is supported by a suite of environmental impact assessment, conservation, and land use planning tools aimed at taking into account and balancing the objectives of sustainable management, biodiversity and ecosystem services, which are enshrined in legislation.

In 2013, work commenced on an Environmental Reporting Bill that will mandate the provision of comprehensive environmental information. An Environmental Reporting System will be developed to report on air, climate and atmosphere, freshwater, marine and land, with biodiversity as a theme across all the domains. It will be aligned with international reporting, such as the OECD Green Growth indicators.

The New Zealand Treasury has produced the Living Standards Framework (<http://www.treasury.govt.nz/abouttreasury/higherlivingstandards>), which goes beyond GDP to incorporate a range of material and non-material factors that impact on well-being (including natural capital) in its definition of Living Standards. The Framework is centred on four main capital stocks - financial/physical, human, social, and natural. The Framework describes the interrelationships among the stocks and flows, and highlights the need for responsible management in order to improve the living standards of both current and future New Zealanders. It identifies biodiversity, as well as the atmosphere, freshwater, soil, and fish stocks, as being of particular importance to living standards in New Zealand.

Italy: Since 2000 the Ministry of Economy and Finance has been publishing the Ecobilancio (ex-ante environmental budget), an accounting document that sets out the expenditure planned by the central government, for activities or actions aimed at environment protection or natural resources use and management.

Namibia: Namibia's development framework of Vision 2030 and National Development Plans represents its ultimate strategy for national development priorities. The conservation of biodiversity is prominently within this framework, particularly Vision 2030, which has a dedicated Chapter on the Sustainable Utilisation of Natural Resources and Environmental Sustainability.

Poland: Poland as the member of the European Union is obliged to prepare National Strategic Reference Framework for subsequent periods in order to have a possibility to use EU's financing. These funds are used to fulfil operational programs which are contained in the National Strategic Reference Framework. For 2007-2013 there were three operational programs especially connected with biodiversity protection: Infrastructure and Environment (mainly the priority number V), Rural Development Program and Sustainable Development of the Fisheries Sector and Coastal Fishing Areas.

Spain: El Plan Director de la Cooperación Española (2013-2016) identifica el desarrollo sostenible y el medio ambiente como línea prioritaria de acción para la cooperación española. Por ello, para la cooperación española, la sostenibilidad ambiental es parte de su objeto, de sus principios y de sus prioridades sectoriales. Así, el Plan Director 2013-2016 promueve la integración de la variable ambiental de manera transversal – incluida la gestión sostenible del capital natural y la lucha contra el cambio climático – en todas las intervenciones y ámbitos, haciendo de ella un requisito imprescindible para la financiación de los proyectos. <http://www.aecid.es>

Sweden: See the 5th National Report to the CBD.

Switzerland: Switzerland has a comprehensive strategic and programmatic framework ensuring that biodiversity is integrated in national and local planning processes (see Switzerland's fourth national report, chapters 2 and 3; Switzerland's fifth national report, chapter 1 and part II). Biodiversity concerns are also included in the guidelines for regulatory impact assessments and for sustainability assessments.

Thailand: 1. National Economic and Social Development Plan 2. National Biodiversity Integrated Plans 3. National BIOFIN Project 4. The Economic Valuation of Ecosystems and Biodiversity for Business Sector, Thailand Business Centre for Sustainable Development

Uganda: The National Development Plan (2010/2015) is under review and proposals have been made on what aspects of biodiversity to be included in the next NDP including support for implementation of NBSAP. Additionally, provisions of the long term National Vision 2040 has been integrated in the review and updating of NBSAP. Thus implementation of NBSAP2 will contribute to implementation of the long term vision and NDP

United Kingdom: Following the Natural Environment White Paper a number of initiatives were launched to ensure the values of biodiversity are better captured in decisions. In the context of national economic planning in England, the Natural Capital Committee was established as an independent committee reporting to the government Economic Affairs Committee on the state of natural capital in England. The Committee's second report was published in March 2014 and can be found on the committee's website <http://www.naturalcapitalcommittee.org/>. Government established Local Nature Partnerships to enable local leadership on the natural environment, and to raise awareness of the benefits and services that are provided by a healthy natural environment. LNPs are currently working in partnership with Local Enterprise Partnerships to integrate consideration for the natural environment in to local growth plans, they also work to influence the development and implementation of other local plans and development frameworks to deliver better environmental outcomes.

3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets

Australia: Refer to Australia's fifth national report to the CBD.

Croatia: According to the Nature Protection Act, the State budget funds provided for the financing of nature protection are used for the preservation, protection and improvement of biodiversity and landscape diversity, in accordance with the strategies, plans and programs. In the execution of the State budget, Ministry of Environmental and Nature Protection (MENP) holds his own separate budget section for the nature protection which comprises a separate budget subsections for administration and management (Nature protection Directorate), for national parks, parks of nature and the State Institute for Nature Protection (SINP), as for the international projects and for loans. Collection of fees for the biodiversity use already exist e.g. for the issuance of documents, such as permits or licenses for the nature utilization

(CITES export permits, ecological network impact assessment permits, permits for derogation from strict protection of endangered wild species etc.), but such revenues are not used exclusively for the biodiversity purpose, and thus are only partially returned to the system through the annual state budget placement. On the other side, revenues from concession approvals (i.e. non-extractive commercial activities) is income of the public institutions designated for nature protection activities while revenues from concessions (i.e. for extractive uses such as mining and forestry) go directly into the State Budget or to the County budget. Public institutions may grant concession approvals for a period of five years to legal or natural persons registered for “craft trade for the economic use of natural resources or exercising other activities in a protected area”. Moreover, collecting of entrance fees exists for all national and some nature parks, as well as for some speleological objects (caves open for public), and represents a very substantial part of the overall budget for biodiversity and ecosystem services. Entrance fees are collected by the public institution (PI) that manages the relevant PA (or the concessionaire) and are kept by the respective PI; these funds should exclusively be used for PA management. Another mechanism that exists is vignettes that marine vessels need to purchase when entering Croatia by sea. Part (10%) of the income from vignettes goes to the marine national and nature parks (5 parks in total), in accordance with the Sojourn Tax Act.

On the other hand, compensation payments are provided to all subjects (mainly farmers and households) affected by the losses caused by strictly protected species, particularly large carnivores (primarily wolf) and strictly protected wetland birds (compensation to carp fishponds).

Estonia: See above points. However, concept and methodology of how to incorporate values of ecosystem services into national budgets need further development.

Ethiopia: Biodiversity conservation and sustainable use integrated to the national budgets. Even though the amount is small, government and donors allocate fund to annual plan.

EU: Biodiversity objectives are mainstreamed throughout the EU budget, and are reflected in the EU funding instruments for the 2014-2020 budget. The European Commission is developing a tracking methodology for domestic and international biodiversity-related financing flows. For the programming period 2014-2020 a tracking procedure for biodiversity-related expenditure has been integrated in the existing methodology for measuring performance used for EU programmes. The methodology has been largely based on the Rio markers established by the OECD. For the first year of the new programming period (2014) it has focused on the instruments that are likely to have the biggest impact on biodiversity. A table presenting estimates of how the main relevant instruments in the next MFF are expected to contribute to biodiversity, based on past trends, was annexed to the communication on the 2014 draft budget. It has shown the estimation of 8.1% of all EU budget commitments to be attributed to broader biodiversity objectives.

Integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets is done in some EU countries through undertaking steps towards natural capital accounting – this is for example the case in United Kingdom and France. At international level, many European countries (Netherlands, United Kingdom, Germany, France and Denmark) and the European Commission provide financial support to the WAVES initiative. In addition, in some cases, countries include an annex on environmental expenses, including biodiversity, when reporting on the use of national budgets to Parliament (e.g. Italy). Since 2014, the European Commission publishes an annex which includes a table on biodiversity finance in communications on annual draft budgets, with estimations of how much different funding instruments will contribute to biodiversity objectives.

France: Des travaux sont en cours sur l'épargne réelle, sur l'impact de la consommation et de la production nationales sur la biodiversité et les écosystèmes à l'étranger.

Germany: National: Exact data are not available, because there are no biodiversity specific statistics or budget lines. Amounts are based on assessments or surveys. They include in principle: domestic nature

conservation projects, biodiversity research for BMUB, administration costs, maintenance and salary as well as national agro-environmental measures. Data on indirectly related resources are not available. International: Biodiversity Finance Initiative - BIOFIN: Germany together with the European Commission and Switzerland is supporting the global BIOFIN initiative which is managed by UNDP (as of January 2014 overall amount 15 Mio USD). The aim of BIOFIN is to support Parties in the following endeavours: a. Determine the current investment in biodiversity; b. Analyse the integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in sectoral and development policy, planning and budgeting; c. Assess future financing flows, needs and gaps for managing and conserving biodiversity and ecosystem services; d. Develop comprehensive national Resource Mobilisation Strategies to meet the biodiversity finance gap; e. Initiate implementation of the Resource Mobilisation Strategy at national level. BIOFIN actually is implemented in 19 countries. At the same time the BIOFIN methodology is also fed into the NBSAP Forum process for wider application by all interested Parties. Further information: www.biodiversityfinance.net.

India: Environmental Impact Assessment Notifications 1994 - Environment and development projects.

Japan: The Basic Policies for Economic and Fiscal Management and Reform approved by Cabinet in July 2013 stressed the necessity of Society Living in Harmony with Nature, where communities maintain and develop socio-economic activities including conservation and utilization of biodiversity. Japan has prepared national fiscal budget year 2014 based on the Basic Policy integrating elements of biodiversity and ecosystem services into the policies.

Malawi: About 5% of the budget for the Environmental Affairs Department is for Biodiversity Conservation.

Mauritius: Will be a Section in the revised NBSAP.

Namibia: This is not systematically integrated in national budgets but the research from 2010 indicates that approximately 2.9% of total expenditure and .9% of GDP was spent on biodiversity.

New Zealand: Biodiversity values have been incorporated in New Zealand's principal legislation governing the use of natural resources and the environment, the Resource Management Act (RMA) since 1991. The RMA takes a whole ecosystem approach to the sustainable management of resources including for biodiversity. The key themes are: sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects on the environment. It is managed through local councils and requires them to actively develop a policy framework to control actual or potential effects on maintenance of indigenous biological diversity. This has led to the development of local plans to manage areas of habitat for important for biodiversity. This is supported by a suite of environmental impact assessment, conservation, and land use planning tools aimed at taking into account and balancing the objectives of sustainable management, biodiversity and ecosystem services, which are enshrined in legislation.

In 2013, work commenced on an Environmental Reporting Bill that will mandate the provision of comprehensive environmental information. An Environmental Reporting System will be developed to report on air, climate and atmosphere, freshwater, marine and land, with biodiversity as a theme across all the domains. It will be aligned with international reporting, such as the OECD Green Growth indicators.

The New Zealand Treasury has produced the Living Standards Framework (<http://www.treasury.govt.nz/abouttreasury/higherlivingstandards>), which goes beyond GDP to incorporate a range of material and non-material factors that impact on well-being (including natural capital) in its definition of Living Standards. The Framework is centred on four main capital stocks - financial/physical, human, social, and natural. The Framework describes the interrelationships among the stocks and flows, and highlights the need for responsible management in order to improve the living

standards of both current and future New Zealanders. It identifies biodiversity, as well as the atmosphere, freshwater, soil, and fish stocks, as being of particular importance to living standards in New Zealand.

Poland: National finances are reflected in the Performance Budget containing 22 functions. These include the function No 12 addressing biodiversity issues, and concerning nature protection as well as the improvement of the environment. The Ministry of the Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and the Voivodes are, among others, the managers of the funds allocated to the implementation of the above tasks.

Slovenia: A new budget line "Implementation of biodiversity goals" has been established and adopted in December 2013 in the state budget for 2014 - 2015.

Spain: Los Presupuestos Generales del Estado incluyen un programa presupuestario (456C) destinado a la protección y mejora del medio natural. <http://www.minhap.gob.es/es-ES/Areas%20Tematicas/Presupuestos%20Generales%20del%20Estado/Paginas/Presupuestos.aspx>

Sweden: Sweden integrates biodiversity and ecosystem services in other sectors such as agriculture, forestry, fishery and education. See the 5th National Report to the CBD.

Switzerland: Biodiversity is not specifically addressed in the national budget. It is a part of the budget "environment protection" and indirectly through other budget lines with relevance to biodiversity (e.g. agriculture, transport). Financial flows with benefits to biodiversity can be estimated (see Switzerland's "Submission of Information for the Review of Implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization").

A new system of financial equalisation and division of tasks between the Confederation and the cantons (NFA) has brought about a change of system in the policy underpinning environmental subsidies. The Confederation and cantons prepare programme agreements, defining which environmental targets they intend to reach and the amount of federal subsidies available for this. Program agreements are provided for different subsidy areas. There is no data available about the federal amounts spent for the financing of these areas (see Switzerland's fourth national report, chapter 2.1.3).

Thailand: Draft National Biodiversity Integrated Plan which contains timeline and budget; however, the plan has not yet submitted to the Cabinet for approval.

Uganda: Lobbying with Ministry of Finance is on-going on this matter. A proposal was written support of implementation of NBSAP including implementation of the Aichi targets. The Ministry of Finance approved the proposal and is expected to increase funding to the National Environment Management Authority during the FY2014/15 to cater for implementation of NBSAP. NEMA coordinates implementation of NBSAP on behalf of Government.

The Focal Point for Resource Mobilization is from the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development. This has facilitated lobbying for increasing funding for biodiversity. Furthermore, Uganda is one of the countries participating in the BIOFIN (Biodiversity Finance Initiative) project supported by the EU and other development partners. The project will help Uganda to refine the Guidelines and Action Plans for Financing Biodiversity Conservation in Uganda as well as the costing of NBSAP2 which is under development.

United Kingdom: With respect to the development of government policy the government has published supplementary guidance to the Treasury 'Green Book' on policy appraisal. This was released in 2012 and represented an important milestone to support the mainstreaming of natural capital and ecosystem service considerations in policy appraisal. The guidance can be found online at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/green-book-supplementary-guidance-environment>.

**C. Reporting domestic biodiversity expenditures, as well as funding needs, gaps and priorities
(paragraph 7 (c) of decision XI/4)**

(a) Tabular overview

Target as per decision XI/4	Paragraph 7 (c): Endeavour for 100 per cent, but at least 75 per cent, of Parties provided with adequate financial resources to have reported domestic biodiversity expenditures , as well as funding needs, gaps and priorities , by 2015, in order to improve the robustness of the baseline and to refine the preliminary targets, as appropriate.								
Elements of target	Reported domestic biodiversity expenditures						Reported funding needs, gaps and priorities		
Relevant sections of PRF	2. Information on the availability of financial resources in each country						3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities		
Source	Government budget – central		Government budget – state/local		Private/market, other (NGO, foundations, academia)	Overall confidence level			
Category	Direct	indirect	direct	indirect		H	M	L	
Reported	Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, EU, Finland, France, Germany, India, Japan, Malawi, Maurit., Namibia, Netherl., New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Spain,	Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, EU, Finland, France, India, Mauritiu., Namibia, Netherl., New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Spain, Switzerl., United Kingdom	Croatia, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France, India, Italy, Japan, Netherl., New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Slovenia, Switzerl., United Kingdom	Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, India, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Spain, Slovenia, Switzerl., United Kingdom	Bulgaria (direct), Denmark (NGO), Estonia, Finland (private/market), France, Japan (other/NGO), Mauritius (other, NGO), Poland (other), Spain (private/market), Switzerl. (other/NGO), United Kingdom	Bulgaria, Croatia, Ethiopia, Greece, Finland, Italy, Japan, Mauriti., Netherl., New Zealand, Thailand	France (“satisfactory”), India, Malawi, Namibia, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Uganda	Czech Republic, EU, Germany, Estonia, Switzerl., United Kingdom	Australia, Bulgaria, Denmark, China, Estonia, EU, Greece, Japan, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerl. Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom

	Switzerl., Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom							
Not reported/ no activities/limited progress/ insufficient information	Australia, Austria, China, Italy, Slovenia, Sweden	Australia, Austria, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Slovenia, Sweden, Thailand, Uganda	Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, China, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Estonia, Germany, Malawi, Namibia, Sweden, Thailand, Uganda	Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Germany, Japan, Malawi, Namibia, Netherl., Sweden, Thailand, Uganda	Australia, Austria, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Germany, India, Italy, Netherl., New Zealand, Malawi, Namibia, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, Thailand, Uganda	Australia, Norway		Austria, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Germany, Italy, Netherl., Norway, Poland

(b) Responses provided

3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities

Australia: Refer to Australia's fifth national report to the CBD.

Bulgaria: Insufficient awareness of the public, for the reasons behind the adoption of legislation, legal instruments and the existing procedures related to the protection of the biodiversity, as well as on the mechanisms for overcoming the contradictions between the conservation of biodiversity and economic development of the country;

- Low degree of awareness, at national level, from the potential beneficiaries on the mutual benefits and opportunities arising from the resource conservation;
- Low level of preparedness of the beneficiaries, to plan and implement large-scale environmental projects with a specific focus;
- Poor communication and readiness for conclusion of partnerships between stakeholders and potential beneficiaries;
- Lack of proper knowledge, from the Beneficiaries, on the procedures for project management and big difference between the levels of expertise and experience of the participants; There are no joint projects realized between state institutions, NGOs and media or media groups; There is no information for implementation of partnerships, framework agreements or contracts for regular media coverage on the subject;
- The role of the regional and local media is highly undervalued;
- There is no coordinated approach to the use of financial resources, made available from the different tools, so that sustainable impact and integrated interventions to be achieved;

China: Progress is limited in identifying funding needs, developing national financing plans and related capacity building. According to the preliminary statistics, China has a huge demand for biodiversity conservation in the future. Implementation of China's NBSAP alone requires billions of investment in USD. In addition, how to coordinate existing financing channels of various sectors to maximize the effectiveness of funds also needs to be tackled.

Croatia: Since the adoption of the first Strategy (NBSAP) in 1999 (revised in 2008), it is evident that significant improvement has been made towards strengthening the financial mechanisms for biodiversity conservation. With regard to the nature protection system as a whole, the state budget continues to be the primary source of financing. Croatia has had a stable biodiversity growth in the national budget in the last years, but unfortunately, like many countries, due to global economic crisis, government budget has shown downturn. Additionally, Government has in place the overall multiannual strategic program (based on sectorial analyses), which also includes the identified short and long term objectives of the nature protection sector, as well as indicators and linkages to financing mechanism. This Program is developed and updated annually together with the multiannual financial prospective. Also, public institutions for management of PAs provide reports on their specific needs and funding priorities as an integral part of their annual programs and financial and management plans.

In order to ensure that biodiversity objectives are successfully addressed, the system of institutions in nature protection was decentralized from central/state government to regional and local governments, including regional/local government resources. Certain percentage of funding is set aside from county, city and municipal budgets mainly for the purpose of management of ecological network and protected areas through the activities of the state/county/local public institutions. Substantial funds for nature protection activities in the reporting period 2006 - 2010 have been additionally secured through various ODA (international projects financed by different IFIs, governments/programmes of European countries and the EU pre-accession programmes). Given the importance of biodiversity conservation at the EU level, a significant financial inflow from European funds and programmes is expected in the next

programming period (2014 - 2020). For the purpose of programming, funding priorities and gaps in terms of EU objectives have been identified and analysed. Additionally, assessment on the financial management is still not fully processed at the overall system level which is recognized as a gap that needs further improvement, especially regarding setting the overall monitoring system for resource mobilization.

Since the adoption of the first Strategy (NBSAP) in 1999 (revised in 2008), it is evident that significant improvement has been made towards strengthening the financial mechanisms for biodiversity conservation. With regard to the nature protection system as a whole, the state budget continues to be the primary source of financing. Croatia has had a stable biodiversity growth in the national budget in the last years, but unfortunately, like many countries, due to global economic crisis, government budget has shown downturn. Additionally, Government has in place the overall multiannual strategic program (based on sectorial analyses), which also includes the identified short and long term objectives of the nature protection sector, as well as indicators and linkages to financing mechanism. This Program is developed and updated annually together with the multiannual financial prospective. Also, public institutions for management of PAs provide reports on their specific needs and funding priorities as an integral part of their annual programs and financial and management plans.

In order to ensure that biodiversity objectives are successfully addressed, the system of institutions in nature protection was decentralized from central/state government to regional and local governments, including regional/local government resources. Certain percentage of funding is set aside from county, city and municipal budgets mainly for the purpose of management of ecological network and protected areas through the activities of the state/county/local public institutions. Substantial funds for nature protection activities in the reporting period 2006 - 2010 have been additionally secured through various ODA (international projects financed by different IFIs, governments/programmes of European countries and the EU pre-accession programmes). Given the importance of biodiversity conservation at the EU level, a significant financial inflow from European funds and programmes is expected in the next programming period (2014 - 2020). For the purpose of programming, funding priorities and gaps in terms of EU objectives have been identified and analysed. Additionally, assessment on the financial management is still not fully processed at the overall system level which is recognized as a gap that needs further improvement, especially regarding setting the overall monitoring system for resource mobilization.

Denmark: Environment and Nature Plan, Denmark 2010-2020 has been developed and included in the 2009 plan for Green Growth. The aim of Environment and Nature Plan Denmark 2010-2020 is to secure not only a better environment and climate, but also more areas of nature of a high quality that are accessible to everyone. The plan not only enables Denmark to meet its obligations under the EU Water Framework Directive and the Natura 2000 Directives but also facilitates follow-up of the Aquatic Environment Plan III and the Pesticide Plan 2004 2009. These investments are conditional on approval by the European Commission.

Estonia: * Strategic funding needs, gaps and priorities for biodiversity are defined in draft Nature Conservation Development Plan until 2020. Planned adoption of the plan is spring 2014. Biodiversity financing on Natura 2000 sites are additionally covered in a prioritised action framework for Natura 2000 (PAF). No biodiversity needs reported to the CBD.

Ethiopia: Identification of fund needs and funding gaps identification preparation is underway.

EU: The Impact Assessment of the EU biodiversity strategy to 2020 analyses the likely impacts of measures under each target against environmental, economic and social criteria. Funding needs are in particular analysed for the implementation of EU nature legislation, and for the development of new legislation on invasive alien species. The European Commission has also recently financed a study of the potential costs of achieving the 15% restoration target of the EU Biodiversity Strategy with a breakdown of projected costs by Member States under 4 different scenarios. This study is available on the CGBN

CIRCABC site. The total estimated additional costs at the level of the EU range from € 0.5 to 11 billion per annum up to 2020 dependent upon the scenario. The economic benefit of achieving the target are certainly much higher than these costs but were not assessed in this study.

Identification and reporting of funding needs, gaps and priorities: there are several initiatives at EU and national level. At international level, the Biofin project funded by the European Commission, Germany and Switzerland, supports the assessment of expenditures, funding gaps and the development of national resource mobilization strategies in 19 countries.

Finland: In line with our NBSAP (page 46) Action 97) Finland is in national and international activities (incl. development cooperation), seeking to implement the global strategy of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its objectives and goals (2011–2020) for halting the loss of biodiversity. For this purpose, by 2015, Finland will prepare a national strategy for mobilising resources, in accordance with decision X/3 of the Convention, and the related financial indicators.

France: Des éléments ponctuels d'analyses des besoins de financement de la biodiversité, des financements manquants et des priorités existent mais ne permettent pas encore de répondre totalement à la question.

Germany: National: no concrete activities. International: Biodiversity Finance Initiative - BIOFIN: Germany together with the European Commission and Switzerland is supporting the global BIOFIN initiative which is managed by UNDP (as of January 2014 overall amount 15 Mio USD). The aim of BIOFIN is to support Parties in the following endeavours: a. Determine the current investment in biodiversity see explanation below on BIOFIN; b. Analyse the integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in sectoral and development policy, planning and budgeting; c. Assess future financing flows, needs and gaps for managing and conserving biodiversity and ecosystem services; d. Develop comprehensive national Resource Mobilisation Strategies to meet the biodiversity finance gap; e. Initiate implementation of the Resource Mobilisation Strategy at national level. BIOFIN actually is implemented in 19 countries. At the same time the BIOFIN methodology is also fed into the NBSAP Forum process for wider application by all interested Parties. Further information: www.biodiversityfinance.net

Greece: During the preparation of all Operational Programmes for period 2014-2020, funding needs and funding gaps are calculated.

India: Annual and five yearly plans with details on funds published by Ministry of Environment and Forests and Planning Commission of India - Research and data analysis.

Japan: In consideration of funding needs and gaps, in September 2012, Japan developed the National Biodiversity Strategy of Japan 2012-2020 and national biodiversity targets in response to Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The priorities are set in National Biodiversity Strategy: i) Mainstreaming biodiversity into society, ii) Reviewing and rebuilding the relationships between people and nature in local communities, iii) Securing linkages between, iv) National land conservation and management on the basis of decreasing population, v) Strengthening the scientific foundation and utilizing it in policy making. In addition to that, the Roadmap for the Achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets lays out 13 national targets and 48 key actions for the priorities.

Malawi: A needs assessment for biodiversity was conducted during the revision of the NBSAP process. The funding priorities have been highlighted in the resource mobilisation strategy.

Mauritius: will be taken care in the revision and updating of NBSAP.

Namibia: Already in 2008 a public expenditure review was undertaken taking into consideration the resource allocation gap for MET's strategic plan. The annual estimated costs of the plan were N\$ 648,7 million, which was three times the actual budget allocations through MET's medium term expenditure framework. Since large parts of the strategic plan covered NBSAP objectives, the numbers allow a first impression of the proportions of the NBSAP resource allocation gap. This is now outdated and the new Resource mobilisation for effective implementation of the updated biodiversity strategy in Namibia

Project will address the funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities to reflect the new developments and gaps.

Poland: Although the information at the central level exists, there is a significant lack of information from regional and local levels. The later information is only partly reported to the central budget. Basic lack of information results from the insufficient mechanism or lack of mechanism of reporting on private funds. Essential lack of information exists in the sphere of external funding provided to national NGOs.

Slovenia: In 2013 funding needs and priorities for funding of biodiversity and biodiversity related issues have been developed by the government agencies and proposed for adoption. In December 2013 the State budget for 2014 - 2015 has been adopted.

Spain: El Plan Estratégico del Patrimonio Natural y la Biodiversidad, aprobado por Real Decreto 1274/2011, de 16 de septiembre, incluye una identificación de prioridades de actuación y una estimación del presupuesto para el desarrollo de sus acciones. http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/temas/conservacion-de-la-biodiversidad/valoracion-y-aspectos-economicos-de-la-biodiversidad/cb_vae_plan_estrategico_patrimonio_nat_bio.aspx

Sweden: This is a part of our work regarding 3.4. and 3.5. - integrated consideration of biodiversity. See the 5th National Report to the CBD.

Switzerland: Funding needs are currently being identified within the elaboration of the Action Plan on the Implementation of the Swiss Biodiversity Strategy (see Switzerland's fifth national report, chapter 2.1). The Action plan will define priority measures and for each measure specify the funding needs / the funding gaps.

Thailand: Thailand's National Budget Formulation Process: Thailand has formulated national budget formulation process which has delivered solid fiscal results over time. The budget process includes strategic performance budgeting, central development planning, the steps in the budget preparation timetable. Many institutions play different roles in the process, institutions involved are: the spending ministries, the Bureau of the Budget and the Central Fund, the Parliament, the Scrutiny Committee on the Budget and of the Office of the Auditor-General.

Annual budget preparation process

The fiscal year in Thailand starts on 1 October. The annual budget preparation process begins ten months earlier, i.e. January. The first step is to determine the economic assumptions applicable for the budget. As the government is committed to operating a balanced budget (nominal surpluses), the calculations of economic activity and the revenues it will generate will in effect set the overall ceiling for total expenditure during the year. The calculations of economic activity and the revenues it will generate will in effect set the overall ceiling for total expenditure during the year.

The calculation of the economic assumptions used in the budget is carried out jointly by four key central economic agencies. These are the Bank of Thailand (central bank), the Ministry of Finance (taxation; cash and debt management), the National Economic and Social Development Board (macroeconomic analysis; central planning machinery) and the Bureau of the Budget itself.

Budget preparation timetable (as applied for the budget for each fiscal year)

Fiscal year: October-September

January: Four key central economic agencies prepare economic assumptions.

February: Bureau of the Budget updates baseline projections.
Spending ministries prepare and submit their initial budget bids.

March: Aggregate budget ceilings established for individual ministries.

April: Spending ministries submit second budget bids, in line with their ceilings.

May: Budget finalised.

Budget submitted to Parliament.

Each of the four agencies makes its own estimates of key macroeconomic variables, with the Ministry of Finance having the principal information on tax revenue. The initial estimates of the four agencies generally differ and a two to three-week process of informal dialogue ensues before a consensus forecast is established. The heads of the four agencies formally endorse the consensus forecast and submit it to the Prime Minister for final approval. This would conclude in February.

The Bureau of the Budget

The Bureau of the Budget is a central agency responsible for budgeting. It reports directly to the Prime Minister. Its official primary responsibilities are to:

- Develop macro-fiscal projections and set medium-term budget ceilings;
- Help budget-dependent agencies prepare their annual budget;
- Assist the executive branch during the parliamentary budget approval process;
- Execute the annual budget – with responsibilities shared with the Ministry of Finance;
- Monitor and evaluate government-wide programmes.

The Bureau of the Budget is divided into a number of analytical divisions that “shadow” spending ministries as well as various “whole-of-budget” divisions, including for co-ordinating the budget process and budget policy, and for following through on the performance and results focus. Parallel to this, spending ministries will be working on their budget submissions. The sophistication of the internal budget procedures varies tremendously from ministry to ministry. In some cases, they are based on elaborate internal strategic planning exercises. The complete reverse is the case in others. Regardless, ministries submit their initial bids in February, i.e. at about the same time as the four core agencies will have arrived at their conclusion.

Spending ministries (including Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, lead agency for the implementation of the CBD) submitted their bids before the overall expenditure ceilings are decided. These initial bids are generally wildly in excess of any realistic expectations of funding – spending ministries appear to view them as a “marketing” device to influence the level of their final spending ceiling.

At this stage, the Bureau of the Budget is in a position to formulate the budget framework for the following year. Based on the work of the four core agencies, the total resources available for next year’s budget will be known. The update of the baselines for current activities will have been completed, thus revealing how much money is left for new initiatives.

Evaluating new bids from spending ministries

The Bureau of the Budget evaluates each bid for new funding against three dimensions:

- Is it in line with government priorities?
- Is the agency that makes the bid the correct administrative unit to be carrying it out?
- How does it contribute to empowering lower levels of government?

As noted earlier, government priorities are formally enunciated in the four-year Government Administration Plan. This is the first point of reference, and all bids must demonstrate their alignment with the Plan. As mentioned, the Plan however encompasses all activities of government and is therefore, by definition, of a general nature – although specific policies are of course highlighted.

In addition to the four-year Plan, the Cabinet generally designates a number of areas separately as priorities. These are referred to as the “National Agenda”. These may be very large activities such as supporting the reconstruction and development efforts following the natural disasters. Or they can be smaller activities such as campaigns to reduce smoking.

Parliament also authorises a comparatively large discretionary fund – the Central Fund – to the Prime Minister to meet new priorities during the year. The use of this fund is *prima facie* a strong indication of the government’s priorities.

Aside from the identification of specific activities as priorities, the government has set itself a number of overall benchmarks for the allocation of expenditure. For example, it aims for capital expenditure to amount to one-fourth of the total budget each year. Similarly, it aims to significantly reduce the share of salaries and other employment costs as a proportion of the total budget – from 40% to 30%. There are numerous vehicles for highlighting government priorities. In the end, it is a political decision as to which priorities to fund and at what level. The Bureau of the Budget – reporting directly to the Prime Minister – is uniquely positioned to play this role.

The Central Fund: A special feature of the Thai budgeting system is the existence of the Central Fund, which is organised in accordance with the Budget Procedures Act of 1959. This is a large fund – amounting to 20% of total government outlays. About 80% of the Fund is pre-determined in the budget formulation and approval phases. The other 20% operates as an in-year discretionary fund for specific purposes, such as “Enhancing the Nation’s Competitiveness and Sustainable Development”, or for emergency projects. This serves to create additional flexibility in budget implementation. The existence of this Fund does not appear to have undermined fiscal discipline, as the Fund is generally not used to supplement appropriations for government entities.

For many years , a vast amount of financial resources and workforce have been allocated to the conservation and management of biodiversity in Thailand, however, only a small proportion of these resources has been directed toward the tasks prioritized by the Convention.

The allocation of expenditures used for biodiversity conservation is not aligned with the priorities expressed in the NBSAPs, Biodiversity finance should be well planned and managed, concern institutions should re-focus their resources management to be better supportive to the Convention, particularly through paying greater attention to meet the Aichi Target defined in the CBD Strategic Plan, in a manner that promotes the sustainable development and the alleviation of poverty.

Uganda: A study on financing biodiversity in line with decision X/3 and XI/4 has been undertaken. Analysis is on-going to assess the funding gap. The outcome will be Guidelines and Action Plans for Financing Biodiversity in Uganda. The study is funded under the NBSAP review and updating process which started in July 2012 and will end in December 2014.

United Kingdom: We are in the process of delivering a LIFE project called iPENS, which is identifying the strategic funding needs for our Natura 2000 network, and will develop a more robust investment plan for these sites with indications of the potential funding opportunities. This is due to complete in 2015. We are also in the process of collecting more comprehensive data on the contribution of the NGO and private sector to our national biodiversity objectives, as part of our national biodiversity indicator set. We have good information on the level of public sector investment in biodiversity. The most significant source of direct funding for biodiversity delivery comes via the Rural Development Programme for England and its agri-environment schemes.

We have identified the need to increase private sector contribution to biodiversity delivery as a priority and we are in the process of developing and testing a number of possible models including Payments for Ecosystem services, biodiversity offsetting, natural capital accounting etc. There is a need to further enhance and diversify the sources of funding and delivery we utilise of we are to meet our ambitious domestic biodiversity outcomes.

(c) Comments/explanations

Australia: Activities undertaken in Australia and funded by the Australian Government that support implementation of the Resource Mobilisation Strategy are set out in Australia's fifth national report to the CBD.

Bulgaria: The Directly related fund are taken for 100%; the indirectly related funds are calculated as 30% of the total sum

Croatia: Regarding the Category "Private-funding" financial flows we succeed to collect data on case by case basis (some companies have stated it is matter of a business secret). Information on funds dedicated for biodiversity on the level of 'private funding' in the period 2006 - 2012 totals EUR 104.940,83 (respectively through years in EUR: 2006 - 14295,28; 2007 - 6416,27; 2008 - 16247,01; 2009 - 4790,45; 2010 - 2031,10; 2011 - 42992,29 and 2012 - 18168,43). Regarding the Category "Other sources" Government is developing procedure which includes obligation to transparent reporting on financial flows for NGOs, so we presume that comprehensive overview of biodiversity financing will be included in the next reporting period.

Czech Republic: The informations presented above indicate aggregate expenditure data for the protection of biodiversity at the national level, taken from the Central Statistical Office. Since there is no existing methodology for monitoring and reporting on financial flows related only to protection of biodiversity in relation to the objectives of the Convention and the Strategic Plan 2011-2020, we had to use available date from Central Statistical Office of the Czech Republic.

The presented data could not be accurately classified according to predetermined criteria allowed in this reporting. It was not possible to provide data that would allow the assignment of the individual amounts to the predefined categories. The data provided are the total numbers, which combines both governmental and business flows, both investment and non-investment in areas only directly related to the protection of biodiversity.

It is therefore necessary to look at the above data as the data overall, but not including all the different entities and all flows.

Above mentioned data do not contain the data that are taken as indirectly related to biodiversity (as defined in the Reporting). Given the available data, it would be possible to present only summary data, which is not possible to classify them into individual sectors. The total amount would greatly exceed the real situation and therefore these data are not presented.

The above mentioned comments should explain why we have decided to provide these data with a low lack of confidence.

EU: The amounts were estimated in terms of average annual commitments for the EU budget period 2007-2013 (taken to be an estimate of the average for the period 2006-2010). The 'indirectly related' category includes projects or measures which contribute significantly to biodiversity but for which biodiversity is not the primary objective. These contributions were counted as 40% of the total amounts.

In the EU, Regulation (EU) 691/2011 on European environmental economic accounts (SEEA) provides essential statistics to underpin environmental protection. The latest extension in 2013 includes Environmental Protection Expenditure Accounts, within which expenditure is allocated to environmental domains according to CEPA 2000 classification (Classification of Environmental Protection Activities and Expenditure). This connects to initiatives at national, EU, and international level (in particular the work of the UN Statistical division).

The Regulation also requires the collection of information on the private sector and other flows, and this information is therefore reported by many EU countries. In some cases, information on contribution from households is also provided (e.g. France). In some Member States, information on contributions at regional and local level, or contributions from NGOs are not available and figures are therefore underestimated.

The categories do not allow an easy distinction between direct and indirect flows and Member States therefore report on these categories in different ways, with several Member States only reporting on the total as a result of this constraint while others (such as Germany) are only reporting direct flows.

Many countries made efforts to collect data beyond formal statistics, for example on contributions from research and education (e.g. submission from Finland, Denmark and Poland). These sometimes represent substantial flows. However, distinguishing between direct or indirect flows was not always possible.

In the case of the EU central budget, a specific tracking methodology for domestic financial flows was developed. Although this will only be fully implemented in the current EU budget (2014-2020), applying the methodology ex post to the 2007-2013 budget has produced some first estimates.

Again, there are some positive trends in several EU Member States (e.g. Finland, France, Germany and Poland) as in most Member States and the EU budget, the very significant contribution from agriculture policy, in particular through agri-environment measures, is worth highlighting, as well as, to a lesser extent, from the fisheries sector. This is linked to the past EU reforms in these sectors.

Denmark: All estimates are compiled from accounts of expenditure and actual spending or estimates thereof and mainly based on the central administrative system (SKS) and governmental accounts. Additionally estimates from Statistics Denmark have also been used. All expenditures are calculated as gross cost.

The compilation of the national resources in relation to biodiversity 2006-2012 included funds used in the Nature Agency, the Environmental Protection Agency, Ministry of Defence and Ministry for Food, Agriculture and Fisheries and the Ministry of higher education and science. For government activities supported under the European Rural Development Program is included. The resource use reported for administration (category B) has been estimated by using 7-10% (8,5 % used in the assessment) of project costs from category A in the years of 2006 to 2010. The rationale for this assessment is that the average administration fee when analyzing general restoration and biodiversity projects. Biodiversity expenditure in relation to the area under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Defence has been estimated to a total of 9.5 million for the years 2007-2010 and does not include positive indirect effects on biodiversity. Policy development at the central level has been included based on an estimate that 25 % of the centrally placed administrative staff participates in development of new policies, an estimated 40 million per year.

A restructuring of the provincial level to municipal level in 2006, resources spend on biodiversity were moved to the municipal or state level. A minor part of the resources included at the municipal level includes activities that have indirect effects on biodiversity (sustainable forest management, promotion of recreational activities).

Specifics for the reporting 2006-2010: The reporting for the years 2006 to 2010 focusses on actual expenditure, direct effects on biodiversity and to a great extent excludes indirect benefits and is assessed as a conservative estimate. Furthermore Greenland costs and expenditures were not included in the reporting and only a few NGO's and Foundations reported on their expenditures on biodiversity.

Specifics for the reporting 2011 and 2012: The reporting for 2011 and 2012 focusses on actual expenditures and includes both direct and indirect benefits on biodiversity. Research on biodiversity matters has been included and explains to a large extent increase in the amount provided for biodiversity at the state level. Greenland has provided numbers for their national contributions, although this is not a complete picture as parts of their administration is not included.

The differences in the reporting on the years 2006 to 2010 and then the reporting on 2011 and 2012 makes it difficult to compare the development in expenditures completely. However any assessment does take account of the differences.

Other (NGO's and Foundations): Furthermore an inquiry was made to the largest NGOs and private foundations with regards to their use of resources at national and international level. However, it has

been kept in mind that international project or activities are often funded through bilateral aid. The reason being, that a large part of the funding to national NGOs comes from public funds (DANIDA). Therefore the NGO's were asked to identify the sources of funding to avoid double counting. The NGO's and foundations were asked to report on expenditures related to both direct and indirect benefits. Moreover they were asked to group the expenditures into different categories such as Biodiversity related to A) Biodiversity protection, B) Policy development and administration, C) Sustainable use and management and D) Sustainable production and consumption or similar categories depending on the activities of the organisation or foundation. It appears that a large part of activities supported by foundations focusses on indirect activities related to biodiversity such as awareness raising, information campaigns etc.

Only a limited number of NGOs and foundations were requested to give input for the years 2006-2010. However for the reporting on 2011 and 2012 a total of 5 large foundations and 2 NGO's provided data

France: Moyenne 2007-2011 de la dépense totale de protection de la biodiversité et des paysages : 1828 millions d'euros. Ce tableau a été renseigné à partir des comptes de l'environnement (source : Ministère de l'écologie, du développement durable et de l'énergie – CGDD – Service d'observation et des statistiques, 2013, L'économie de l'environnement en 2011. Rapport de la Commission des comptes et de l'économie de l'environnement .pp. 71-78)

http://www.statistiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/fileadmin/documents/Produits_editoriaux/Publications/References/2013/compte-environnement/references-economie-environnement-en-2011-edition-2013-2.pdf).

Les données 2011 sont provisoires, les données 2010 sont semi-définitives, les données 2009 et précédentes sont définitives. Les données 2012 ne sont pas encore disponibles.

Il n'a pas été possible de distinguer les activités directes et indirectes, Toutes les dépenses prises en compte sont qualifiées de « protection de la biodiversité et des paysages », mais comprennent également des dépenses de gestion. Voir question 5 pour des commentaires détaillés.

Les dépenses publiques régionales (Provincial Budgets) regroupent les dépenses des régions, des départements et des agences de l'eau.

Les dépenses du secteur privé sont les dépenses des entreprises.

La rubrique « Autres » regroupe les dépenses des ménages (qui sont principalement des contributions aux associations) et d'autres dépenses. Voir onglet "Détail" pour plus d'informations sur l'ensemble de ces données.

Germany: Exact data are not available, because there are no biodiversity specific statistics or budget lines. Amounts are based on assessments or surveys. They include in principle: domestic nature conservation projects, biodiversity research for BMUB, administration costs, maintenance and salary as well as national agro-environmental measures. Data on indirectly related resources are not available.

India: Please note that this study includes only 10 ministries. Though a detailed study is being carried out with 24 ministries by others, we have stuck to 10 ministries. The figures for the year 2010 submitted previous year differs from this one because of a difference in the selected ministries and schemes and because of a better estimate of the 'multipliers' used in the estimation. The figures have been taken from Ministry Demand for Grants data.

Italy: Data for category 2.1.2 are provided by ISTAT (Italian National Institute of Statistics). They refer to expenditure made by Regional Administration and Autonomous Provinces. Directly related expenditures refer to class CEPA 6 "Protection of biodiversity and landscape" of the CEPA2000 Classification (Classification of Environmental Protection Activities and expenditure). In this class are included payments for activities related both to biodiversity and to landscape protection. At this moment they can be considered only as a whole.

Japan: Overall comments: Central Government Budgets finances state/provisional, local/municipal budgets and academia. Thus, duplications were not be able to avoided among those budgets.

Government Budgets Central: Expenses item for Biodiversity Conservation in “Environmental Conservation Expenses” statistics compiled by Ministry of the Environment was used for this source.

Government Budgets – State/ Provincial & Local/Municipal : The figure was estimated i) by calculating the ratio of biodiversity conservation expenses of several prefectural governments ii) by reflecting the ratio to total sub-national government budgets.

Private Sector/ Markets: The figures of Private Sector expenses in Toyokeizai CSR survey are available. However, due to unclear classification of the biodiversity expenses by each company, the figures are not enough reliable for official reporting.

Others (NGOs, foundation, and academia): As to academia expenses, “Biodiversity Conservation expenses” in “The Environment Research and Technology Development Fund” was counted. No appropriate figure was available for expenses by NGO.

Netherlands: a) Budget for nature was transferred from central government to provinces (ILG, 2007-2012). Comparable data for 2006 are not available. The data for 2007-2010 above show expenditures for ‘nature’ made by the Provinces: management and maintenance of nature areas and the implementation of protection measures for nature and landscapes. (<http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=80502NED&D1=35-38&D2=a&D3=5-16&D4=a&VW=T>). b) Municipal expenditure: within the municipal budgets for green infrastructure no specific data for biodiversity (related) funding are available. c) Other indirectly related and direct (domestic) expenditure of Central Government has been estimated. Indirect expenditure has been included for 40%. Reduction of Ecological and Nature Defragmentation (connectivity) counts for 100% (MJPO).

New Zealand: All local council information not yet collated. Local NGO information not yet collated.

Norway: For domestic expenditures we have not updated the information, but would refer to our submission from 2012.

Poland: Average annual biodiversity funding for the years 2006-2010, preliminary baseline for financial resources available in the country, equals to 564 338 929,00 USD per year (2 821 694 645,00 : 5 = 564 338 929,00)

Slovenia: The amounts for each year include public money spent for functioning of nature conservation system, research projects and programmes directly related to biodiversity (strictly scientific, applicative and post- doc projects). The calculation also includes funds spent through the EU’s financial instrument supporting environmental and nature conservation projects throughout the EU (LIFE) and measures directly related to biodiversity by agriculture and forestry sectors.

Switzerland: Domestic budgets: Methodology used for assessing national flows of financial resources

Expenditures and investments for the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of its components are rarely specifically shown in public sector accounts. Some budgetary items contribute to the objectives of the CBD to some extent, but not entirely. In order to estimate the contribution of a budgetary item to the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity, a so called Biodiversity-factor (BD-factor) was used to adjust expenditures where necessary (see tables 1 and 2).

Table 1: The BD-Factor is an estimate of the extent a budgetary item contributes to the objectives of the CBD.

Estimated relevance for CBD objectives	Biodiversity factor	
	Value (0 - 1)	%
Budgetary item supports CBD's objectives to its full extent	1.00	100%
Budgetary item supports CBD's significantly	0.75	75%
About half of the Budgetary item supports CBD's objectives	0.50	50%
Budgetary item contributes to CBD's objectives for the smaller part	0.25	25%
A minor part of the budgetary item contributes to CBD objectives	0.10	10%
A marginal part of the budgetary item contributes to CBD objectives	0.05	5%

The national financial contribution in support of the objectives of the CBD was extruded from the model of the Federal Finance administration. This model describes Federal budgets according to major budgetary items at the federal, cantonal and communal level (FS-Modell; Ausgaben nach Funktionen, Bund; FSModell Ausgaben nach Funktionen, Kantone im Vergleich; S-Modell; Ausgaben, Gemeinden insgesamt)³ The model does, however, not include staffing expenditures. Most of the identified budgetary items contribute to some extent to the objectives of the CBD, but not in their entity. Therefore, the biodiversity factor (BD-factor) was used to readjust the expenses, as well as to avoid double-counts among the various levels. The biodiversity factor applied was defined in consultation with multiple experts from the Federal administration, academia and CSOs. The same methodology was used by Switzerland in the past in the resource mobilization submission of July 2012³. The methodology will be revisited on a regular basis and may be further refined.

³ Federal Finance Administration FFA:

http://www.efv.admin.ch/d/dokumentation/zahlen_fakten/finanzstatistik/index.php

Table 2: The BD-factor used to readjust budgetary items at the Federal, Cantonal and Municipal level.

Code	Category	BD-factor applied:		
		National	Subnational	Municipal
311	Museums and fine arts	0.05	0.05	0.05
741	Water engineering	0.10	0.10	0.05
750	Species conservation and landscape protection	0.75	0.25	0.50
761	Air pollution control and climate protection	0.10	0.10	0.05
769	Countering environmental pollution, NES*	0.25	0.10	0.10
779	Environment protection, NES*	0.25	0.25	0.25
790	Regional development	0.10	0.10	0.05
813**	Improvement of animal breed	0.05	0.05	0.05
814**	Improvement of crop production	0.10	0.10	0.05
816	Agriculture: direct support schemes	0.10	0.00	0.10
820	Forestry	0.10	0.05	0.05
830	Hunting and fisheries	0.25	0.05	0.05

* NES: not elsewhere specified

** The expenses related to the improvement of animal breeds and crop production (Code 813 and 814) target the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources. The total amount of both categories roughly corresponds to the budgetary item of the "Sélection végétale et élevage" of the Federal Office for Agriculture FOAG (OFAG (2011): Rapport Agricole 2011, Tableau 52, p. A58).

The "Code 750 Species conservation and landscape protection" is earmarked as "direct" related to biodiversity and the other codes as indirect.

Private / market expenditures: Based on schemes for corporate environmental accounting, which are currently being developed and discussed in international fora, private companies' expenditures and investments for BES can be broken down into various measures and activities. Some of those activities have a direct or an indirect effect on biodiversity, which is different according to the business sector and the specific measure. Such measures include:

- direct expenditures into site restoration or ecosystem and species conservation measures with a link to business activities or company properties,
- direct sponsoring activities for projects in research, conservation or education,
- direct investments into partnerships with NGOs with regard to BES or (multi-stakeholder) fora on land and natural resource management
- investments into corporate environmental management such as emissions reduction, waste management, water consumption etc. or product development and stewardship, which also have a proportional effect on BES
- investments into new financial mechanisms such as Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)

In addition, environmental fees and compliance provisions can be linked to biodiversity and ecosystem services to a certain extent. Many sectors have additional specific measures and activities, e.g. investments into different types of complex cooperation with partners to develop certifiable

environmentally friendly products. In most sectors, activities with an assumed regard to biodiversity are entangled with others, so that their contributions with regard to biodiversity per se can – according to the feedback of companies and the information provided in publicly accessible data bases and reports – be hardly assessed in detail.

Methodology: To assess the amount of Swiss company expenditures and investments into biodiversity and ecosystem services from the measures mentioned above, the Swiss Government commissioned a survey. Companies with headquarters in Switzerland, which were known to be aware of being linked to biodiversity and ecosystem services according to their business model and which have disclosed information on biodiversity in their recent non-financial reporting (annual and CSR reporting) were selected. The companies were asked to provide financial data for the abovementioned categories for the baseline between 2006 and 2010. Additional information was derived from public material of the companies, such as sustainability reports and interviews, which were conducted with company representatives responsible for environmental or sustainability management.

Results: Due to lack of data and coherence between the different data sources the total estimated investments for BES from the private sector can't be reported. In order to increase the reliability of the private sector data, much more sophisticated assessment methodologies on specific sector level would be necessary. Methods for environmental accounting would have to include differentiation possibilities for national and international flows and an individual focus on different forms of natural capital. Company activities with respect to the different forms of natural capital (e.g. expenditure and investments into emissions reduction to respond to climate change, solid waste and waste water management and treatment) would have to be attributed with individual biodiversity factors, according to different business sectors.

Other financial flows (NGOs, foundations and academia)

Methodology: NGOs: There are numerous national and regional NGO's as well as foundations in Switzerland committed to activities related to the objectives of the CBD. However, the present indicator is limited to NGO's and foundations being active at the national level, i.e. having the right to appeal (Verbandsbeschwerderecht). NGOs being active at the international level predominantly are addressed in a separate assessment (non-ODA).

An overview on expenditures/revenues of NGOs and foundations does so far not exist. Therefore, the data for the present indicator had to be gathered on a case-by-case basis, by reviewing each NGO's financial statements and/or annual report.

The work of all the NGO's listed hereinafter has positive effects on biodiversity. Their support of the objectives of the CBD is far from limited to policy making. Year after year these organizations generate substantive funding, mainly from private donors, to carry out biodiversity-related projects. From the total expenditures, the ones relating to biodiversity were estimated based on available information in annual reports. The project costs have been summarized and transformed by applying a BD-factor, having excluded all administrative efforts to run the NGO's as well as the financial support received from the federal, cantonal and communal administrations in order to avoid double counting (Table 6).

Table 6: NGOs considered for the calculation of biodiversity relevant expenditure and the BD-factor applied.

NGO	Estimated relevance for CBD objectives	
	low-end estimate	high-end estimate
Alpine-Initiative	0.5	0.5
Equiterre	0.5	0.75
Bern Declaration	0.05	0.05
Greenpeace Switzerland	0.5	0.75
Greina Foundation	0.25	0.75
Mountain Wilderness	0.25	0.5
Pan Eco	0.5	0.75
Swiss Foundation for practical Environment Protection	0.1	0.75
Pro Natura	0.75	0.75
Pro Specia rara	0.5	0.75
Rheinaubund	0.5	0.5
Swiss Alpine Club	0.05	0.1
Swiss Energy Foundation	0.5	0.5
Swiss Heritage Society	0.25	0.5
Swiss hiking trails	0.25	0.25
Swiss Foundation for Landscape Conservation	0.1	0.1
SVS/BirdLife Switzerland	0.5	0.5
Swiss Transport and Environment Association	0.1	0.25
WWF Switzerland	0.5	0.75

Academia: Biodiversity-related research and education supports the objectives for the CBD as well, in direct and more in indirect forms. This section provides an overview of existing data in this sector and an estimate of the yearly expenses in Switzerland for research and education. Data from surveys undertaken by Swiss Statistics and official reports, such as annual reports and audited financial statements were used as a basis for collecting information: (i) R&D expenditures at universities and universities of applied sciences (including SNSF-projects) An adjustment of the expenditure on R&D is made with statistics of the SNSF (share of biodiversity relevant projects approved – adjusted for each year): (ii) Educational expenditures at universities (without R&D) An adjustment of the expenditure on education in universities is made with the BD-factor (5% - 10%); (iii) Educational expenditures at universities of applied sciences (without R&D) An adjustment of the expenditure on education in universities of applied sciences is made with the BDfactor (5% - 10%).

Uganda: Core Government expenditure on biodiversity is estimated at US\$160 million per year.

United Kingdom: Central Government direct spend estimates are based on data provided by Government Departments, but in some cases using expert judgement to identify share allocated to biodiversity. Includes spend on R&D. Administration costs are excluded from all categories as we do not collect this data from Gov. departments.

D. Preparing national financial plans and assessing or evaluating the values of biodiversity (paragraph 7 (d) of decision XI/4)

(a) Tabular overview

Target as per decision XI/4	Paragraph 7 (d): Endeavour for 100 per cent, but at least 75 per cent, of Parties provided with adequate financial resources to have prepared national financial plans for biodiversity by 2015, and that 30 per cent of those Parties have assessed and/or evaluated the intrinsic, ecological, genetic, socioeconomic, scientific, educational, cultural, recreational and aesthetic values of biological diversity and its components	
Elements of target	Preparation of national financial plans	Assessment/evaluation of values
Relevant sections of PRF	3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity
Reported	Croatia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Estonia, EU, Finland, France, India, Japan, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom	Australia, Bulgaria, China, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, EU, Finland, France, Germany, India, Japan, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, Netherl., New Zealand, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom
Not reported/limited progress, no activities	Austria, Bulgaria, China, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherl., New Zealand, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden	Austria, Ethiopia, Greece, Italy

(d) Responses provided

3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity

Australia: Australia's Biodiversity Conservation Strategy 2010-30 recognizes that national biodiversity accounting has an important role in demonstrating the extent and condition of biodiversity and ecosystem services in Australia. Such accounts would support public policy and evaluation and ensure that the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services is realistically reflected alongside Australia's national economic and social indicators.

Australia is in the process of developing a series of national environmental-economic accounts, consistent with the international framework of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA), adopted by the United Nations in 2012. National accounts for biodiversity and ecosystem services will sit alongside other environmental accounts within the broader framework of the SEEA, which itself will sit alongside the System of National Accounts (SNA).

The SEEA was adopted as an international statistical standard by the United Nations Statistical Commission at its 43rd meeting in 2012. As an international statistical standard the SEEA now has the same status as the SNA, from which key economic indicators such as GDP (gross domestic product) emerge. The adoption of the SEEA by the United Nation's peak statistical body is a significant milestone in the on-going development of information to support the needs of government, industry and the general public in the area of environmental policy.

The SEEA is a measurement framework that can provide a range of metrics that link information on the economy and the environment. This integration of information is achieved by the use of common

frameworks, classifications and standards, providing an integrated database for policy analysis and decision making.

The SEEA has its roots in the SNA. The SNA is a framework that measures economic activity and organises a wide range of economic data into a structured set of accounts. It defines the concepts, classifications and accounting rules needed to do this. The SNA measures economic activity in monetary terms and such valuation is usually based on market transactions. In a limited number of cases where market transactions do not occur but the transactions are very similar to market transactions, the value is approximated using a range of internationally agreed techniques. The SEEA extends the SNA by recording environmental data that are usually available in physical or quantitative terms in conjunction with the economic data in monetary terms from the SNA. The power of the SEEA comes from its capacity to present information in both physical and monetary terms in a coherent manner.

Parallel to developing a national system of environmental-economic accounts, the Australian Government is implementing a National Plan for Environmental Information (NPEI). The NPEI is a particularly important initiative as environmental accounts must be underpinned by regular and reliable environmental information.

Bulgaria: Bulgaria participates in the Working Group on Mapping and Assessment on Ecosystems and their Services (MAES) set up under the Common Implementation Framework. The working group developed ideas for a coherent analytical framework to be applied by the EU and its Member States to ensure consistent approaches are used. The report adopted in April 2013 proposes a conceptual framework linking biodiversity, ecosystem state and ecosystem services to human well-being. Furthermore, it develops a typology for ecosystems in Europe and promotes the CICES classification for ecosystem services.

China: The Economics of Ecosystem and Biodiversity (TEEB) was officially launched in 2014 at the national level.

Croatia: First step was taken in 1999 after ratification of the CBD and adoption of the first National Strategy and Action Plan for the Protection of Biological and Landscape Diversity (NBSAP), which introduced for the first time the concept of biodiversity conservation in integrated and systematic manner. Following on that, in 2003 the Nature Protection Act introduced the concept of protected nature values and economic natural values. In the period up to the year 2007 Croatia became a full-fledged member of all international conventions in the field of nature protection, and actively pursued initiatives.

Denmark: As a follow up on the EU biodiversity strategy a project was launched on mapping and assessing ecosystems and their services.

Estonia: * No nationwide activities have been initiated. * There are some projects based activities for some types of ecosystems or parts of them (see comments). * Some universities e.g. Tallinn Technical University and Estonian University of Life Sciences are dealing with the biodiversity and ecosystem services value assessments on scientific bases.

Ethiopia: Assessment of biodiversity value is not conducted. It will be conducted as soon as the fund for conducting is secured.

EU: Action 5 of the EU Biodiversity strategy to 2020 foresees that Member States, with the assistance of the Commission, will map and assess the state of ecosystems and their services in their national territory by 2014, assess the economic value of such services, and promote the integration of these values into accounting and reporting systems at EU and national level by 2020. The European Commission funded a

study to support EU Member States to take forward this action by providing 'A synthesis of approaches to assess and value ecosystem services in the EU in the context of TEEB'. The report takes stock of existing national and international initiatives related to The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB), their main objectives and focus, progress, lessons learned, key issues, and future research priorities. The report outlines a conceptual framework for the assessment of ecosystem services, and the choices to be made between classifications, methods and approaches. Recommendations are presented to allow Member States to choose the information and methods that are of highest relevance to them. The report is available at

<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/economics/pdf/EU%20Valuation.pdf> .

In addition, the Commission is financing the project "TEEB National Implementation: Reflecting the Value of Ecosystems and Biodiversity in Policymaking", which is implemented by UNEP. The project aims to implement TEEB in five developing countries, and was launched in Hyderabad at CBD CoP-11. One of the project deliverables is a Guidance Manual to support national TEEB implementation.

Regarding the assessment of values of biodiversity, many Member States are involved in TEEB-related initiatives (e.g. Sweden, France, Germany, Spain, United Kingdom, Finland and Netherlands). The European Commission is supporting Member States' work through the Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services initiative, which involves a component on valuing ecosystems and their services, and integrating these values into accounting and reporting systems. Support to TEEB work in developing countries is also provided, for example through the UNEP-implemented TEEB national implementation project funded by the European Commission, support to regional and sub-regional capacity building workshops (Sweden) or the bilateral support to national TEEB initiatives from Germany.

Finland: TEEB Finland (2013–2014) project aims to systematically incorporate the value of ecosystem services into all levels of decision-making in the future. The project's goal is to identify Finland's most important (key) ecosystem services and propose methods to assess their current status and future trends. It will also aim to provide some preliminary estimates on the economic importance of some key services, especially the ones that so far remain under-recognized. Consequently, the project pays special attention to the regulating and cultural services that thus far have received limited attention. Building on the insights above, TEEB Finland will also analyze the opportunities for improving the governance of ecosystem services, including exploring how ecosystem services can be linked to supporting the development of sustainable green economy in Finland. The project will produce recommendations for effective integration of ecosystem services into decision-making processes, and for governing natural capital and ecosystem services. The project will also identify major knowledge gaps. In terms of concrete objectives, TEEB Finland aims to support a number of ongoing policy processes at both national and regional level including, in particular, 1) development of national framework for assessing and monitoring ecosystem services (e.g. identification and establishment of appropriate indicators), 2) development of national policies and policy instruments supporting truly 'green' green economy and 3) supporting the sustainable regional development through the implementation of green infrastructure. Building on the above, the project is foreseen to contribute to Finland's commitments in achieving the global and EU biodiversity goals by 2020.

France: La France a engagé l'évaluation française des écosystèmes et des services écosystémiques (projet EFESE) en 2012. Ce programme repose sur des travaux et réflexions engagés depuis 2007. Ces travaux ont permis d'élaborer des valeurs de référence pour certains services écosystémiques pour certains grands types d'écosystèmes (forêts tempérées et prairies naturelles : CAS, 2009) ; des études de cas ont également été conduites sur certains écosystèmes spécifiques : zones humides, (CGDD, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013) , haies, cultures de légumineuses., récifs coralliens (Ifreco).

Germany: National: The German TEEB-Study was publicly launched in 2012 and will be completed in 2016. A first substantial report on climate ecosystem services and biodiversity has been published in 2014. The aim is to apply this TEEB approach to Germany, generating economic arguments for nature protection policy. International: Germany supports partner countries to undertake national TEEB activities (e.g. Brazil, India, Mexico, Namibia.)

India: Green Accounting for Indian States and Union Territories (GAISP) 2004 -Technical Support

Japan: Japan conducted economic evaluations of the publicly beneficial functions of forests then presented the results of these estimations in 1972, 1991, and 2000. In November 2001, the Science Council of Japan submitted a report entitled "Evaluation of Multiple Functions of Agriculture and Forests in relation to the Global Environment and Human Livelihood." The report offered a systematic breakdown of the functions of forests with the details and an evaluation of each function. It presented figures on those functions and clarified physical functions that could be evaluated in monetary terms, and thereby reconfirmed the vital importance of forests. The evaluated monetary value of multi-functions of forest was JPY 70 trillion per year, though functions are limited to accessible ones.

After above mentioned national level assessments, several regional assessments with a biodiversity aspect were conducted by using several advanced methods. For example, Kabukurinuma (wetlands designated under the Ramsar Convention, in Osaka, Miyagi Prefecture), known as one of the largest destinations of anatine birds in Japan, the economic value of ecosystem services (maintaining the number of anatine birds coming to the wetlands at the current 70,000) protected by environmentally-sound farming around the wetlands has been analyzed. The analysis was made using the conjoint method, under which a survey is carried out by presenting multiple environment conservation measures to potential respondents and asking them to rank their desirability to evaluate the economic value. A nationwide questionnaire survey for a six-day period via the Internet drew a total of 3,257 responses (the response rate at 21.6%). The survey results put the willingness to pay at an average JPY 1,007 per household per year, which is estimated to total JPY 53.2 billion when extended to the total number of households of 52.88 million in Japan (as of March 2009) (based on "Policy Research on Environmental Economics," Associate Professor Managi and Professor Kuriyama).

Malawi: A study that was commissioned by the Poverty Environment Initiative was carried out in 2011 to evaluate the economic importance of sustainable natural resource use in Malawi. The study further recommended the assessment of values of biodiversity.

Mauritius: will be highlighted in the next exercise for the updating and revision of existing NBSAP.

Namibia: Namibia through the MET has taken a proactive approach to address the question of the value of biodiversity in Namibia by implementing a project based approach to natural resource accounting. The overarching project goal is that the Namibian capacities of mobilising resources for biodiversity conservation is based on the economic valuation of ecosystem services and that its mainstreaming into national governance processes has been improved and applied sustainably. Current research carried out by the Environmental Economics Unit focuses on Tourism Satellite Accounts (TSAs) and Forestry and Wildlife Accounts. Furthermore, a Review of Environmental Valuation in Namibia was conducted to inform the basis for the upcoming the valuation of priority ecosystem services in Namibia.

Biodiversity and natural resources are of great importance to the country's development. Natural resources-based sectors form the backbone of Namibia's economy with mining, fisheries and agriculture alone accounting for around 30% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and 85% of exports. In addition, around 70% of Namibia's population is directly dependent on the natural resource base for income; food; medicinal and health needs; fuel and shelter. Tourism (based largely on Namibia's pristine landscapes

and rich and healthy wildlife populations and conservation areas) is also an important engine for economic growth in rural areas, while biotrade is a small contributor to the economy but with much potential for expansion. This situation demands that biodiversity, and the ecosystem services it provides, are maintained and enhanced as far as possible for sustainable development.

Netherlands: The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB): As from 2011 a number of thematic TEEB studies have been commissioned and a number of them have been finalized. (<http://www.biodiversiteit.nl/teeb>). With TEEB-NL the Dutch government aims for improved transparency of economic value, in terms of costs and benefits of ecosystem services for businesses, government and citizens. The results are in the first place meant to raise awareness of the fact that the value of biodiversity and ecosystems should be incorporated in decision making processes for policies and investments. The results of TEEB-NL also include concrete proposals or prospects for action.

DANK (Digital Agenda Natural Capital): DANK is the Dutch National Ecosystem Assessment. It's goal is to provide a geographical or GIS-based inventory of the national ecosystems and their services. The inventory offers both qualitative and quantitative description of the national ecosystems, including a monetary valuation. The project is a national implementation of the EU Biodiversity Strategy initiative called MAES (Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services). DANK is a multi-year project that started in 2012.

GBO4 (Global Biodiversity Outlook 4): The Netherlands and Dutch Agencies contribute to the realization of the Global Biodiversity Outlook 4.

New Zealand: Biodiversity values have been incorporated in New Zealand's principal legislation governing the use of natural resources and the environment, the Resource Management Act (RMA) since 1991. The RMA takes a whole ecosystem approach to the sustainable management of resources including for biodiversity. The key themes are: sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects on the environment. It is managed through local councils and requires them to actively develop a policy framework to control actual or potential effects on maintenance of indigenous biological diversity. This has led to the development of local plans to manage areas of habitat for important for biodiversity. This is supported by a suite of environmental impact assessment, conservation, and land use planning tools aimed at taking into account and balancing the objectives of sustainable management, biodiversity and ecosystem services, which are enshrined in legislation.

In 2013, work commenced on an Environmental Reporting Bill that will mandate the provision of comprehensive environmental information. An Environmental Reporting System will be developed to report on air, climate and atmosphere, freshwater, marine and land, with biodiversity as a theme across all the domains. It will be aligned with international reporting, such as the OECD Green Growth indicators.

The New Zealand Treasury has produced the Living Standards Framework (<http://www.treasury.govt.nz/abouttreasury/higherlivingstandards>), which goes beyond GDP to incorporate a range of material and non-material factors that impact on well-being (including natural capital) in its definition of Living Standards. The Framework is centred on four main capital stocks - financial/physical, human, social, and natural. The Framework describes the interrelationships among the stocks and flows, and highlights the need for responsible management in order to improve the living standards of both current and future New Zealanders. It identifies biodiversity, as well as the atmosphere, freshwater, soil, and fish stocks, as being of particular importance to living standards in New Zealand.

Poland: National Strategy for the protection and sustainable use of biological diversity and the Action Plan in the years 2007-2013, adopted by the Council of Ministers in 2007, sets as one of the tasks within the strategic goal:” Identification of national biodiversity and the existing and potential threats to biodiversity “ the task No 1: Inventory and evaluation of elements of biodiversity, especially of natural habitats. The sum allocated from the State Budget amounts to 4 250 000 PLN (1.4 million USD) annually for the years 2008-2013. No direct information on the amount spent is available now, although a number of study/research works in this scope have been undertaken by various scientific institutions over the last 5 years. There are a number of initiatives devoted to the assessment of nature's value, mainly taken from the scientific perspective. Due to dispersal of the information sources the exact amounts of expenditures are hard to determine.

Slovenia: Study - The use of methods for economic evaluation of ecosystem services in protected areas. The study summarizes the most useful methods for economic evaluation of ecosystem services in protected areas. The study was carried out within the framework of the NATREG.

Spain: Proyecto de Evaluación de Ecosistemas del Milenio en España, realizado por la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid con el apoyo de la Fundación Biodiversidad del Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente. Resultados: www.ecomilenio.es

Sweden: See the 5th National Report to the CBD.

Switzerland: Switzerland has initiated a process to make the services that the environment provides measurable and communicable, i.e. an “Inventory of Final Ecosystem Goods and Services”. Based on the feasibility study “Welfare-significant environmental indicators” (Ott/Staub 2009), the Federal office for the Environment FOEN, with the help of numerous internal and external experts, has drawn up a list of relevant ecosystem goods and services that forms the starting point for an inventory of ecosystem goods and services that are directly enjoyed, consumed or used by humans (Final Ecosystem Goods and Services, FEES; Staub/Ott 2011). The three main components of the study are I) an inventory with 23 ecosystem services relevant to Switzerland as well as proposals for indicators for the individual services, II) an indicator set of FEES (catalogue of 23 FEES and 46 related indicators), and III) an application Website for planners (<http://oesl-check.ethz.ch/>) that supports the assessment of projects according to their importance for and their effects on ecosystem services.

Further Information: Switzerland's Fifth National Report under the Convention on Biological Diversity (2014). Chapter 1

References: Ott Walter, Staub Cornelia 2009: Welfare-Significant Environmental Indicators. A Feasibility Study on providing a Statistical Basis for the Resources Policy. Summary. Environmental studies no. 0913. Federal Office for the Environment, Bern: 11 pp. Download: www.environment-switzerland.ch/uw-0913-e ; Staub Cornelia, Ott Walter et al. 2011: Indicators for Ecosystem Goods and Services: Framework, methodology and recommendations for a welfare-related environmental reporting. Federal Office for the Environment, Bern. Environmental studies no. 1102: 17 S.; Download: www.environment-switzerland.ch/uw-1102-e ; von Grünigen Stefan, Kienast Felix, Ott Walter, Cerny Noëmi 2013: Ökosysteme und ihre Leistungen erfassen und räumlich darstellen. Econcept /WSL for Federal Office for the Environment, Bern. Download: <http://www.bafu.admin.ch/aktionsplan-biodiversitaet/12608/12621/12638/index.html?lang=de>

Thailand: Thailand has carried out Studies and Reports on the Economic value of Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity; Sea Grass Ecosystem (year of completed: 2012) The objectives of the study was to analyse the economic returns from investment in conservation and restoration of Thailand's sea grass

beds , to assess the economic benefits from conservation investments when taking into consideration the opportunity costs of forgone income from economic activities.

Uganda: Economic valuation of protected areas, Contribution of the Forest Sub-sector to National Economy. The Economic valuation of PAs was supported by GEF under CBDPOWPA (US\$ 85,000) in 2009 and was completed in 2012 while the contribution of forest sector was supported by Government. The economic value of biodiversity in the fisheries, tourism, agriculture and energy was estimated at USD546 million/year in 2002 while ecosystem services was estimated to be over USD200 million/year. Result -Information to be used to include information on the values of natural resources in national planning and accounting processes.

United Kingdom: Following the Natural Environment White Paper, and the National Ecosystem Assessment in 2011, a number of initiatives around valuing biodiversity and its benefits have been established. An important element of this work at a national level is work with the Office for National Statistics to fully include natural capital in the UK Environmental Accounts. This recognizes that natural capital is absolutely integral to our economy and well-being. Losses and gains relating to these assets need to be properly recorded within the nation's balance sheet, alongside human, manufactured and social capital. The Natural Capital Committee is working closely with the ONS and Defra to implement the Roadmap to 2020 that the ONS published in December 2012. Early progress has been made with a number of initial discussion papers and accounts published in June 2013; further work is being taken forward on aggregate natural capital accounts as well as specific accounts for woodlands and the Public Forest Estate, Enclosed Farmlands, Wetlands and Marine. Progress reports and initial accounts for these will be published between March and December 2014. There has also been a follow on work programme after the UN National Ecosystem Assessment. The work packages being carried out under the follow on study cover: a Natural Capital Asset Check; Macroeconomics; Economic values of ecosystem services; Marine economics; Cultural Ecosystem Services; Cultural, Shared and Plural Values; Scenarios; Response Options; Institutional Cultural and Behavioural Barriers and Tools. The results of the this work will be published later in 2014, and will appear on the project website <http://uknea.unep-wcmc.org/>.

3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity

Australia: Refer to Australia's fifth national report to the CBD.

China: But progress is limited in identifying funding needs, developing national financing plans and related capacity building.

Croatia: The legislative basis for national financial plans for biodiversity has been incorporated in the NBSAP including the strategic goals, targets, guidelines and action plans for its achievement. NBSAP is also a stronghold in the provision of new and strengthening of the existing financial mechanisms for biodiversity conservation. The bases for preparation of NBSAP is the Report on the State of Nature which among others contains information about the financial inflow for biodiversity for the respective reporting period from overall funding sources and associated mechanisms. The new draft of report for the period 2008 – 2012 is being prepared. Current implementation of the "National Biodiversity Planning to Support the implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan in Croatia" project, inter alia, contributes to Croatia's efforts towards identification of baseline funding needs and funding gaps that will contribute to revision of Resource Mobilisation framework to be incorporated in new NBSAP. This will also include the monitoring framework for its implementation.

Additionally, regarding the EU funding prospective (2014-2020), Croatia is finalizing related strategic documents (Partnership Agreement and operational programmes) needed for defining the funding needs and priorities in the next 7-year period. Biodiversity is recognized as one of the funding priorities. All mentioned documents will be adopted by Croatian government giving it strong political support.

Additionally (as mentioned under 3.2), in order to ensure multiannual programming, all government bodies have to adopt 3 years planning programs as part of the Strategy of Government Programmes, including relevant indicators to follow the achievement of the set goals.

Finally, in relation to managing of PAs, management plans are developed for almost all national and nature parks, while only a few still have to be adopted, in line with the strategic guidelines of the NBSAP, but financial needs presented in management plans are only partially transposed in the financial plans that comprise better/realistic projections. However, recently developed management plans include financial resources planned for the 10 years period that are based on current funding and, hence, are more realistic. Initial baseline identification on funding needs, gaps and priorities for protected areas was undertaken during the preparation phase of the project “Strengthening the institutional and financial sustainability of the national protected areas” in 2013, which is supported by GEF. Implementation of the project will start in 2014 with the expected implementation timeframe of four years. Project, inter alia, will support the preparation of the national planning framework for the national protected area system. Framework will comprise three components: a medium-term strategic plan; a medium-term financial plan; and a set of standardized policies and guidelines for protected areas. The planning framework will serve as an input into the updated NBSAP. Financial plan will give detailed financial analyses that will identify realistic funding needs and gaps and give a guide on the implementation of a sustainable financing strategy.

Denmark: The funding priorities, including biodiversity funding is set out in the former government’s plan for Green Growth (2010-2015). Priorities for the years 2015-2020 will focus on green conversion. The economic area of focus is still to be defined.

Ethiopia: Biodiversity is part of the national five year or short terms plans. As a result biodiversity is part of the development of national financial plan. Yearly budget is allocated from public and international fund.

Estonia: * Strategic planning for biodiversity financing is covered in draft Nature Conservation Development Plan until 2020. Plan lists the necessary activities and the resources needed for biodiversity conservation. Nature conservation activities are included in the EU funds distribution.

EU: The sections on resource mobilization of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 review financing needs and financing sources and options. The Strategy highlights that biodiversity considerations should be integrated in European Commission Proposals for the 2014-2020 EU budget, and that contributions from the private sector should be stepped up. The need for integration in funding instruments is also stressed in the Communication on Green Infrastructure adopted in May 2013.

NBSAPs have been, or are in the process of being updated, in many EU Member States (e.g. Belgium, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, United Kingdom, Spain, Poland, Sweden, Estonia and Denmark), and at EU level, and often include a section on financing biodiversity. A special biodiversity agency is to be set up in France as part of the new national biodiversity law.

Finland: The national budget planning system in Finland includes conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. For example indicators have been developed and reports made available such as the The State of the Environment in Finland 2013. This is a compact review of the state of the environment in Finland. It brings together the most important indicators which can be used to assess the state of the Finnish environment, to reveal trends and to evaluate the effectiveness of actions taken. The indicators represent eight different themes: Natural resources, Climate change and energy, Communities and transport, Air pollutants, Fresh water and the sea, Biodiversity, Chemicals and hazardous substances and Green economy. As stated in the Finnish national biodiversity strategy and action plan, national

financing for biodiversity is decided on in the budget process (annual budgets and decisions on central government spending limits).

France: La politique nationale de la biodiversité est portée par le ministère de l'écologie, du développement durable et de l'énergie. Elle est inscrite dans la stratégie nationale pour la biodiversité (SNB) adoptée en 2004 et renouvelée en 2011 pour la période 2011-2020. Le texte des engagements de l'État français pour la mise en œuvre de la SNB pour la période 2011-2013 est disponible à l'adresse suivante : http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/SNB20112020engagement_etat.pdf . Il est prévu de créer un établissement public de l'État à caractère administratif dénommé "Agence française pour la biodiversité qui inscrirait son action dans le cadre de la stratégie nationale pour la biodiversité.

Germany: National: no concrete activities; International: Biodiversity Finance Initiative - BIOFIN: Germany together with the European Commission and Switzerland is supporting the global BIOFIN initiative which is managed by UNDP (as of January 2014 overall amount 15 Mio USD). The aim of BIOFIN is to support Parties in the following endeavors: a. Determine the current investment in biodiversity see explanation below on BIOFIN; b. Analyse the integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in sectoral and development policy, planning and budgeting; c. Assess future financing flows, needs and gaps for managing and conserving biodiversity and ecosystem services; d. Develop comprehensive national resource mobilization strategies to meet the biodiversity finance gap; e. Initiate implementation of the resource mobilization strategy at national level. BIOFIN actually is implemented in 19 countries. At the same time the BIOFIN methodology is also fed into the NBSAP Forum process for wider application by all interested Parties. Further information: www.biodiversityfinance.net

India: National Biodiversity Authority 2003 Ministry of Environment and Forests- Organizational building support.

Japan: Relevant Ministries of Japanese Government develop fiscal year financial plan in consideration of and for achieving National Biodiversity Strategy of Japan.

Malawi: The national financial plans for biodiversity have been developed during the development of the national resource mobilization strategy. The alternate CBD Focal Point has also received several trainings organized by the CBD secretariat on resource mobilization.

Mauritius: will be done in revised NBSAP.

Namibia: The NBSAP 2 has enabled initial cost estimates for financing biodiversity priorities in Namibia. This costing will help to inform the financial planning process of the country, which will be developed as part of the national resource mobilization Strategy. An example of current attempts to mobilize additional resources for biodiversity conservation can be seen in the work done on sustainable financing plan for protected areas. The financial plan on protected areas established that in 2009 that the total contribution to GNI, which includes multiplier effects, was estimated to be N\$ 2,048 million, or 3.8% of GNI. The study also established that a capital injection of about N\$ 541 million and an annual recurrent expenditure of N\$ 157.3 million for park management will be required. These investments would be expected to improve management and facilities in the parks, resulting in improved biodiversity and a better tourism product overall.

Poland: No special biodiversity financial planning is available. Biodiversity support is partly included in the recently developed Performance Budget as of 2008.

Spain: El Plan Estratégico del Patrimonio Natural y la Biodiversidad, aprobado por Real Decreto 1274/2011, de 16 de septiembre, incorpora una serie de acciones destinadas al objetivo de movilizar los recursos financieros de todas las fuentes para asegurar la adecuada financiación de la política de

conservación de biodiversidad. http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/temas/conservacion-de-la-biodiversidad/valoracion-y-aspectos-economicos-de-la-biodiversidad/cb_vae_plan_estrategico_patrimonio_nat_bio.aspx

Sweden: Sweden does not develop special national financial plans for biodiversity. Funding for biodiversity activities is part of the state budget. Switzerland: The question of national biodiversity finance is addressed through the Swiss Biodiversity Strategy SBS: The implementation of the Swiss Biodiversity Strategy SBS will require additional financial and human resources. The elaboration of a financial plan is evaluated in the context of the development of the Action Plan on the Implementation of the Swiss Biodiversity Strategy and is linked to potentially necessary legislative amendments.

Further information and weblinks: Swiss Information System Biodiversity (SIB) / Action Plan on the Implementation of the Swiss Biodiversity Strategy: www.sib.admin.ch

Thailand: The Biodiversity Division will be conducting a study and organize workshops involving all line agencies and set up a working group to draft financial guidelines and a policy formulation. The workshop will be co-organized by Thailand Environmental Fund Division under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment.

Uganda: This is advanced stage and is being carried out in line with decision X/3 and XI/4 as stated above. A draft has been developed and was subjected to stakeholder input in November 2013. The Guidelines and action plans are expected to be completed by May 2014 in time to guide resource mobilization for biodiversity for FY2014/15

United Kingdom: There are two current LIFE projects running in England and Wales that will conclude in June 2015. The Improvement Programme for England's Natura 2000 sites (IPENS) project will develop improvement plans for each N2K site, and the financial investment required across the N2K network. We are also finalizing the structure for delivering in England the next round of our New Environmental Land Management Schemes (replacing the agri-environment schemes) which play an important role in the delivery of our domestic biodiversity objectives. The outcome of this work will inform the development of national financial plans for biodiversity, which remain dynamic to reflect the current transition in a number of key funding sources including EU Common Agricultural Policy and EU Structural and Investment Funds. We are also working to better capture the financial and resource contributions that NGO's, voluntary sector, and businesses are making towards our domestic biodiversity outcomes.

III. OVERALL COMMENTS, INCLUDING ON CHALLENGES AND GAPS

A. Compilation

Australia: On activity classification, Australia recommends that the Secretariat consider the utilization of the categorization system contained within the System of Environmental Economic Accounts (SEEA) be adopted for the resource mobilization strategy. The United Nations is developing a system of integrated classifications regarding environmental activities within an overarching framework of Classification of Environmental Activities (CEA). The definition of activities and their classification is an important part of the SEEA, and its utilization would provide for greater clarity, consistency and comparability in ongoing reporting.

Bolivia (Plurinational State of):⁴ In response to notification No. 2014-019 and according to decision XI/4 of the Conference of the Parties with regard to the presentation of information for the review of the implementation of the resource mobilization strategy, that will be referred at the fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI-5). In virtue of Article 26 of the Convention, that establishes the presentation of reports on measures adopted by countries to implement the provisions of this Convention and the effectiveness of these measures for achieving the objectives of the Convention. These reports besides fulfilling international commitments for biological diversity will contribute to the progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets 2015-2020 and make contributions to the relevant 2015 targets of the Millennium Development Goals.

In this regard, the Plurinational State of Bolivia wishes to submit the information requested by the Secretariat in relation to decision XI/4, paragraph 23, regarding class actions and efforts of indigenous and local communities to the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of living systems. Considering that until now the contributions of indigenous and local communities in conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity has not been visible, lessening in this manner the contributions generated based on values that guide the behavior of its people to ensure the long-term survival of the territories, resources, people, systems of life and that of Mother Earth, and taking into account that the population of indigenous peoples in the world is more than 370 million (approximately 5% of the world population), which occupies 20% of the earth's surface.

Bolivia during COP11 raised the importance of recognizing the collective action of indigenous people in conservation and sustainable use of nature as a significant contribution from developing countries that quantifiably exceeds contributions from the public and private sectors and that has a very important qualitative input with regards to their vision and principles. Under this context, Bolivia, with support from the Permanent Secretariat of ACTO, has proposed conducting a “Study on recognizing the role of Indigenous and Local Populations Collective Action in Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity”, which will represent an important step towards the recognition of important collective action of indigenous peoples and local communities for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

The aforementioned study aims to develop methodological parameters that allow for qualitative, quantitative and/or quali-quantitative analysis that could be incorporated to the national reports of the countries to the CBD. In this sense, the study results will be submitted to the CBD, as a regional contribution of ACTO Member Countries and in accordance to decision XI/4 of the Conference of the Parties, in order for them to be taken into account in COP12 of the CBD to be held in October 2014.

Therefore, Bolivia wishes to present the information from this study at the next meeting (WGRI 5) in order to be taken into account in the negotiations carried out in the framework of WGRI 5 in preparation for COP12.

Furthermore, the Plurinational State of Bolivia wishes to share two experiences on land management focused on collective actions that indigenous peoples and local communities carry out for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

Experiences of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities on Land Management focused on Collective Actions

a) Financial Promotion and Technical Assistance for Conservation and Strategic Sustainable Management of the “COMSERBO Pando” forest resource in Pando.

⁴Original in Spanish. Not an official translation.

This program developed by the autonomous departmental government of Pando, through the Secretariat of Environment, Water and Land and native indigenous peasant communities, aims to promote and improve sustainable and integrated forest management and conservation by generating voluntary agreements, between agrarian property rights holders and forests, forest users and the autonomous departmental government of Pando, as a means of fighting poverty and climate change.

Moreover, the aim of this program is to reduce deforestation by illegal logging and uncontrolled fires, with a focus on climate change mitigation and adaptation, direct redistribution to native indigenous peasant communities of patent forest use as financial promotion for conservation and integrated forest management, and promotion of socioeconomic and cultural development of native indigenous peasant peoples and nations in harmony with Mother Earth.

In this framework and as a result for the period 2011-2013, COMSERBO Pando promoted community actions for forest conservation and management in six rural communities and one indigenous territory, with a total coverage of 70 thousand hectares, through direct financial transfers to communities and technical assistance. As a result, 16 thousand hectares are under permanent forest conservation, 37 thousand hectares under non-timber forest use and 18 thousand hectares under timber forest use.

b) National Bio-culture Program

This program is implemented by the Ministry of Environment and Water, through the Vice-Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change and Forest Management and Development. Its main objective is to contribute to ecosystem conservation and wellbeing (poverty reduction) of peasant and indigenous communities in the Andean region of the country, through sustainable management of biodiversity, as well as respect and appreciation of local cultures. It aims to revalue, build and implement models, integrated sustainable bio-cultural endogenous systems focused on ecosystem management directed at: (i) improving the quality of life and food security in the Andean region of Bolivia, (ii) conservation and restoration of Andean ecosystems included in the program. In the period 2010-2013 the following results were achieved:

- Improvements in local governance. 115 communal norms on biodiversity sustainable management and implementing natural resources were approved by local peasant and indigenous authorities, 8 municipal regulations generated and implemented on natural resources management and conservation approved by municipal bylaws. Preparation of 8 municipal city charters, 3 Autonomous Indigenous Statutes and comprehensive territorial plans, 3 municipal development plans (MDP) with bio-cultural approach, 4 strategic plans on bio-cultural Tourism and 5 climate change adaptation plans with knowledge sharing approach.
- Improvements in quality of life, well-being, sustainable economic and productive development. Improvements in food security and productive diversification in 4,598 families and 560 hectares of agro-ecological production.
- Improvements in ecosystem conservation. Conservation of 154 water sources with the protection of 670 hectares of recharge. Implementation of 54 micro-systems in 396 hectares under irrigation. Reforestation of 169 hectares with native species.
- Strengthened management of 7 national protected areas.
- Knowledge Revaluation: 70 documents of local knowledge revaluation and innovation in production and climate aspects and cultural practices. 117 educational units (4780 students, 2083 women) with adjustments in 5 curricula incorporating local and ancestral knowledge and

environmental education programs. Additional training for 440 teachers, 205 women in knowledge revaluation.

Bulgaria: Bulgaria is not a member state of the OECD, even though funds are provided to support the development of non-EU countries. In many cases, it is difficult to understand the way of how and for what the majority of these funds are spent by the recipient country. With sufficient accuracy, only a few small targeted cash flows can be identified as being directly related to the objectives of the biodiversity conservation.

Budget financial flows, allocated to achieve the outlined targets of the CBD, at local level are significantly better structured, consistent and transparent. The complexity of their reporting comes from the need to consider separately the contribution of each budget item to the implementation of the targets for biodiversity conservation. In this regard, the development of a common methodology, which to help tracking biodiversity-related expenditure in the budgets of the Member States of CBD, will facilitate and streamline greatly the process of reporting.

For the reporting of the financial flows from the private sector, the biggest problem we face is the lack of accessibility to financial data concerning the private sector and the inability to assess the reliability of the data that exists. With sufficient reliability only individual projects and investments, which have a direct link with the objectives of biodiversity conservation, can be identified and separated.

In connection with the foregoing, we consider that it is appropriate, at this stage of development of the Preliminary Reporting Framework, Bulgaria to limit its reporting to identified financial flows, which have a direct link to the objectives of the biodiversity conservation and whose contributions will be accounted as 100% (Rio marker 2 projects) and to apply common rate for all of the other cash flows in which biodiversity is important, but secondary objective (Rio marker 1).

We agree with the view that the compensation paid for the permitted damage to biodiversity is to be considered as private funding for biodiversity, if it is paid from private entities.

We believe also, that reaching to agreement on the typology of financial flows resulting from the private sector, is essential for their proper identification and will contribute to the standardization of the reporting.

Bulgaria supports the initiative for a collective EU baseline to be defined and the establishing of a common framework for reporting of the Member States.

We would like the focus of the anticipated decision of CoP12 to contain information about the established successful IFMs and guidelines for their application. China: We are still in the process of exploring and improving the methodologies to collect and calculate biodiversity related financial inputs, especially that for local input and private sector. It is not mature to fill in the preliminary reporting framework at this stage. (...)

Experience in Applying the Preliminary Reporting Framework: First, it is hard to collect the statistics of local inputs. Biodiversity related inputs relate to several sectors and are allocated both through local governments and directly from the central government. Second, the channels for biodiversity related inputs are complicated and sometimes overlap with each other when being calculated. China suggests that the SCBD collects relevant methodologies and best practices of data collection and calculation for reference of parties.

European Union:

Introduction

In line with the global commitment undertaken in Hyderabad, the EU and its Member States re-affirm their commitment to providing robust information on mobilization of resources in support of the implementation of the strategic plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity. We also support the reporting process in a number of developing countries (see for example information on Biofin below) and believe this is essential information to support the resource mobilization process under the CBD.

This submission addresses both contributions from the central EU budget (which in itself is composed of contributions from all EU Member States) and contributions at individual Member State level. All individual submissions are included in annex. The figures and information provided for the central EU budget relate to contributions and activities of the European Union and do not include the contributions and activities of the individual Member States. Most of the central EU funding instruments do not finance the total envelope of projects and individual EU Member States also provide co-financing. The data presented seek to separate out EU level and Member States level biodiversity spending.

This submission builds upon the initial EU and Member States 2012 submission in response to notification 2012-023. Compared to the initial submission, an increased number of EU Member States have submitted reports, the reports span a wider range of resource mobilization indicators, and data submitted have improved in terms of accuracy and timeliness. For example, reports for Finland and Italy differ from the previous because of increased reliance on Official Statistics, whilst the European Commission and some Member States (e.g. France, Germany, Spain and Poland) have developed a specific tracking and reporting methodology for international or domestic flows of financial resources. ⁵

Experiences in applying the preliminary reporting framework

Successes and barriers in reporting and monitoring are referred to in the introduction to section 1.

The new excel sheet format of the preliminary reporting framework is welcome. It could however be improved, for example through including a synthetic table which allows the comparison over different years, and the comparison with a 2006-2010 baseline. There are a number of technical difficulties which would need to be solved (e.g. difficult to enter free text, justifying figures, rounding figures, printing options). In some places (e.g. question 3), the notes could be clearer to help distinguishing amongst categories. The definition of the 'others' category could also be improved; at present there is no way of reporting on household flows. The description of direct and indirect flows could also be improved, with a clearer explanation, and better connection to existing processes, e.g. OECD Rio markers, but also other statistical processes (e.g. UNSD SEEA). It is worth noting that the cell formats should not always be numbers – for example the reform of harmful subsidies do not always generate net additional resources, but may provide better incentives.

The explanatory text should make it clearer when there is a risk of double counting.

Finally, it would be useful if the explanatory text for the different categories made an explicit reference to the relevant goals of the resource mobilization strategy (e.g. goal 7 on ABS is about raising awareness, and promoting exchange of good practices).

New Zealand: -Not all requested information has been included (e.g. private sector funds; NGO funds). We view this exercise as an ongoing work in progress, so we are continuing to collect and collate data,

⁵ The submission continues by providing comments on the individual elements of the preliminary reporting framework. For ease of reference, these comments were integrated into the compilation of comments under section II of this note.

with a view to more detailed information to come as the strategy moves forward. However, we do not want to hold up progress in terms of analysis of resource mobilization data, so we are submitting this information, even if incomplete.

Please note that the New Zealand financial year goes from 1 July – 30 June, so does not align with the requested reporting timeframes (calendar years) of the framework. Therefore, for any given year in the table, it represents the start of that financial year for NZ (e.g. 2006 = 2006/2007).

Poland: The analysis of national biodiversity funding mechanisms and institutions in Poland has shown that there are several constraints and problematic areas when collecting relevant data, especially for regular reporting purposes. The major barriers and/or difficulties relate to both information availability and assessment of its reliability. If collecting information on funding directly related to biodiversity is relatively simple, getting information on funding related to actions across different sectors (e.g. forestry, agriculture, education) is much more complicated due to various information flows and reporting channels (information noise). Still more problematic, in terms of reliability, are the results of gathering information on funding to promote biodiversity-friendly initiatives that have other primary purposes than the support of the CBD, such as activities aiming at climate-change mitigation and adaptation.

The major challenges and gaps include:

- Broad dispersion of funding sources (mechanisms and channels) and institutions which manage biodiversity funds – there is no centralized information flow on funding biodiversity related activities of funding institutions and other donors.
- The existing financial mechanisms generally do not have separate allocated funds for biodiversity.
- There are no separate budget lines in accounting systems for reporting biodiversity expenditures in the majority of public financial institutions.
- Lack of coherence of financial reporting systems on funds spent on biodiversity between various institutions and donors. There is a lack of a uniform system to report such expenditures.
- Lack of or low accessibility to information concerning biodiversity funding at local level.
- Very limited capacity to provide estimates at a level of expenditures on indirect funding of biodiversity.
- Limited opportunities to gather information on harmful subsidies including those that have actual and potential adverse effect on biodiversity and information about records on eliminating cases of investments which have negative impacts on biodiversity.
- Lack of mechanisms for reporting a level of resources spent on biodiversity funding by NGOs and the private sector.
- Institutional inactivity, as e.g. a low interest of local self-government in fundraising for biodiversity purposes.
- Problems with applying a developed methodology for obtaining relevant data due to inconsistencies in reporting format from sources of information in consecutive years.
- Process of data collecting is laborious, time consuming and complicated, resulting in additional costs for preparing the report.

- Preliminary reporting framework presented a few obstacles like with multiplying the tables and adjusting the formulas for calculations, inserting data and printing (from certain versions of Excel)

Conclusion: There is a very time and money consuming process to collect and elaborate necessary data, and repeat that exercise year by year, particularly for domestic resources on local level and non-budgetary sources. The reporting process should be more simplified and common methodology should be developed in order to have more transparent and comparable data in future reports.

Switzerland: Switzerland would like to thank the Secretariat for Notification No. 2013-050 inviting the Parties to provide information through the preliminary reporting framework and, among others, further pertinent information of relevance to the implementation of goals 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the strategy for resource mobilization, for discussion at the upcoming meeting of the WGRI, as requested by the Parties through decision XI/4. Switzerland wishes to recall its concern expressed in COP-111 regarding the setting of quantified targets for resource mobilization, especially because the progress on the methodology of measuring these targets is insufficient and considering that robust baselines, as requested by decision X/3, paragraph 8(i), have not yet been identified. This makes it very difficult for Switzerland to subscribe to the 2015 interim goal as proposed in decision XI/4, paragraph 7(a). Switzerland will act in good faith to live up to the decision XI/4 until 2020 and will take it as a reference for the engagement in national and international biodiversity related activities. Switzerland is committed to contribute its fair share towards an overall substantial increase of funding for biodiversity from all sources, according to Aichi Target 20. Country ownership, and the fact that biodiversity is fundamental for life is essential for Switzerland.

Switzerland has encountered many challenges while working on the establishment of the baseline and can therefore not yet communicate any figures, due to lack of methodology to ensure the robustness and comparability of the figures. Switzerland believes that there is a lot of scope for improving methodologies for the establishment of a robust comparable baseline and for assessing public and private financial flows of all parties in support of the objectives of the Convention. Such improvement is very much needed as the tools available for the monitoring of the implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization were not developed with the objective of monitoring financial flows (e.g. Rio-markers) or may even be lacking, e.g. at the national level. The lack of instruments and/or the technical shortcomings of existing tools results in uncertainty, vagueness and ambiguity when reporting on the implementation of the strategy, thus undermining the achievement of Aichi Target 20. The weaknesses of the existing system are recognized and efforts to further develop instruments are conducted (e.g. Rio markers are currently discussed and further developed by the OECD). This provides the opportunity to feed the needs of the Convention into these international processes to realize synergies for the benefit of all processes.

In addition, Switzerland would like to recall the relevance of the effectiveness and efficiency of financial flows in support of the objectives of the Convention. The effective and efficient use of investments should be fostered through enabling environments (including the reduction of incentives with harmful effects for the environment). Therefore, Switzerland encourages to include elements to monitor the effectiveness and efficiency of financial flows in support of the objectives of the Convention within the preliminary resource mobilization reporting framework.

B. Synthesis and analysis

26. Bolivia provided a statement and additional background information on the role of collective action, including by indigenous and local communities, and non-market-based approaches to achieving the objectives of the Convention. Several submissions provided comments on the application of the preliminary reporting framework.

The role of collective action, including by indigenous and local communities, and non-market-based approaches to achieving the objectives of the Convention

27. The submission from Bolivia underscored the importance of recognizing the collective action of indigenous people in conservation and sustainable use of nature as a significant contribution from developing countries that quantifiably exceeds contributions from the public and private sectors. A study is currently under preparation, with support from the Permanent Secretariat of ACTO, on recognizing the role of Indigenous and Local Populations Collective Action in Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity. The submission explained that this study aims to develop methodological parameters that allow for qualitative, quantitative and/or quali-quantitative analysis that could be incorporated to the national reports of the countries to the CBD. The study results will be submitted to the CBD, as a regional contribution of ACTO Member Countries and in accordance to decision XI/4 of the Conference of the Parties, in order for them to be taken into account in COP12 of the CBD to be held in October 2014.

28. The submission also provided a brief synthesis of two projects that promote the role of indigenous and local communities in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. A programme developed by the autonomous departmental government of Pando, through the Secretariat of Environment, Water and Land and native indigenous peasant communities, aims to promote and improve sustainable and integrated forest management and conservation by generating voluntary agreements, between agrarian property rights holders and forests, forest users and the autonomous departmental government of Pando, as a means of fighting poverty and climate change. The National Bio-culture Programme, implemented by the Ministry of Environment and Water, seeks to contribute to ecosystem conservation and wellbeing (poverty reduction) of peasant and indigenous communities in the Andean region of the country, through sustainable management of biodiversity, as well as respect and appreciation of local cultures. It aims to revalue, build and implement integrated sustainable bio-cultural endogenous management systems, focused on ecosystem management, that (i) improve the quality of life and food security in the Andean region of Bolivia, (ii) contribute to the conservation and restoration of Andean ecosystems included in the programme.

29. In the context of the submission from Bolivia and the case examples provided, it is noteworthy that some work programmes of the Convention are pertinent to the role of collective action, including by indigenous and local communities, and non-market-based approaches to achieving the objectives of the Convention. Insofar reporting is concerned, reporting on the role of collective action, including by indigenous and local communities, and non-market-based approaches to achieving the objectives of the Convention, could therefore take place under pertinent Aichi Targets 3 and 18.

- First, under the programme of work on incentive measures, adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting,⁶ these roles have been reflected as ‘indirect incentive measures.’⁷ CBD Technical Series No 56 explains⁸ that indirect incentive measures “*seek to support activities or projects that are not designed exclusively to conserve or promote the sustainable use of biodiversity, but have the effect of contributing to these objectives. Many of these incentives are non-monetary (or ‘non-market’) in nature (although they may have financial implications for the provider); for instance, the official recognition of the role of local communities in the context of community-based natural resource management programmes. 9/*”

⁶ Decision V/15.

⁷ Decision VII/18, paragraph 8.

⁸ The work contained in this volume was requested by decision IX/6, paragraph 6, of the Conference of the Parties, and was undertaken by the third international workshop on incentive measures, consisting of government-nominated experts, which took place in Paris, France, from 6 to 8 October 2009. <http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-56-en.pdf>

⁹ CBD Technical Series No. 56, page 14.

It explains further that “community recognition can act as an important non-monetary (or ‘non-market’) incentive, in particular in the context of community-based natural resource management programmes. The involvement and empowerment in natural resource management alone generates awareness and a sense of responsibility, with positive impacts on patterns of natural resource use. Transparency, participation, inclusion and ownership are important factors in the effective empowerment of communities. Collaborative management schemes in Uganda and community based wildlife management in Botswana have ceded control of resources to local communities who are able to use these resources to generate income.¹⁰”

- And second, the work currently undertaken on customary sustainable use (Article 10 c) of the Convention) is also relevant, in particular the draft plan of action on customary sustainable use that has been developed by the Ad Hoc Open-ended Inter-sessional Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity at its eighth meeting and recommended for endorsement by the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting.¹¹ The draft plan of action explains that “incorporating customary sustainable use of biological diversity with the effective participation of indigenous and local communities into national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) is an important and strategic way to integrate Article 10(c) and its implementation as a cross-cutting issue in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets” and that “customary sustainable use of biological diversity and traditional knowledge can contribute to the effective conservation of important biodiversity sites, either through shared governance or joint management of official protected areas or through indigenous and community conserved territories and areas.¹²”

Application of the preliminary reporting framework.

30. In addition to identifying relatively minor technical issues either associated with the current format of the preliminary reporting framework or with the associated guidance, such as on a more explicit reference to the applicability of the OECD Rio markers, or on the need to avoid double-counting, comments pointed in particular to challenges and limitations in the availability and/or accessibility of relevant data. Specific challenges identified include: (i) the broad range of approaches taken by OECD DAC member countries for accounting ODA flows indirectly related to biodiversity; (ii) the identification of biodiversity relevant ODA for donor countries that are not members of the OECD DAC and hence do not apply the Rio marker methodology; (ii) the absence of a practical common methodology for identifying indirectly-related domestic biodiversity expenditures.

31. To some extent, these challenges are already addressed, or could be addressed in the near future, in the context of ongoing supportive work undertaken by relevant international organizations and initiatives:

- The OECD recently revived a joint ENVIRONET and WP-STAT task team on the Rio markers, environment and development finance statistics, with a view develop recommendations to improve the robustness and accuracy of Rio marker data, to advise on steps to build confidence in the Rio marker methodology, and to improve communication on the underlying concepts of marker data. Elements in the proposed work plan of this task team include improving the use of Rio marker data outside of CRS for reporting against quantitative financial targets and to international conventions, as well as improving guidance to users on how to use and interpret Rio marker data, and the provision of

¹⁰ *ibid.*, page 17.

¹¹ Document UNEP/CBD/COP/12/5, recommendation 8/2 and annex.

¹² *Ibid.*, annex, paragraphs 7 and 9 (rationale of the plan).

Training Sessions and Training materials. These activities, in particular the latest one, is of potential value also for donor countries that are not members of the OECD DAC.

- The submissions make reference to the ongoing development of methodologies to identify indirectly-related domestic expenditures by some Parties. The submissions from Australia and the European Union also made reference to using the classifications contained in the system of environmental economic accounts (SEEA) and the associated reporting thereon. Such approaches and the associated experiences and lessons learned could usefully inform the efforts of other Parties in improving reporting on national expenditures. It could also inform, and help to further develop, the methodology of the UNDP BIOFIN initiative, which already contains the preparation of national biodiversity-related expenditure reviews as one critical step towards the development of national resource mobilization plans. Such further development of the BIOFIN methodology could also be useful for non-BIOFIN countries.

32. With regard to the latter point, the BIOFIN initiative has been co-organizing, together with the Secretariat of the Convention and the World Conservation Monitoring Center of the United Nations Environment Programme, the resource mobilization sessions of the global workshop on reviewing progress and building capacity for the national biodiversity strategies and action plans revision process held in Nairobi, Kenya, from 11-November 2013, as well as the four regional workshops on resource mobilization that were held in the first half of 2014. These workshops, organized further to paragraph 27 of decision XI/4, sought to support the preparation of national financial plans for biodiversity and, in this process, improve financial reporting and the establishment of robust baselines.

33. However, other challenges identified in the submissions seem to be of a more fundamental nature, that is, unlikely to be remedied in the short- or even in the medium term. Those include, according to the submissions, in particular the scattered nature of funding sources and of institutions which manage biodiversity funds, and the associated lack of coherence of financial reporting systems on funds spent on biodiversity across various institutions and donors as well as along consecutive years. This applies in particular with regard to biodiversity funding by NGOs and the private sector. As a result, the submission from Poland states that the process of data collection is laborious, time consuming and complicated, resulting in additional costs for preparing the report. The submissions from Bulgaria and Poland recommend considering the development of a common methodology with a view to have more transparent and comparable data in future reports, and to simplify the reporting process. This challenge seems to merit further consideration in the context of the eventual adoption of a final target, or final targets, for resource mobilization as per paragraph 22 of decision XI/4.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

34. In paragraph 22 of decision XI/22, the Conference of the Parties decided to review, at its twelfth meeting, progress towards the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 20 with the aim of adopting a final target for resource mobilization. The following conclusions and recommendation are provided for consideration by the Working Group in light of this overarching aim by the Conference of the Parties, as well as in light of the analysis provided above.

35. It would facilitate reporting and the use of the reporting framework if the revised reporting framework was brought fully in line with the final target or targets for resource mobilization, in particular concerning wording as well as the overall scope of the reporting framework.

36. With a view to minimize the reporting burden and to enhance the feasibility of reporting, it would be useful to assess the required scope and granularity of the reporting, under each target, against data quality and accessibility, and the associated prospective cost of reporting. The results of such an assessment could fall into three broad categories:

- a) Maintain current scope and granularity if data quality and accessibility is deemed satisfactory or can be expected to improve globally in the near future, including because of ongoing or planned supportive work of relevant international organizations and initiatives. This could include reporting on bi- and multilateral ODA, possibly including OOF, by donor country Parties, as well as reporting on governmental domestic expenditures, both direct and indirect, by all Parties.
- b) Simplify reporting by reducing granularity where data quality and accessibility is deemed unsatisfactory and is unlikely to globally improve in the near future. This could include international flows from market/private sources as well as other sources like NGO, academia, etc, as well as domestic expenditures from these actors. Simplified reporting could include:
 - a. Report on measures that were taken by Parties to encourage these actors to, as applicable, achieve the individual financial target;
 - b. This could possibly be amended by illustrative information on relevant flows or expenditures, based on a sample of these actors. This approach was already taken in several submissions.

37. The recommendation above could be operationalized by requesting the Executive Secretary, once the financial target or targets are finalized and adopted, to revise the reporting framework in accordance with a task list to be developed by the Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention at its fifth meeting, based on the recommendations above, and reviewed and finalized by the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting, in conjunction with its finalization of its financial target or targets;

38. As pointed out above, there is currently significant overlap between the provisional reporting framework and the guidelines to the fifth National Report, implying duplication of reporting obligations and associated work. In order to better synergize and thus reduce the overall reporting burden, financial reporting could be better coordinated with, and eventually integrated into, national reporting:

- a) In light of the advanced work on the fifth national report, and for the purpose of establishing the baseline against the resource mobilization targets, the revised financial reporting framework would need to stay an independent framework. It could, however, cross-reference pertinent sections of the guidelines for the fifth national report and invite Parties to use these avenues, possibly providing, as needed, amendments in order to take into account financial considerations.
- b) The financial reporting framework could subsequently be integrated into the guidelines for the sixth national report, in manner that maintains consistency between the formats for the fifth and sixth national reports as per decision X/10, paragraph 10, in order to allow for long-term tracking of progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

39. The guidance to the financial reporting framework could be further improved, for instance, on how to avoid double-counting, or on the availability of existing methodologies, and possible alternatives if specific methodologies are currently not applied.

40. The work of relevant international organizations and initiatives that support and facilitate financial reporting under the Convention, or the resource mobilization process more broadly, by providing technical support and guidance, and capacity-building, could be taken note of with appreciation, and the further intensification and upscaling of this work encouraged. This would include the work of the OECD DAC to improve the Rio markers, or the work of the BIOFIN initiative of the

United Nations Development Programme. The Executive Secretary could be requested to further cooperate with these organizations and initiatives.

41. Undertaking so-called public expenditure reviews is useful for reporting domestic expenditures both directly and indirectly related to biodiversity and, moreover, is a critical step in the development of national finance plans for biodiversity, in the framework of national biodiversity strategy and action plans. It has been successfully undertaken in other sectors such as health or education.¹³ While a few submissions report that biodiversity-related expenditure reviews were undertaken, or are currently being undertaken, such work seems overall being at an early stage, with the absence of a common methodology being one major obstacle, as noted by several submissions. It could therefore be useful to initiate technical work, in form of a technical expert workshop as an initial step, with a view to (i) present, share and analyse the aforementioned work and the underlying methodologies; (ii) assess experiences and methodologies applied in other sectors with a view to identify opportunities for methodological transfer; and (iii) identify options for convergence towards, and possible elements of, a common methodology. Such work would need to be undertaken in close cooperation with relevant organizations and initiatives, such as the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank.

¹³ See, for instance, <http://go.worldbank.org/J2441NFM30> or <http://www.snap-undp.org/elibrary/Publications/DG-2013-CPEIR-Methodological-Note.pdf>.

Annex

REFERENCED PERTINENT WORK UNDER THE CONVENTION

Guidelines for the fifth national report

Part II: The national biodiversity strategy and action plan, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity

(...)

Q8: How effectively has biodiversity been mainstreamed into relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral strategies, plans and programmes? Describe how biodiversity is reflected in poverty reduction strategies and other key cross-cutting policy instruments, and into the various economic sectors (which sectors (and ministries) integrate biodiversity well and which do not?). Describe also how biodiversity is integrated into planning mechanisms. Describe actions taken and outcomes achieved by each sector to implement biodiversity actions included in their respective strategies, plans and programmes. Which tools are used (e.g., ecosystem approach, biodiversity-inclusive environmental impact assessment and strategic environmental assessment, spatial planning, etc.)? Describe also how synergies are achieved at the national level in the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and other relevant conventions. Describe also how biodiversity is considered in international and/or transboundary cooperation, including South-South cooperation.

(...)

Part III: Progress towards the 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant 2015 Targets of the Millennium Development Goals

Q10: What progress has been made by your country towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets? Drawing upon information in parts I and II, analyse the progress towards each of the 2020 targets of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, as well as towards the overall mission of the Plan. Also indicate progress towards the national targets referred to in the answer to question five (i.e., national actions taken to achieve each target and outcomes achieved). Where possible, use quantitative indicators including the application, as appropriate, of global headline indicators contained in decision VIII/15, as well as additional indicators for measuring progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets that may be adopted at the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Technical details of the indicators may be provided in an appendix. Also draw upon expert qualitative assessments. You may wish to use a simple “traffic-light” scheme or similar illustrative tool to give an overall assessment of progress.
