



**Ensuring stakeholder engagement in the development,
implementation and updating of NBSAPs**

Module B-5

Version 1 – July 2007

**This module was prepared with funds from the GEF, through
the Biodiversity Planning Support Programme (BPSP), UNEP,
in collaboration with the CBD Secretariat.**

Contents

Introduction

- 1. Why is stakeholder participation so important for National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans?**
- 2. What do we mean by ‘stakeholders’ in the context of an NBSAP?**
- 3. How can we identify who are the stakeholders for NBSAPs?
Undertaking identification and invitation**
- 4. When should the different categories of stakeholders be brought into the NBSAP process?**
 - Two-stage process?
 - All at once?
 - Implementation and updating
- 5. What are possible mechanisms for involving stakeholders?**
 - Possible formats
 - Possible techniques
 - Access to necessary information
 - Documentation
 - Final considerations
 - Discussion question(s)
- 6. Questions for discussion**

List of Acronyms

Introduction to this Module

What you will learn in this module

This module explains why the preparation and revision of a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) should involve the active participation of ‘stakeholders’. It will show that, for a country to develop and implement an effective NBSAP that will enable it to fulfil the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), all those sectors and institutions that have a ‘stake’ in biodiversity-related questions need to play an active part in the preparation and revision of the NBSAP.

The module will explain what is meant by the term ‘stakeholders’ and how to identify who they are. It will offer some ideas on mechanisms for promoting their effective engagement in NBSAPs.

1. Why is stakeholder participation so important for National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans?

The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity has stressed that the development and implementation of an NBSAP constitute the cornerstone of national implementation of the Convention. The NBSAP is thus a key component of national environmental management and the central feature of national biodiversity planning.

The NBSAP involves both planning and implementation. If ‘biodiversity planners’ are to become ‘biodiversity implementers’, then everyone with a stake in the outcome of the NBSAP needs to be engaged. If the NBSAP is to be effective and meet its goals, all relevant government agencies, community organizations, non-governmental organizations, indigenous and traditional peoples’ groups, scientific associations and the academic community, business and industry, educators and the media need to be involved in its design and implementation.

The argument that the NBSAP requires the active across-the-board involvement of all stakeholders, leads us to two compelling conclusions.

- No small group of official or expert ‘biodiversity planners’ will ever have the understanding, experience and knowledge to be able to successfully identify all the policy issues that will arise in such a broad exercise, still less to identify a set of policy proposals that will effectively address the issues. Such a restricted exercise would inevitably be a theoretical, top-down approach to policy development which, without the input of real life experience from local stakeholders, will prove ineffective when implementation is attempted.
- Implementing programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity will involve changing habits and adopting new techniques. Human nature, social theory and experience of implementation all suggest that individuals and groups are reluctant to do this if they do not see the benefits to themselves. The obvious way to convince stakeholders of the benefits of proposed changes is to involve them as equal partners in the process of analysis of the issue and the development of policy proposals.

In other words, people will act when they feel they have ‘**ownership**’ of the process by having contributed their experiences and points of view from the outset and by having participated in the formulation of the policy proposals.

Top-down demands for compliance with policy developed at a distance, by ‘experts’ or with the seal of ‘government authority’ almost certainly won’t work in the case of biodiversity planning.

Box 1
Case Study: India's NBSAP

The preparation of India's NBSAP was carried out by the Ministry of Environment and Forests. However, a unique arrangement was established whereby the technical coordination, including the bulk of the conceptualization, implementation, and daily coordination, was carried out by the national NGO Kalpavriksh. Kalpavriksh established a 15-member Technical and Policy Core Group comprised of representatives from NGOs, scientists, and activists.

This highly participatory process involved over 25,000 people and targeted stakeholders from all relevant sectors, including the private sector, productive sectors, national and local governments, indigenous peoples, academics, youth, and NGOs. Information, stakeholder feedback, and public education and awareness were coordinated through:

- national, regional, and state-level workshops
- public hearings
- sectoral meetings
- radio programme series
- community-based biodiversity registers
- mobile biodiversity festivals
- village-level consultations

The NBSAP Statement of Principles stressed the central role of stakeholder interests. This was reinforced throughout the development of the NBSAP through its emphasis on:

- equity among stakeholders and resource users
- access to and decision-making control over biodiversity
- inclusion and empowerment of marginalized groups
- cross-sectoral mainstreaming of biodiversity.

This decentralized and grassroots-based approach resulted in the development of 71 biodiversity strategies and action plans, divided into State and Union Territory, sub-state, eco-regional, thematic, and sub-thematic BSAPs. These combined to form the national-level document.

Source:

TPCG and Kalpavriksh. 2005. *Securing India's Future: Final Technical Report of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan*. Prepared by the NBSAP Technical and Policy Core Group. Kalpavriksh, Delhi / Pune.

IIED. 2005. *An Activist Approach to Biodiversity Planning: A Handbook of Participatory Tools Used to Prepare India's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan*. IIED, London.

2. What do we mean by ‘stakeholders’ in the context of an NBSAP?

The term ‘**stakeholder**’ is increasingly used in discussions on planning, public policy and governance. Used in this context, ‘stakeholder’ refers to social groups or institutions that have an interest in the policy or planning questions under discussion.

If, by ‘stakeholder’, we include all those persons, communities and organizations that have a necessary and legitimate interest¹ in the outcome then we can also say that another way of identifying these is to call them ‘**interest groups**’.

In many languages the expression used to signify what we mean by 'stakeholder' is the equivalent of ‘interest group’ and we can consider ‘stakeholder’ and ‘interest group’ to be synonymous.

Stakeholders may have an interest in the NBSAP for a number of reasons:

- They have a direct legal or administrative responsibility for aspects of biodiversity. For example, the ministry of environment; the national environment agency; agencies responsible for forests, water resources, or coastal management; the national patent office or intellectual property agency (for ABS-related matters).
- Activities they carry out may have an impact on biodiversity. For example, agencies with responsibility for agriculture, transport, forestry, regional planning, or urban development.
- Measures and policies adopted under the NBSAP may have an impact on their own work. For example, environmental impact assessment requirements will affect the way an energy ministry plans for and licences new energy generation projects or the way the transport ministry or highway agencies plan and licence projects.
- They may be affected, directly or indirectly, in positive or negative ways, by the outcomes of the policy and planning decisions taken. For example, establishing protected areas under the NBSAP will have consequences for the population living in or around these areas; measures to make biodiversity use sustainable will impact on those communities whose livelihoods are derived from the (currently unsustainable) use of such resources.
- They may possess experience, knowledge and/or expertise that is relevant to biodiversity and that can assist the NBSAP to obtain better outcomes or avoid negative outcomes. It is important to involve all those who have knowledge and expertise of the issue, without distinction. The knowledge held by research institutions, public and private, and that held by those communities – indigenous,

¹ This means those who are directly or indirectly affected; it does not necessarily include those who may be 'interested' in the issue, but will not necessarily be affected (examples might be academic researchers, journalists or others).

traditional, farming, fishing and so on – who deal with the issue as part of their livelihoods are equally important.

- They have a legitimate interest in the issue and thus an entitlement to be consulted on and to participate in the decision-making process. An individual's or a community's entitlement to information on plans and proposals that may affect them and to participate in the process of decision making is a cornerstone of democratic governance. This principle is enshrined in the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development adopted at the Earth Summit in 1992 and in an increasing number of global and regional environmental treaties.

3. How can we identify who are the stakeholders for NBSAPs?

Module 2 explains that an important first step in preparing a NBSAP is the establishment of a multi-stakeholder steering committee that includes representatives of different agencies of government, sectors of civil society, scientific expertise and national biomes or geographical regions.

As the steering committee proceeds with the identification of the different components of the national biodiversity strategy and the programme of activities for developing each component, and with bringing these together into the overall strategy, it should be continually asking the question: “**who needs to be involved in this activity?**” This question should apply to each of the activities to be undertaken – data collection, scientific synthesis, workshops, regional meetings, national meetings, reviewing drafts. In each case, the answer has to be “**representatives of all those that have an interest in the issue**”.

The components of the NBSAP will include activities to enable the country to meet the three objectives of the Convention – the conservation of biodiversity, the sustainable use of the components of biodiversity, and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources.

These are likely to involve action for:

- the conservation of different biomes;
- ensuring that economic activities that use biodiversity do so sustainably;
- addressing complex cross-cutting issues with scientific, legal or administrative characteristics; and
- promoting communication, education and public awareness on issues relating to biodiversity.

As was explained in previous modules, the immediate target of the Convention is to achieve a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss by 2010 and the NBSAP is the principal instrument for achieving this.

The range of stakeholders that should be brought into the process is much wider than initially imagined. The box below suggests who might need to be involved on questions relating to agricultural biodiversity.

Box 2
Example: agricultural biodiversity

Developing the policy approach and identifying plans and priorities for agricultural biodiversity may involve the following range of stakeholders:

- ministry of environment,
- ministry of agriculture,
- public and private agricultural research bodies,
- agricultural extension agencies,
- agricultural colleges or training establishments,
- the national focal point(s) for FAO-related matters, including for the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture,
- agro-biotechnology industry associations,
- university or other research bodies,
- associations of peasants or small farmers,
- agribusiness associations,
- indigenous and local community associations,
- agricultural economists,
- germplasm and seed bank managers,
- specialist non-governmental organizations,
- associations of bee-keepers or other sectors relating to pollinators,
- plant and animal breeding bodies,
- CBD national focal point for ABS (access to genetic resources and benefit sharing) matters.

These are only the 'direct' agricultural stakeholders. However, given that the agricultural sector in most countries plays an important role in food security, foreign trade and export earnings, and is often supported by policies for agricultural credit, land reform, education and vocational training, and science and technology, relevant stakeholders in this case should be taken to include, not just those directly involved in agricultural biodiversity issues, but the full range of organizations whose mandates relate to the issue.

These could include ministries and government agencies relating to health, trade and commerce, planning and finance, education and training, science and technology and others. It also includes those civil society sectors that work on these issues, for example, rural credit unions, organizations working on health and nutrition issues, economists and analysts with expertise in identifying new markets for traditional products of agricultural biodiversity, and others.

Here are some other examples of who the stakeholders might be:

Box 3
Example: taxonomy

Relevant museum and university bodies, zoological and botanical gardens, herbaria and arboreta, probably the ministries of education, science and technology, and environment, professional associations (the national association of biology, botany, zoology or similar) and others. Most countries experience a 'taxonomic deficit', in other words they do not have the resources they need to train and employ taxonomists, support collections and maintain institutions needed to identify their national biodiversity. This means there is a need to involve other potential stakeholders such as planning and finance authorities, financial institutions and foundations, and other funding bodies.

Box 4

Example: communication, public education and awareness

Ministries of environment and education, media organizations, associations of teachers and educational establishments, non-governmental organizations and others.

Box 5

Example: Fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources

Those within the country who hold genetic resources need to be identified and brought into the process of developing this aspect of the NBSAP. These could include:

- representative organizations of indigenous and traditional communities
- farmers
- other communities whose livelihoods involve capture, collection or other usages of plant and animal resources

Other stakeholder categories to be identified and brought into the process could include:

- relevant government agencies (for example, those with responsibility for environment, science and technology, trade, intellectual property matters and industrial development)
- the private sector (for example, the biotechnology, pharmaceutical and cosmetics sectors)
- legal specialists and other actors.

Undertaking identification and invitation

The essential point is that there can be no pre-determined list of who the stakeholders are in any particular case. The examples above are just that – examples. In each specific case in individual national contexts, the identification of the stakeholders will result in different lists. This is as it should be, as each country has different sets of institutions, different legal and administrative arrangements, different traditions and forms of participation – not to mention different biodiversity.

Each national manager responsible for NBSAP development and each national steering committee will need to use flexibility and creativity to identify the stakeholders for each topic in accordance with national circumstances.

This calls for consultation, since no individual official and probably no individual department will have a complete and reliable overview of who the national stakeholders are likely to be. This is one of the reasons for attempting to start the process with a steering committee that is as broad-based as possible. **The more sectors represented on the steering committee, the greater will be its ability to pool information and therefore the likelihood of correctly identified the full set of stakeholders.**

In some circumstances, this may require breaking with existing habits or perceptions. It may for example require establishing contacts where none currently exist, involving habitually marginal communities or local administrations in opposition to the national government.

It is important that all sectors, regions and social categories that have an interest in the issue under review are invited to participate in the development and implementation of the NBSAP.

4. When should the different categories of stakeholders be brought into the NBSAP process?

Two-stage process?

The first phase of NBSAP preparation covers stocktaking and assessment, and definition of initial priorities and objectives of the strategy. In this first phase some countries may feel it more appropriate to involve only those stakeholders directly involved – the so-called ‘biodiversity community’.

Such a decision may permit a tighter focus on the scientific and social assessment aspects of NBSAP development and on the identification of its priorities and objectives in the initial stages of the process. However, the need for ownership of the strategy by all stakeholders implies the risk that those potential stakeholders not included from the very beginning may feel excluded and reluctant to fully participate when subsequently invited.

There is a common sense issue here. If you think the outcome of your stocktaking and review will involve convincing other actors to accept your analysis and recommendations, and thereby to modify their behaviour and practices, it is sensible to involve them from the beginning. This is not just a question of participative democratic principle, but of ensuring that the process arrives at the best outcome by the most efficient means.

All at once?

The scope of initial participation may have an impact on the dynamics and efficiency of the process. There are advantages and disadvantages to broadening the participation right from the beginning. There are risks in not doing so.

The argument for putting off the active involvement of some sets of stakeholders to a second stage is that their engagement in the issue is less direct than the first group of invitees. By following this argument however the NBSAP committee may create two problems for itself:

- the possibly negative feelings of those brought in late may have to be appeased, and
- the belated realization that the ‘second wave’ of participants possess views and experience that were not available from the beginning and that now mean adjustments to the policy proposals have to be made. In this case it would have been more efficient to have avoided this risk, and to have got all the information and viewpoints on the table at the earliest opportunity.

Ultimately these decisions of timing can only be taken at the national level by the NBSAP managers and the committee.

Implementation and updating

Whatever strategy is adopted for involving stakeholders in its development, the implementation phase of the NBSAP will inevitably see the increasing engagement of stakeholders of all categories. Identifying and monitoring national biodiversity will be impossible without the involvement of universities and scientific bodies. The conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity will require the active participation of a wide range of actors (see box 2).

Each component of the NBSAP will probably generate its own set of stakeholders, as its influence consolidates and expands – thematically and geographically. The questions that need to be constantly asked are ‘who are the stakeholders for this issue?’ and ‘who needs to be involved in this region or biome?’

By the time the first version of the NBSAP is ready to be updated, there should be an extensive network of stakeholders involved in the implementation of each element of the NBSAP. It will be, in large part, their experience of implementation and their views on adaptations that need to be made that will provide the inputs to the updating of the NBSAP.

It is therefore extremely important to ensure that there are forums and mechanisms for sharing and systematizing the experiences of implementation and that the network of stakeholders is fully involved in the NBSAP revision process.

Box 6

Case study: stakeholders in Brazil's NBSAP

The national biodiversity strategy was developed through a national participative process, involving consultation with all state governments and meetings to evaluate the draft strategy involving representatives of stakeholders from all sectors of society. The outcome of this process was the presidential decree of 2002 specifying the principles and guidelines that make up the National Biodiversity Policy.

Implementation of the National Biodiversity Policy became the responsibility of the existing National Biological Diversity Programme (Pronabio), established in 1994 to promote partnership between government and civil society for the implementation of the CBD. Pronabio was amended by decree in 2003 to incorporate the principles and guidelines of the Policy.

The same decree also established the National Biodiversity Commission (Conabio) to coordinate and guide both the National Biodiversity Policy and Pronabio. The Commission comprises a representative of each of the following:

Federal government

- Ministry of the Environment
- Ministry of Science and Technology
- Ministry of Agriculture
- Ministry of Health
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Ministry of Planning
- Ministry of Agrarian Development
- Ministry of National Integration
- Secretariat of Aquaculture and Fishing
- Brazilian Institute for the Environment and Renewable Natural Resources

State governments

- Brazilian Association of State Environmental Authorities

Academic community

- Brazilian Society for the Advancement of Science
- Brazilian Academy of Sciences

NGOs and social movements

- Forum of NGOs and Social Movements (representing environmental NGOs)
- Forum of NGOs and Social Movements (representing social movements)

Indigenous communities

- Coordination of Indigenous Organizations of Amazonia

Workers' organizations

- National Confederation of Agricultural Workers
- National Movement of Fishers

Business sectors

- National Confederation of Agriculture
- National Confederation of Industry

The preparation of the Third National Report to the CBD in early 2005 involved 164 organizations: 27 state environmental authorities, 57 federal government programmes, 67 civil society organizations and 13 other government bodies. The National Report, considered and approved by Conabio, identified existing gaps in implementation of the National Biodiversity Policy. This resulted in the preparation of a document containing a draft revision of the National Biodiversity Policy.

This proposed revision was distributed to existing stakeholders and opened for public consultation via the national clearing-house mechanism. Stakeholders were requested to identify omissions, additional gaps, priority actions to cover the gaps and indicators for monitoring this. 780 proposals were received and were consolidated into a single document that formed the basis for a national workshop in August 2005 involving 130 participants from NGOs, the private sector, research institutions, state and federal governments and members of Conabio. This workshop identified 494 proposed activities for the revised biodiversity strategy and action plan.

A consolidated revision of the National Biodiversity Policy was reviewed by Conabio over a six-month period. In February 2006 Conabio adopted the "Guidelines and Priorities of the Plan of Implementation of the National Biodiversity Policy (PAN-Bio)", which was launched at CBD COP-8 in March 2006.

5. What are possible mechanisms for involving stakeholders?

The need to involve the widest range of stakeholders in the NBSAP process raises the question of how to go about this. What are the possible mechanisms? What are the procedures and formats that will ensure the most effective dynamics and the best outcomes of the preparation stages?

There are no hard and fast answers to these questions – no universal, one-size-fits-all solution. To start with, the options will vary in accordance with the size, structure and traditions of the country itself. The best way of arranging things in the case of a small island state will probably not apply to a large federal state, for example.

One obvious recommendation to make is that those involved in getting the NBSAP process off the ground should not try to re-invent the wheel. If the country already has consultation procedures for public policy discussions in place or if there are existing forums for broad-based discussion of environmental or development policy, then a sensible decision will be to build on these examples – using the same structures, or establishing a new structure modelled on procedures that have been proved to work in the national context.

However, if there are no previous national models, or if those that exist are felt to be inadequate or inappropriate, then new arrangements will need to be decided upon.

Answers to the question ‘what are the possible mechanisms for involving stakeholders?’ will come in two parts. First, what are the possible formats? Second, what are the best techniques to be used in the consultation and policy development discussions to ensure full participation in and ownership of the outcomes?

Possible formats

Workshops

This is the format that is most likely to be decided by geographical and cultural factors. In a small country it may be that all potential stakeholders can be easily identified because they are already visible within national policy discussions on the issues to be addressed in the NBSAP process. Bringing such stakeholders together in national biodiversity planning workshops or development sessions in the national capital may be logistically easy and cost-effective.

In the case of large countries, especially those with federal structures or strong sub-national authorities, many of these have opted for one or more series of NBSAP workshops at state or provincial levels, leading to national meetings. This is often the most cost-effective way of involving the largest number of participants in the process and ensuring that the strategy development process is informed to the fullest extent possible by the experiences and demands of stakeholders throughout the national territory. The national meetings will then

serve to synthesise and structure the local experiences and recommendations into a national policy framework.

The same logic also applies to arrangements that involve sectoral consultations that are then brought together into an overall national strategy framework. In this case, initial workshops for different sectors or stakeholder categories – for example, the scientific community, indigenous groups, the private sector, the agricultural sector – could be arranged (at either national or sub-national levels, depending on national circumstances), and the outcomes of these consultations would flow into the national level synthesis.

In an ideal situation, the best arrangements might be to have all three sets of consultations: local, sectoral and national. However these sorts of decision will need to be taken by the NBSAP managers and/or committee in light of a series of factors: national circumstances, human and institutional resources, financial resources and the time allowed for the process.

E-conferences

A further possibility, if feasible within national circumstances, is to organise internet or email based consultations ('e-conferences'). However, these should only be organised if a significant and representative proportion of potential stakeholders would be able to participate. If, for example, only urban stakeholders have e-mail access, or if indigenous and traditional communities are unfamiliar with or have poor access to the necessary technology, then this option should be approached with caution, as it may result in unequal participation by some stakeholder groups.

Where e-conferences and other electronic options are used, they should be seen as a complement to, and not a substitute for, workshops and other live, face-to-face interactions.

Possible techniques

As important as the decisions on format, are the decisions to be taken on the methodologies. It is important that all stakeholders participating in the NBSAP process are made to feel comfortable that they are equal partners in the process, that their experience and knowledge is important, and that their views will be considered on an equal basis.

Instilling this level of comfort, which is essential for generating the overall desired outcome of a shared sense of ownership of the process by all stakeholders, is no easy task. It may involve breaking with tradition and ingrained habits, for example by thinking about how to really promote interactive roundtable discussions and not fall into the trap of organising a lecture series, where 'experts' talk from the podium to a room full of passive 'listeners'.

Box 7

There are a number of **widely-used techniques and methodologies** for ensuring such interaction and promoting full participation such as ZOPP, AIC and TeamUP. Information on where to learn more about these is given in the resource module. Staff of the GEF Implementing Agency (UNDP, UNEP or the World Bank) that is helping your country with NBSAP preparation and implementation can also provide guidance on the available techniques.

Access to necessary information

A key to the success of the enterprise – ensuring increasing buy-in and avoiding the dropping-out of participants, leading to overall ownership of the process – is making sure that all participants have access to the necessary information and are kept in the information circuit.

Access to necessary information means access to information in a culturally appropriate format and in the everyday language of the recipient.

Language(s)

For example, the background and context of why a NBSAP needs to be developed will need to be explained to most stakeholders. This will involve preparing and disseminating information about the CBD, decisions of the COP, the CBD Strategic Plan and its programmes of work, existing guidelines for NBSAP development and summaries of lessons learned. Whilst much of this information is likely to be available in one or more of the six official languages of the United Nations, none of these may be appropriate if they are not widely spoken in the country in question. In fact, unless one of these languages is the official language of the country and spoken by all social groups, it is almost a foregone conclusion that the necessary information will need to be translated into one or more national or local languages to ensure equality of access to the information by all participants.

Accessible media

Similarly information disseminated in a format accessible to scientists or private sector representatives may not be appropriate to farming communities, or to indigenous and traditional groups. In this regard, it is important not to fall into the trap of thinking that, because some leaders of local and traditional communities may be comfortable in the national language (whether this is a UN language or not), all members of their communities will be equally at ease. The task of promoting participatory biodiversity planning involves extensive discussions and capacity building within communities. We know that in all communities, rural and urban, there is a serious risk that decision-making is dominated by adult males and that other sections of the community that are likely to have valuable experience and views that need to be taken on board (women, the elderly, even the young) will have unequal weight within the decision-making process. Compounding such inequality by choosing inappropriate media for disseminating information must be avoided; not least because, in this case, it could result in the exclusion of potentially important information and insights from the NBSAP process.

Therefore, in addition to considering the question of the language(s) to be used, it is important to consider what the most appropriate medium of communication might be for each target group. In some regions radio may be the medium by which most communities access information. In some countries there are programmes for communication and information dissemination by means of the distribution of audio or video cassettes. Some countries have invested in providing indigenous and local communities with internet

access, so dissemination in digital format via email or website may be appropriate. As always, the NBSAP managers will need to think carefully about the specific needs of each stakeholder category.

Documentation

Every activity undertaken as part of the NBSAP preparation process needs to be fully documented and the ensuing reports circulated to all stakeholders (i.e. not just those that took part in the workshop or other activity in question, but the whole national set of stakeholders) as soon as possible after the event and in an appropriate format.

Final considerations

The choice as to which of the possible mechanisms for involving stakeholders – both formats and participatory methodologies – should be decided by the NBSAP managers or committee in accordance with national resources, traditions and circumstances. Whatever mechanisms or combinations of mechanisms are selected, it is essential to ensure that all stakeholders are given access to the information they need to understand what is expected of them, in an appropriate language and format and to ensure that, throughout the life of the process, information is circulated to all participants in a timely and transparent way.

Each set of stakeholders must speak for itself and only for itself. For example, the views of small farmers should be put by representative organisations of small farmers and not by agriculture ministry officials, extension agency staff or NGOs speaking on their behalf. The views of indigenous and traditional communities should be their own views, enunciated by their own representatives. Outside actors such as anthropologists, NGOs or religious organisations should not speak on their behalf, however sympathetic and well-informed they may be.

Questions for discussion

- What was the process that your country used to identify NBSAP stakeholders?
- Do you feel that all relevant stakeholders are now included? If not, what are the sectors that still need to be engaged?
- Will the degree of stakeholder participation in the process of revising the NBSAP be different from that in the initial development of the NBSAP?

List of Acronyms

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
COP	Conference of the Parties (to the CBD)
IUCN	World Conservation Union
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
UNU	United Nations University
WGRI	Working Group on Review of Implementation (of the Convention)
WRI	World Resources Institute