

Republic of Armenia
Second National Report

to the

Convention on Biological Diversity

Department of Fauna and Flora
Ministry of Nature Protection
Yerevan

15th May 2001

Contents

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Introductory tables | 3 |
| Article 5 Cooperation | 9 |
| Article 6 General measures for conservation and sustainable use | 13 |
| Article 7 Identification and monitoring | 16 |
| Decisions on Taxonomy | 21 |
| Article 8 In situ conservation [excluding Articles 8h and 8j] | 25 |
| Article 8h Alien species | 30 |
| Article 8j Traditional knowledge and related provisions | 33 |
| Article 9 Ex situ conservation | 37 |
| Article 10 Sustainable use of components of biological diversity | 40 |
| Article 11 Incentive measures | 44 |
| Article 12 Research and training | 47 |
| Article 13 Public education and awareness | 50 |
| Article 14 Impact assessment and minimizing adverse impacts | 53 |
| Article 15 Access to genetic resources | 58 |
| Article 16 Access to and transfer of technology | 63 |
| Article 17 Exchange of information | 65 |
| Article 18 Technical and scientific cooperation | 66 |
| Article 19 Handling of biotechnology and distribution of its benefits | 70 |
| Article 20 Financial resources | 72 |
| Article 21 Financial mechanism | 76 |
| Article 23 Conference of the Parties | 77 |
| Article 24 Secretariat | 78 |
| Article 25 SBSTTA | 79 |
| Article 26 Reports | 80 |
| | |
| Ecosystem approach | 81 |
| Inland water ecosystems | 82 |
| Marine and coastal biological diversity | 85 |
| Agricultural biological diversity | 87 |
| Forest biological diversity | 92 |
| Biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands | 94 |
| Operations of the Convention | 96 |
| | |
| Concluding tables | 97 |

Please provide the following details on the origin of this report

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Contracting Party | Republic of Armenia |
| National Focal Point | |
| Full name of the institution: | Ministry of Nature Protection |
| Name and title of contact officer: | Sergey Shashikyan, Head of the Division of Flora and Fauna Conservation, CBD Focal Point |
| Mailing address: | 35 Moskovyan St. Yerevan, 375002, Armenia |
| Telephone: | (374-1) 53-18-41 |
| Fax: | |
| E-mail: | sergeynp@freenet.am |
| Contact officer for national report (if different) | |
| Full name of the institution: | |
| Name and title of contact officer: | |
| Mailing address: | |
| Telephone: | |
| Fax: | |
| E-mail: | |
| Submission | |
| Signature of officer responsible for submitting national report: |  |
| Date of submission: | May 14, 2001 |

Please provide summary information on the process by which this report has been prepared, including information on the types of stakeholders who have been actively involved in its preparation and on material which was used as a basis for the report

A list of seven National Experts, all of whom had contributed significantly to the first National Report, was drawn up by the National Focal Point, Sergey Shashikyan, who is also working as the project coordinator. These experts consulted with various governmental and non-governmental organisations, departments and research institutes, in coordination with the National Focal Point. The information collected was then entered into the guideline reporting format supplied by the Secretariat of the CBD, with the assistance of staff from the Department of Flora and Fauna Conservation and Protected Areas. This draft report was written in English.

The seven National Experts involved were;

Georgi Fayvush – In situ / Ex-situ conservation
 Zhirayr Vardanyan – Flora
 Mark Kalashyan – Fauna
 Bardukh Gabrielyan – Water biodiversity
 Alvina Avagyan – Genetic Resources
 Volodya Zoranyan – Agrobiodiversity
 Yekaterina Aleksanyan – Education / Awareness Raising, Public Participation / Environmental Impact Assessment

The institutes and organisations that provided information for the report were;

Institute of Biotechnology
 Institute of Botany
 Institute of Microbiology
 Institute of Water Ecology and Fisheries
 Institute of Zoology
 Scientific Centre for Soil, Agriculture and Plant Protection
 Scientific Centre for Vegetables and Orchards
 Forest Scientific Centre
 Armenian Agricultural Academy
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Ministry of Nature Protection (almost all departments consulted)
 Department of Ecological Expertise
 Yerevan State University
 Byurakn – NGO
 Ecological Survival - NGO

The staff of the Department of Flora and Fauna Conservation and Protected Areas that participated in drawing up the Second National Report were:

Tatyana Danielyan
 Siranush Muradyan
 Karen Jenderedjian
 Aram Aghasyan

The draft report was then reviewed by international consultants from the UK organisation Fauna and Flora International who edited the report, identified gaps in the information in the draft, and then conducted interviews with the appropriate stakeholders in order to gather the information necessary to fill these gaps. FFI Consultants involved were;

Alistair Taylor (UNEP-WCMC)
 Chris Magin (FFI)

At the suggestion of the National Focal Point a half-day seminar was organised prior to submitting the report in order to present the process and results of the Second National Report to around 20 stakeholders including representatives from government, scientific and academic institutions and NGOs.

Following a brief introduction by the National Focal Point, each of the seven experts gave a short presentation on their role in the process and what they saw as high priority needs or activities for Armenia in their particular area. Feedback was sought from the stakeholders present and this was incorporated into the report under the section, "Further comments on work programmes and priorities".

The report was then finally reviewed by the National Focal Point and submitted to the CBD Secretariat.

Please provide information on any particular circumstances in your country that are relevant to understanding the answers to the questions in this report

The Republic of Armenia suffered severe economic hardships at the beginning of the 1990s, when it became involved in a political dispute with neighbouring Azerbaijan. One consequence of this was a transport blockade by Azerbaijan and Turkey, causing a severe energy crisis that led to widespread deforestation near urban centres as people cut trees for fuel wood. Economic recovery has now begun, aided by a reasonably low level of international debt. The financing of biodiversity conservation programmes is supported by a number of mechanisms, including the State budget and foreign contributions to projects. While environmental problems are recognised, the environment is not considered a high national priority for public expenditure.

Furthermore Armenia has a shortage of training for biodiversity conservation specialists in several areas. There is a shortage of protected area management specialists and currently no training available for such specialists. Armenian specialists were trained in Soviet methods of management and need instruction in recent developments in this area in order to fulfil international obligations.

There is also a need for specialists in the economic aspects of protected areas management and data management. Specialists in monitoring activities are also needed, both field specialists and those trained in the organisation of monitoring activities and in information management.

Armenia also lacks information and expertise in the key area of alien invasive species. More clarification is needed of potential risks and management strategies for dealing with such risks in this area.

Information and assistance is also sought in the area of inter-sectoral relationships in biodiversity conservation, since many institutional changes have been made since the end of the Soviet era.

The COP has established programmes of work that respond to a number of Articles. Please identify the relative priority accorded to each theme and the adequacy of resources. This will allow subsequent information on implementation of each Article to be put into context. There are other questions on implementation of the programmes of work at the end of these guidelines.

Inland water ecosystems

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 1. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country? | |
| a) High | √ |
| b) Medium | |
| c) Low | |
| d) Not relevant | |
| 2. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | |
| a) Good | |
| b) Adequate | |
| c) Limiting | √ |
| d) Severely limiting | |

Marine and coastal biological diversity

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 3. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country? | |
| a) High | |
| b) Medium | |
| c) Low | |
| d) Not relevant | √ |
| 4. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | |
| a) Good | |
| b) Adequate | |
| c) Limiting | |
| d) Severely limiting | |

Agricultural biological diversity

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 5. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country? | |
| a) High | √ |
| b) Medium | |
| c) Low | |
| d) Not relevant | |
| 6. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | |
| a) Good | |
| b) Adequate | |
| c) Limiting | √ |
| d) Severely limiting | |

Forest biological diversity

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 7. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country? | |
| a) High | √ |
| b) Medium | |
| c) Low | |
| d) Not relevant | |
| 8. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | |
| a) Good | |
| b) Adequate | |
| c) Limiting | |
| d) Severely limiting | √ |

Biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 9. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country? | |
| a) High | √ |
| b) Medium | |
| c) Low | |
| d) Not relevant | |
| 10. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | |
| a) Good | |
| b) Adequate | |
| c) Limiting | √ |
| d) Severely limiting | |

Further comments on work programmes and priorities

Following the process of gathering the necessary information for the report, a seminar was held in order to present the results of the process to stakeholders. Each of the seven national experts involved in writing the report gave a short presentation on the high priority needs of Armenia in the field of biodiversity conservation. While the most pressing need was acknowledged by all to be the lack of financial resources for biodiversity conservation as a result of the economic situation of the country, there was a wide variation in opinions over what was the most important biodiversity conservation activity to be carried out were finances to be made available.

The following activities were all proposed as high priority needs;

- The establishment of a Coordinating Centre for projects and a framework for monitoring projects
- Producing an inventory of species of flora and fauna in Armenia, including alien invasive species
- The establishment of a permanent monitoring network, with the necessary legislative and institutional framework and resources, with a coordinating centre in Yerevan and several regional centres
- The establishment of a centre for taxonomic activities
- Training for taxonomists, forest biodiversity specialists, protected area managers
- The establishment of "dendroparks" (i.e. reserves for forest and woody species conservation) in biodiversity rich arid areas in the south of Armenia
- Improved public awareness and education through better coordination between educational establishments and the introduction of a regulation on the provision of information
- Improved legislative framework
- The establishment of a general comprehensive ecological policy for the Transcaucasus
- The establishment of the appropriate legislative framework and either one or two state institutions responsible for access to genetic resources and / or conservation of genetics and information

The relative urgency of these needs was discussed with the National Focal Point and it was his opinion that an accurate up to date inventory of fauna and flora species in Armenia, including any alien invasive species present in the country would be the first and most essential activity. Such an inventory might result in changes to the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (hence BSAP) itself.

This would then be followed up with measures to strengthen and clarify biodiversity conservation management structures. These measures would pave the way for subsequent activities directly addressing biodiversity conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity.

Article 5 Cooperation

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| 11. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | | b) Medium | ✓ | c) Low | |
| 12. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | | b) Adequate | | c) Limiting | ✓ |
| d) Severely limiting | | | | | |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| <p>11. Armenia's major goals for international environmental co-operation are determined by its geopolitical location, the priority of environmental problems, and the need to co-ordinate efforts with other countries in solving environmental issues. On the basis of these principles Armenia participates in global environmental processes and has signed a number of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). At the same time attention is paid to regional co-operation, with an emphasis on co-operation with countries in a similar economic situation with comparable environmental problems. National environmental policy takes international environmental policy into account.</p> <p>A programme for the implementation of the UNECE Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, the UNECE Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity for the period from 1998 to 2002 was adopted by Decree No.115 of February 1998. In addition, Decree No.620 of 1998 lays down an implementation plan for the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification. However, in some cases, the obligations of MEAs have not been incorporated into domestic policies, laws and regulations.</p> <p>Armenia co-operates with many international organisations and funding institutions, including UNECE, UNEP, UNDP, OECD, TACIS, FAO, the World Bank, as well as with national governments. Armenia's application to join the WTO is at an advanced stage, and it has also applied for membership of the Council of Europe, but there are still some underlying political problems that might hamper its joining.</p> | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 13. Is your country actively cooperating with other Parties in respect of areas beyond national jurisdiction for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity? | |
| a) bilateral cooperation (please give details below) | ✓ |
| b) international programmes (please give details below) | ✓ |
| c) international agreements (please give details below) | ✓ |

Decision IV/4. Status and trends of the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems and options for conservation and sustainable use

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 14. Has your country developed effective cooperation for the sustainable management of transboundary watersheds, catchments, river basins and migratory species through bilateral and multilateral agreements? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent (please give details below) | ✓ |
| c) yes - significant extent (please give details below) | |
| d) not applicable | |

Decision IV/15. The relationship of the CBD with the CSD and biodiversity-related conventions, other international agreements, institutions and processes or relevance

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 15. Has your country developed management practices for transboundary protected areas? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent (please give details below) | √ |
| c) yes - significant extent (please give details below) | |
| d) not relevant | |

Decision V/21. Co-operation with other bodies

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 16. Has your country collaborated with the International Biodiversity Observation Year of DIVERSITAS, and ensured complementarity with the initiative foreseen to be undertaken by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity to increase scientific knowledge and public awareness of the crucial role of biodiversity for sustainable development? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) to a limited extent | |
| c) to a significant extent | |

Decision V/27. Contribution of the Convention on Biological Diversity to the ten-year review of progress achieved since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 17. Is your country planning to highlight and emphasize biological diversity considerations in its contribution to the ten-year review of progress since the Earth Summit? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

13 a) Bilateral co-operation. During the years 2000-2001 Armenia conducted bilateral negotiations with a number of countries on collaborative agreements in the field of environmental protection and biodiversity conservation. In particular, agreements between the Governments of the Russian Federation and Armenia and between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Armenia have reached the stage of signing. In these agreements the conservation of rare and endangered species of flora and fauna is a priority.

13 b) International programmes.

| <i>Project title</i> | <i>Budget</i> | <i>Duration</i> | <i>Donor organisation</i> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| National Environmental Action Plan | \$200,000 | 1996-1998 | World Bank |
| Lake Sevan Environmental Action Plan | \$485,000 | 1996-1998 | World Bank |
| Forestry Sector Development | \$380,000 | 1994-1997 | UN FAO |
| First National Report, Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan to CBD | \$175,000 | 1997-1999 | GEF |
| Preparation of the Full Project for the in-situ Conservation and Sustainable Use of agrobiodiversity in Armenia | \$97,000 | 1998-1999 | GEF |
| Inventory of Armenian Ramsar Sites: ways for restoration of lost and rehabilitation of endangered waterfowl habitats | \$23,000 | 1998-1999 | Ramsar Small Grants Fund |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Armenian Forest Resources Assessment | \$200,000 | 1998-1999 | SIDA |
| National Action Programme to Combat Desertification in Armenia | \$40,000 | 1999-2000 | UNEP |
| Analysis of the present condition and development of priority activities on biodiversity conservation and rational use in Caucasus | \$12,000 | 2000-2001 | McArthur Foundation |
| Restoration of Gilly Lake | \$20,000 | Since 2000 | GEF |
| Management of Natural Resources and Poverty Reduction in Armenia | \$15,000,000 | Since 2000 | Several donors |

13 c) International agreements. Armenia is a signatory of several Conventions directly or indirectly related to the problems of biodiversity conservation:

- Armenia ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1993. A Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP) and the First National Report to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention were prepared in 1999. The Government has approved a schedule of measures to implement the Convention. The BSAP will be the basis for national biodiversity policy and will be adopted by the Government. It aims at ensuring the conservation, sustainable use and regeneration of Armenia's landscape and biological diversity. It includes a budget for its implementation, identifying what can be funded in Armenia and what needs international funding, indicating possible sources of finance.

- Armenia became a Party to the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention) in 1993. Two sites were designated for the List of Wetlands of International Importance: Lake Sevan and its basin (489,100ha) and Lake Apri and its bogs (3,139ha). Lake Sevan is one of the world's largest alpine lakes and it and the surrounding basin are significant resting and wintering areas for migratory waterfowl.

- Armenia ratified the *United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification* in 1997. A National Action Programme addressing control of land distribution, re-cultivation of eroded land, reclamation of salinized lands and restoration of their natural productivity is being prepared. Armenia has received US\$32,000 from the Convention's secretariat for this purpose. Armenia participated in a regional project with Georgia and Azerbaijan "Arid and Semi-Arid Eco-system Conservation in the Caucasus" (see this questionnaire, question 374).

- Armenia ratified the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in 1993. A national implementation strategy and the first national communication were prepared in 1998 as part of the project "Armenia – Country Study on Climate Change". The communication contains a specific activity related to biodiversity, which is formulated as "An assessment of vulnerability and adaptation measures for natural ecosystems, water resources, agriculture and health issues related to climate change".

- Armenia ratified the UN Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context in 1997, making it the only country in the Trans-Caucasian region to accede to it. This restricts the application of its provisions in the region.

- Armenia participated in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992. There have been no specific initiatives to implement Agenda 21 in Armenia. However, a process to develop a National Environmental Action Plan was initiated in 1996 and finished in 1998. It included two chapters related to biodiversity: "Forest conservation" and "Biodiversity conservation".

- Armenia has been actively involved in the "Environment for Europe" process since the second ministerial meeting in Lucerne, Switzerland. Participation in the process fits well with Armenia's goal to move closer towards the EU, and is thus considered important. Armenia is trying to implement the decisions taken within the framework of the process. It supports the establishment of a regional environmental centre (REC) in Georgia for the Caucasian region, and an agreement on the regional REC was signed between Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan in the autumn of 1999. A national report in the framework of "Europe's Environment: the Second Assessment" (Dobris +3) was prepared with financial support from EU/TACIS.

- Armenia has adopted the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy. Within the framework of this strategy, Armenia participates in the development of documents on global environmental networks, the clearing-house mechanism, the global taxonomic initiative, integrating biological and landscape diversity objectives into sectoral policies, as well as in the decision-making processes on the proposed documents.

- In the Framework of Pan-European Strategy of Biological and Landscape Diversity there is a Programme Element "Establishment of potential for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Central and East Europe (CEE) and Newly Independent States (NIS)", which contains a separate action "Development of regional co-operation (Armenia, Russia, Georgia, Azerbaijan) aimed at better management and sustainable use of biodiversity in transboundary territories" (included in the Strategy during the conference "Biodiversity in Europe" in March, 2000). For this purpose, a regional seminar will be organised in Armenia in June, 2001 (see Article 18, questions 254-255).

- Armenia has participated in the meetings of the Black Sea Economic Co-operation Forum since 1992. Armenia is particularly interested in projects with a wide scope such as: environmental education, tourism, harmonisation of monitoring and information systems, managing mountain ecosystems, cleaner production, etc.

- In 1992 Armenia signed the Agreement on Co-operation in the Field of Ecology and Nature Protection, which is being coordinated by the Interstate Ecological Council for the CIS Region. Armenia participates in all activities undertaken in the framework of this Agreement, including various working groups and sub-agreements.

- Armenia has signed the following agreements within the CIS region: (a) "Agreement on co-operation in the field of ecology and environment protection" (1992); (b) "Agreement on co-operation in the field of information exchange for ecology and environment protection" (1998); (c) "Agreement on co-operation in the field of forestry and forest industry" (1998); and (d) "Agreement on co-operation in the field of ecological monitoring" (1999).

14. Armenia is not a Party to the 1992 Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes. All Armenia's rivers flow out of the country because it is higher than its neighbours. Therefore it exports more water pollution than it imports. Because of this and related concerns about the polluter-pays-principle embodied in the Convention, preparations for its ratification are still problematic. None of Armenia's neighbours has ratified the Convention yet. Armenia nevertheless participated in the negotiations on the Protocol on Water and Health, which it signed in June 1999.

Armenia's rivers are tributaries of the two major transboundary rivers: the Kur (a basin of 700 square km) and the Araks (22,790 square km basin). There are no common management systems or environmental agreements concerning these rivers. Negotiations have started with Azerbaijan and Georgia on a joint project to clean up point sources of pollution, but they have not been completed. Armenia has an agreement with Turkey, dividing the use of the transboundary Araks and Akhourian rivers in equal proportions (1,230 million m³ per year each), but Armenia has not been using its full share, and disputes between the two countries have occurred over their entitlements.

A number of Armenian NGOs are carrying out several small projects on transboundary migrating species, such as "Vertebrate Animals Biodiversity Conservation in Transboundary Regions of Transcaucasus", a project implemented with the support of NACRES and ensuring participation of both Armenian and Georgian stakeholders. There are a number of projects at the project development stage on the management of water ecosystems of the neighbouring countries of Southern Caucasus, financed by USAID and TACIS (see question 309).

15. The management methods have not been developed, but various project proposals on transboundary protection area conservation and management have been endorsed as priorities within the regional project "Analysis of the present condition and development of priority activities on biodiversity conservation and rational use in the Caucasus".

Article 6 General measures for conservation and sustainable use

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| 18. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | | b) Medium | ✓ | c) Low | |
| 19. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | | b) Adequate | | c) Limiting | ✓ |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| See text box following question 29. | | | | | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 20. What is the status of your national biodiversity strategy (6a)? | |
| a) none | |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) completed ₁ | ✓ |
| e) completed and adopted ₂ | |
| f) reports on implementation available | |
| 21. What is the status of your national biodiversity action plan (6a)? | |
| a) none | |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) completed ₂ | ✓ |
| e) completed and adopted ₂ | |
| f) reports on implementation available | |
| 22. Do your national strategies and action plans cover all articles of the Convention (6a)? | |
| a) some articles only | |
| b) most articles | ✓ |
| c) all articles | |
| 23. Do your national strategies and action plans cover integration of other sectoral activities (6b)? | |
| a) no | |
| b) some sectors | ✓ |
| c) all major sectors | |
| d) all sectors | |

1/ Please provide information requested at the end of these guidelines.

Decision II/7 and Decision III/9 Consideration of Articles 6 and 8

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 24. Is action being taken to exchange information and share experience on the national action planning process with other Contracting Parties? | |
| a) little or no action | ✓ |
| b) sharing of strategies, plans and/or case-studies | |
| c) regional meetings | |
| 25. Do all of your country's strategies and action plans include an international cooperation component? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | ✓ |
| 26. Are your country's strategies and action plans coordinated with those of neighbouring countries? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) bilateral/multilateral discussions under way | |
| c) coordinated in some areas/themes | |
| d) fully coordinated | |
| e) not applicable | |
| 27. Has your country set measurable targets within its strategies and action plans? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) programme in place | |
| e) reports on implementation available | |
| If a developing country Party or a Party with economy in transition - | |
| 28. Has your country received support from the financial mechanism for the preparation of its national strategy and action plan? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | ✓ |
| If yes, which was the Implementing Agency (UNDP/UNEP/World Bank)? | UNDP |

Decisions III/21. Relationship of the Convention with the CSD and biodiversity-related conventions

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 29. Are the national focal points for the CBD and the competent authorities of the Ramsar Convention, Bonn Convention and CITES cooperating in the implementation of these conventions to avoid duplication? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes - limited extent | |
| c) yes - significant extent | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

In 1997 Armenia received GEF assistance in the sum of USD \$174,800 to implement the project "First National Report, Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan to CBD". In 1999, the combined work of eight groups of specialists resulted in a "First National Report on Biodiversity of Armenia" and a "Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan" (BSAP), which were prepared in line with CBD guidelines and the priority development goals of Armenia.

The strategy is a series of strategic approaches or techniques for conservation, which can be applied to meet the objectives and aims of the BSAP. These explain what approaches will be applied to resolve the issues linked to biodiversity loss in Armenia. These strategic components also provide a framework for the action plan. In addition, the strategic approaches provide a direct reflection of the articles of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and thus provide a clear way to monitor the progress of the country in meeting its obligations to the convention. Fourteen strategic approaches have been identified:

- In-situ conservation
- Ex-situ conservation
- Sustainable use of biological and landscape resources
- Development of institutional potential and training
- Ecological education and public participation
- Identification and monitoring
- Research
- Information exchange and accessibility
- Co-operation (technical, scientific, inter-state, and technology transfer)
- Impact assessment
- Incentive measures
- Legislation
- Financial resources
- Co-ordination of the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP)

The Action Plan documents the specific activities, which must be completed to achieve the overall aims and objectives of the BSAP. The actions are organised around the framework of the 14 Strategic Approaches outlined in section 3.2.3 of the BSAP. Within each action, a series of more specific activities are listed. The actions and activities have been developed within an integrated, holistic structure, and therefore may link to activities listed under separate Strategic Approaches.

Since March 2001 a project has been launched as a second phase of Biodiversity Enabling Activity. It received additional financing from GEF totalling \$143,130 and includes the following components:

1. Assessment of Capacity-building needs for
 - Implementation of measures for in-situ and ex-situ conservation and sustainable use
 - Initial assessment and monitoring programmes, including taxonomy
 - Access to genetic resources, benefit-sharing and formulation of mechanisms for these purposes
2. Establishment of a Clearing House Mechanism in Armenia
3. Preparation of the Second National Report.

23. An objective of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy is the integration of biological and landscape diversity objectives into sectoral policies, as well as into the decision-making processes on global environmental networks (see question 13).

Armenia seeks information and guidance on inter-sectoral relationships in the area of biodiversity conservation. As with most newly-independent CIS States Armenia has inherited a strictly separated institutional system from the Soviet era, although some changes have been made in order to incorporate some scientific centres within the structures of the Ministry of Agriculture.

Article 7 Identification and monitoring

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|-------------|--|-------------|----------------------|
| 30. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | ✓ | b) Medium | | c) Low | |
| 31. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | | b) Adequate | | c) Limiting | d) Severely limiting |
| | | | | | ✓ |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| <p>30-31. The high priority of this Article is determined by the almost complete absence of monitoring activities in the country, although significant work on the identification of components of biological diversity has been carried out. During the Soviet era there was no specialised monitoring service and no comprehensive monitoring programme. Limited data was held by the various research institutes. Some monitoring of the plants in Dilijan State Reserve and of the fauna and flora in the Khosrov State Reserve took place, but this only resulted in an inventory of species.</p> <p>There is also a need for field specialists, general monitoring specialists and information management specialists for dealing with the data collected. Such specialists are in short supply in Armenia and there are no programmes in place for training them.</p> <p>At the same time Armenia is a country with an economy in transition, where a number of social-economic processes seriously, and often destructively, affect the biodiversity of the country. In particular, the direct use of components of biodiversity (cutting down of trees, collecting food plants and mushrooms, fishing and hunting, including illegal practices, etc.) has increased. Therefore, control over the status of biodiversity is one of the main preconditions to fulfilling the country's obligations under the Convention. However the country has practically no financial resources for the implementation of the requirements of the Convention.</p> | | | | | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 32. Does your country have an ongoing inventory programme at species level (7a)? | |
| a) minimal activity | |
| b) for key groups (such as threatened or endemic species) or indicators | |
| c) for a range of major groups | ✓ |
| d) for a comprehensive range of species | |
| 33. Does your country have an ongoing inventory programme at ecosystem level (7a)? | |
| a) minimal activity | |
| b) for ecosystems of particular interest only | ✓ |
| c) for major ecosystems | |
| d) for a comprehensive range of ecosystems | |
| 34. Does your country have an ongoing inventory programme at genetic level (7a)? | |
| a) minimal activity | ✓ |
| b) minor programme in some sectors | |
| c) major programme in some sectors | |
| d) major programme in all relevant sectors | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 35. Does your country have ongoing monitoring programmes at species level (7a)? | |
| a) minimal activity | √ |
| b) for key groups (such as threatened or endemic species) or indicators | |
| c) for a range of major groups | |
| d) for a comprehensive range of species | |
| 36. Does your country have ongoing monitoring programmes at ecosystem level (7b)? | |
| a) minimal activity | √ |
| b) for ecosystems of particular interest only | |
| c) for major ecosystems | |
| d) for a comprehensive range of ecosystems | |
| 37. Does your country have ongoing monitoring programmes at genetic level (7b)? | |
| a) minimal activity | √ |
| b) minor programme in some sectors | |
| c) major programme in some sectors | |
| d) major programme in all relevant sectors | |
| 38. Has your country identified activities with adverse affects on biodiversity (7c)? | |
| a) limited understanding | |
| b) threats well known in some areas, not in others | √ |
| c) most threats known, some gaps in knowledge | |
| d) comprehensive understanding | |
| e) reports available | |
| 39. Is your country monitoring these activities and their effects (7c)? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of programme development | √ |
| c) advanced stages of programme development | |
| d) programme in place | |
| e) reports on implementation available | |
| 40. Does your country coordinate information collection and management at the national level (7d)? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of programme development | √ |
| c) advanced stages of programme development | |
| d) programme in place | |
| e) reports on implementation available | |

Decision III/10 Identification, monitoring and assessment

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 41. Has your country identified national indicators of biodiversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) assessment of potential indicators underway | √ |
| c) indicators identified (if so, please describe below) | |
| 42. Is your country using rapid assessment and remote sensing techniques? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) assessing opportunities | |
| c) yes, to a limited extent | |
| d) yes, to a major extent | |
| e) reports on implementation available | |
| 43. Has your country adopted a "step-by-step" approach to implementing Article 7 with initial emphasis on identification of biodiversity components (7a) and activities having adverse effects on them (7c)? | |
| a) no | |
| b) not appropriate to national circumstances | √ |
| c) yes | |
| 44. Is your country cooperating with other Contracting Parties on pilot projects to demonstrate the use of assessment and indicator methodologies? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes (if so give details below) | |
| 45. Has your country prepared any reports of experience with application of assessment methodologies and made these available to other Contracting Parties? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 46. Is your country seeking to make taxonomic information held in its collections more widely available? | |
| a) no relevant collections | |
| b) no action | √ |
| c) yes (if so, please give details below) | |

Decision V/7. Identification, monitoring and assessment, and indicators

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 47. Is your country actively involved in co-operating with other countries in your region in the field of indicators, monitoring and assessment? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) limited co-operation | |
| c) extensive co-operation on some issues | |
| d) extensive co-operation on a wide range of issues | |
| 48. Has your country made available case studies concerning the development and implementation of assessment, monitoring and indicator programmes? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes - sent to the Secretariat | |
| c) yes - through the national CHM | |
| d) yes - other means (please specify) | |
| 49. Is your country assisting other Parties to increase their capacity to develop indicator and monitoring programmes? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) providing training | |
| c) providing direct support | |
| d) sharing experience | |
| e) other (please describe) | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

32. For a period of several years the identification of components of biological diversity was carried out in the country for a significant number of flora and fauna taxa. Identification was carried out for all groups of vertebrates (almost completely), for a number of taxa of insects (mainly coleoptera, some butterflies, orthoptera, homoptera etc.), arachnids (mites, and to a lesser degree spiders), molluscs, some groups of helminths and also a number of groups of fungi and major higher taxa of vascular plants. Numerous reports, including volumes of "Flora of Armenia" and "Fauna of Armenia" were published. Activities for the identification of components of biodiversity currently continue at a much more limited level due to a sharp reduction in resources. However, it should be emphasised that all the above-mentioned activities were carried out, or are in progress, as part of current scientific work and not within the framework of a specific State project aimed at fulfilling the country's obligations under the Convention.

33. At the ecosystem level the definition of components of biodiversity is also an ongoing process. In Armenia (during the Soviet era) a number of habitats were selected which were of particular value from the point of biodiversity conservation. They gained the status of Specially Protected Areas. Nowadays the identification of unique ecosystems not covered by the Protected Area network of the country continues to a limited extent.

34. Cytogenetic research activities, including taxonomic research, were carried out and are being implemented for a number of plant groups, some rodents and bats, and some taxa of reptiles, fishes and insects.

35-37. Monitoring research at all three levels, species, ecosystem and genetic, are carried out to an extremely limited extent, outside the framework of any comprehensive programme and not at the state level. A lack of resources does not allow for repeated research into taxa and ecosystems that have already been investigated once.

38-39. A generally well known set of threats exists, including tree cutting, overgrazing and, to a lesser degree, ploughing and construction, as well as, to an insignificant extent, industrial wastes. There is also an estimation of the consequences of forecasted changes in climate. At the same time there is not enough data on the spatial distribution of these threats and quantitative parameters have not yet been evaluated, even for such easily determined threats as tree cutting.

41. The assessment of potential indicators is being carried out on the basis of the personal initiative of the various experts. The work is not coordinated or paid for by the state.

43. This approach does not entirely correspond with national circumstances. As set out above (answers to questions 32-34), a significant part of the components of biological diversity in Armenia have been identified already and it is now necessary to start filling gaps, rather than following a step-by-step approach.

46. The collections are available in several academic institutions (Institutes of Botany, Zoology, and Microbiology of the National Academy of Sciences), as well as to a limited extent in the biological departments of a number of educational institutions (Yerevan State University, Armenian Pedagogical Institute). These establishments provide scientists and experts with access to the collections within the framework of scientific co-operation through dispatching sample materials (although the payment of postage is not expected).

Decisions on Taxonomy

Decision IV/1 Report and recommendations of the third meeting of SBSTTA [part]

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 50. Has your country carried out a national taxonomic needs assessment, and/or held workshops to determine national taxonomic priorities? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) early stages of assessment | |
| c) advanced stages of assessment | |
| d) assessment completed | |
| 51. Has your country developed a national taxonomic action plan? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of development | √ |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) action plan in place | |
| e) reports on implementation available | |
| 52. Is your country making available appropriate resources to enhance the availability of taxonomic information? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes, but this does not cover all known needs adequately | |
| c) yes, covering all known needs | |
| 53. Is your country encouraging bilateral and multilateral training and employment opportunities for taxonomists, particularly those dealing with poorly known organisms? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) some opportunities | |
| c) significant opportunities | |
| 54. Is your country investing on a long-term basis in the development of appropriate infrastructure for your national taxonomic collections? | |
| a) no | |
| b) some investment | √ |
| c) significant investment | |
| 55. Is your country encouraging partnerships between taxonomic institutions in developed and developing countries? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes - stated policy | |
| c) yes - systematic national programme | |
| 56. Has your country adopted any international agreed levels of collection housing? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) under review | |
| c) being implemented by some collections | |
| d) being implemented by all major collections | |
| 57. Has your country provided training programmes in taxonomy? | |
| a) no | |
| b) some | √ |
| c) many | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 58. Has your country reported on measures adopted to strengthen national capacity in taxonomy, to designate national reference centres, and to make information housed in collections available to countries of origin? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes - in the previous national report | |
| c) yes - via the clearing-house mechanism | |
| d) yes - other means (please give details below) | |
| 59. Has your country taken steps to ensure that institutions responsible for biological diversity inventories and taxonomic activities are financially and administratively stable? | |
| a) no | |
| b) under review | |
| c) yes for some institutions | √ |
| d) yes for all major institutions | |
| 60. Has your country assisted taxonomic institutions to establish consortia to conduct regional projects? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) under review | |
| c) yes - limited extent | |
| d) yes - significant extent | |
| 61. Has your country given special attention to international funding of fellowships for specialist training abroad or for attracting international experts to national or regional courses? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) under review | |
| c) yes - limited extent | |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 62. Has your country provided programmes for re-training of qualified professionals moving into taxonomy-related fields? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) some | |
| c) many | |

**Decision V/9. Global Taxonomy Initiative: Implementation and further advance
of the Suggestions for Action**

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 63. Has your country identified its information requirements in the area of taxonomy, and assessed its national capacity to meet these requirements? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) basic assessment | |
| c) thorough assessment | |
| 64. Has your country established or consolidated taxonomic reference centres? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 65. Has your country worked to increase its capacity in the area of taxonomic research? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 66. Has your country communicated information on programmes, projects and initiatives for consideration as pilot projects under the Global Taxonomy Initiative to the Executive Secretary? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 67. Has your country designated a national Global Taxonomy Initiative focal point linked to other national focal points? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 68. Has your country participated in the development of regional networks to facilitate information-sharing for the Global Taxonomy Initiative? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| <i>If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -</i> | |
| 69. Has your country sought resources through the financial mechanism for the priority actions identified in the decision? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) applied for unsuccessfully | |
| c) applied for successfully | |

Further comments on implementation of these decisions

50-51. On both items the assessment and study are implemented as a result of the personal initiative of certain experts.

54. The special investments for collection maintenance are not specified. Since the collections are located in academic institutions, they are maintained only by means of the institutes' budgets, which does not allow for their effective protection from deterioration and attack by vermin. The sole exception is the collection of the Institute of Microbiology.

55. The policy does not exist; collaboration takes place on the basis of personal contacts between scientists.

56. Similar tasks are set out in the "Law on Fauna" and the "Law on Flora", but no normative regulations have been developed.

57. The only available educational programmes are the brief curricula of the biological departments of higher educational institutions.

59. The financial situation of the institutions is dependent on thematic financing by the state, which does not take taxonomic problems into account.

64. The Institutes of Botany and Zoology of the National Academy of Sciences could serve as such centres, but their current condition is not appropriate for this.

Article 8 In situ conservation [excluding Articles 8h and 8j]

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 70. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | b) Medium | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Low | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 71. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | b) Adequate | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Limiting | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | d) Severely limiting | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| <p>70-71. Armenia is host to an extremely rich biodiversity. For the conservation of such biodiversity, even without considering the decisions on the ecosystem approach, in-situ conservation is the best method. Taking into account the uniqueness of the flora and fauna of the country, the large number of rare, relict and endemic species, the rich gene fund of wild relatives of crops and domestic animals, as well as the traditionally high degree of their utilisation in various sectors, in-situ conservation is considered by the State as a primary guarantee of sustained conservation of the rich biodiversity of the country. Thus, it is one of the priorities of environmental policy in Armenia. Unfortunately, the current transitional condition of the economy, the economic crisis, and a lack of financial resources in the state budget are not sufficient to be able to carry out the measures necessary for in-situ conservation even to a minimal extent.</p> <p>The main constraints are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inadequate legislative framework • extremely low financial and technical provisions • absence of investments by the State • lack of proper in-situ conservation network • lack of human resources and capacity for the training of protected areas management specialists | | | | | |
| 72. Has your country established a system of protected areas which aims to conserve biological diversity (8a)? | | | | | |
| a) system under development | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| b) national review of protected areas coverage available | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| c) national protected area systems plan in place | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| d) relatively complete system in place | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| 73. Are there nationally adopted guidelines for the selection, establishment and management of protected areas (8b)? | | | | | |
| a) no | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| b) no, under development | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| c) yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| d) yes, undergoing review and extension | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| 74. Does your country regulate or manage biological resources important for the conservation of biological diversity with a view to ensuring their conservation and sustainable use (8c)? | | | | | |
| a) no | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| b) early stages of development | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| c) advanced stages of development | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| d) programme or policy in place | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| e) reports on implementation available | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 75. Has your country undertaken measures that promote the protection of ecosystems, natural habitats and the maintenance of viable populations of species in natural surroundings (8d)? | |
| a) no measures | |
| b) some measures in place | ✓ |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) reasonably comprehensive measures in place | |
| 76. Has your country undertaken measures that promote environmentally sound and sustainable development in areas adjacent to protected areas (8e)? | |
| a) no measures | ✓ |
| b) some measures in place | |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) reasonably comprehensive measures in place | |
| 77. Has your country undertaken measures to rehabilitate and restore degraded ecosystems (8f)? | |
| a) no measures | |
| b) some measures in place | ✓ |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| 78. Has your country undertaken measures to promote the recovery of threatened species (8f)? | |
| a) no measures | |
| b) some measures in place | ✓ |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| 79. Has your country undertaken measures to regulate, manage or control the risks associated with the use and release of living modified organisms resulting from biotechnology (8g)? | |
| a) no measures | ✓ |
| b) some measures in place | |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| 80. Has your country made attempts to provide the conditions needed for compatibility between present uses and the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components (8i)? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | ✓ |
| d) programme or policy in place | ✓ |
| e) reports on implementation available | |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 81. Has your country developed and maintained the necessary legislation and/or other regulatory provisions for the protection of threatened species and populations (8k)? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) legislation or other measures in place | √ |
| 82. Does your country regulate or manage processes and categories of activities identified under Article 7 as having significant adverse effects on biological diversity (8l)? | |
| a) no | |
| b) under review | |
| c) yes, to a limited extent | √ |
| d) yes, to a significant extent | |
| <i>If a developed country Party -</i> | |
| 83. Does your country cooperate in providing financial and other support for <i>in-situ</i> conservation particularly to developing countries (8m)? | |
| <i>If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -</i> | |
| 84. Does your country receive financial and other support for <i>in situ</i> conservation (8m)? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes (if so, please give details below) | √ |

Decision II/7 Consideration of Articles 6 and 8 of the Convention

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 85. Is action being taken to share information and experience on implementation of this Article with other Contracting Parties? | |
| a) little or no action | |
| b) sharing of written materials and/or case-studies | √ |
| c) regional meetings | √ |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

| |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>72. In-situ conservation programmes and projects in Armenia are mainly managed and co-ordinated by the state and implemented through Nature Specially Protected Areas (hereafter referred to as Protected Areas). During the Soviet era a network of Protected Areas was established in Armenia, containing 5 reserves, 1 National park and 22 reservations. This Protected Areas network covers 10% of the total territory of the country and conserves populations of 60% of the total flora and fauna species recorded in the country. For a country with such a small territory, the protected areas network might be considered an excessive one. Unfortunately, the allocation of territory for the Protected Area network was carried out without considering the concept of representivity of biological, ecosystem or landscape diversity. The majority of Protected Areas are forests. As a result many ecosystems of extreme importance in terms of biodiversity conservation are not included in the PA network. Currently the State is working on reviewing and improving the status and functions of Protected Areas, as well as working on establishment of new Protected Areas. A complete, detailed list of protected areas in Armenia is included in the First National Report to the CBD.</p> |
| <p>73. This year the Ministry of Nature Protection will provide amendments to the law on protected areas as well as suggestions on strengthening protected areas management. A draft resolution on governmental reforms, the institutional framework and the further development of the Protected Areas Network has already been prepared. It is expected that the government will soon sign it.</p> |

74. The sustainable use of biological resources of great importance with regard to biodiversity is regulated by the "Forest Code", the "Law on Flora" and the "Law on Fauna" as well as by the Regulations and licenses for utilisation (collection, hunting, fishing, export and import) issued by the Government. The use of natural pastures and grasslands is regulated by Government Regulation No. 282 (1991) and by the directions of the Ministry of Agriculture. Although specific grazing periods and the quantity of animals in each area are defined, these measures are almost always violated. The "Law on Flora" and the "Law on Fauna" require the development of the "Regulation on the use of natural resources" and "The regulation on import and export of plants", which are being developed by the Ministry of Nature Protection and are currently in the process of endorsement by the Government.

75. Conservation of the ecosystems within the Protected Areas network is mainly regulated by the "Law on Nature Specially Protected Areas" as well as by the Charter of each Protected Area. According to this law, four different categories of Protected Area are defined in Armenia: State reserve, State reservation, National Park and Nature monument. The law is not up-to-date and does not correspond to current socio-economic conditions in Armenia; thus the Ministry of Nature Protection plans to begin a process of developing several improvements to the Law.

The conservation of ecosystems outside Protected Areas is mainly regulated by the "Forest Code", "Law on Flora" (adopted in 1999) and "Law on Fauna" (2000). The last two Laws are not being applied properly due to the absence of necessary sub-laws and regulations. Ecosystem conservation is also regulated in a lesser extent by the "Water Code", "Land Code", "Geological Resources Code" and by the "Law on Environmental Impact Expertise".

77. Several measures were introduced and are being implemented. They all are related to forest ecosystems. A programme of reforestation is being implemented in an area of 6,000 ha which was deforested in previous years. Measures for the restoration of degraded pastures (as a result of overgrazing) were also carried out by means of scientific research and experiments on smaller sites. A number of the projects on the restoration of destroyed ecosystems have been further developed and are currently in progress. They are:

- Restoration of the Ecological Balance of Lake Sevan
- The Lake Gilli Restoration Project (US \$20,000, approved in early 2000)
- The Conservation of Highly Threatened Forest Ecosystems (US \$22,900)
- "Management of Natural Resources and Poverty Reduction" (US \$15,000,000 partially credit and partially grant)

78. The same could be said of several individual representatives of Armenian biodiversity, primarily animals. Work on the restoration of a number of populations of Armenian Mouflon has been carried out, work on the restoration of a number of populations of endemic races such as Lake Sevan trout was conducted, and special areas for the preservation and restoration of Armenian Cochineal were established, but these have been stopped due to a lack of financial resources. However, taking into account the general condition of ecosystems in Armenia, these measures are insufficient.

79. This issue is not urgent for Armenia.

80. The integration of biodiversity conservation with the sustainable use of its components was initially implemented in 1996 through the licensing of fishing on Lake Sevan. According to the "Regulation on industrial fishing in Lake Sevan" fishing enterprises are permitted to operate on the basis of contractual licenses. The duration of each fishing season, the natural resources subject to fishing activities, and the fishing methods are defined by the Ministry of Nature Protection on the basis of advice provided by the Institute of Hydroecology and Fisheries of the National Academy of Sciences. This experience has created an opportunity to manage the traditional ways of utilising resources in order to ensure the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of its components.

81. There is a need for the sub-laws and regulations required by the "Law on Flora" and "Law on Fauna" which should provide for effective implementation of these laws. Currently the "Regulation on Armenian Red Book operation" is being developed by the Ministry of Nature Protection. The two volumes of this publication contain data on endangered species of Armenian Flora and Fauna, their distribution, and

current status. The last edition of the Red Book was published in 1987-1989 after more than one decade of research. It is currently in need of review and improvement in light of the definition of new IUCN categories, and there is also a need for the identification of a new list of species.

81/82. In addition to those legislative regulations on the conservation, reproduction, sustainable and global use of biodiversity which exist from the Soviet period, the following legislative acts were adopted by the National Assembly in the last 2-3 years:

- 1) "Law on Nature Specially Protected Areas" (1991), "Forest Code" (1994)
- 2) "Law on Veterinary Practice" (October 26, 1999)
- 3) "Law on plant conservation and plant quarantine" (March 20, 2000)
- 4) "Law on food security" (December 8, 1999)
- 5) "Law on protection of selection achievements" (November 23, 1999)
- 6) "Law on decentralisation of the state owned lands located within the administrative territories of town and village communities" (November 24, 1998)
- 7) "Law on Fauna" (2000)
- 8) "Law on Flora" (1999)
- 9) Decree of the Government No. 282 on April 16, 1991 provides the framework for "Renting fees and utilisation regulations of natural pastures, grasslands and other land in Armenia"

The aforementioned legislative documents address the problems of:

- conservation and effective use of Armenian flora and fauna genetic resources
- environment protection
- diagnosis and prevention of viral and parasitic diseases of plants and animals

The Laws define the stakeholder institution responsible for the control of:

- primary and processed food security
 - the requirements for imported and exported plants and animals
 - norms of quarantine, etc.
- (see question 331).

82. The regulation of adverse effects on biodiversity is regulated by the "Law on environmental impact expertise" (see also Article 14).

84. Armenia has received financial support for the implementation of the following projects related to the in-situ conservation of biodiversity.

- Restoration of the Ecological Balance of Lake Sevan (World Bank)
- The Lake Gilli Restoration Project (US \$20,000, approved in early 2000 by GEF)
- The Conservation of Highly Threatened Forest Ecosystems (US \$22,900)
- "Management of Natural Resources and Poverty Reduction" (US \$ 15,000,000 partially credit and partially grant – several donors)
- "Preparation of the Full Project for the in-situ Conservation and Sustainable Use of agrobiodiversity in Armenia" (US \$97,000 GEF)
- " National Action Programme to Combat Desertification in Armenia " (US \$40,000 UNEP)
- "Improvement of management structure of the Ministry of nature Protection" (US \$130,000 GEF)

85. (Decision II/7). The exchange of information on the biodiversity of Armenia and on the implementation of this Article is carried out mainly through scientific publications and reports at scientific conferences. Some materials are formulated as annual reports and are directed to the Executive Secretary or reported on at regional meetings.

Article 8h Alien species

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| 86. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | | b) Medium | ✓ | c) Low | |
| 87. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | | b) Adequate | | c) Limiting | ✓ |
| d) Severely limiting | | | | | |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| 86. The danger to biodiversity caused by alien invasive species is well known, however no specialised research on these species has yet been carried out. Therefore the level of priority is determined as average (what we do not know about can be assumed to be not very dangerous). Resources for the implementation of this Article are limited in Armenia: financial resources are limited due to the general economic situation, and human resources are limited due to an absence of focused training and specialised capacity building of experts. Clarification of the risks of alien invasive species and potential management strategies for dealing with these risks is needed. | | | | | |
| 88. Has your country identified alien species introduced? | | | | | |
| a) no | | | | | |
| b) only major species of concern | | | | ✓ | |
| c) only new or recent introductions | | | | | |
| d) a comprehensive system tracks new introductions | | | | | |
| e) a comprehensive system tracks all known introductions | | | | | |
| 89. Has your country assessed the risks posed to ecosystems, habitats or species by the introduction of these alien species? | | | | | |
| a) no | | | | ✓ | |
| b) only some alien species of concern have been assessed | | | | | |
| c) most alien species have been assessed | | | | | |
| 90. Has your country undertaken measures to prevent the introduction of, control or eradicate those alien species which threaten ecosystems, habitats or species? | | | | | |
| a) no measures | | | | | |
| b) some measures in place | | | | ✓ | |
| c) potential measures under review | | | | | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | | | | | |

Decision IV/1 Report and recommendations of the third meeting of SBSTTA

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 91. Is your country collaborating in the development of projects at national, regional, sub-regional and international levels to address the issue of alien species? | |
| a) little or no action | √ |
| b) discussion on potential projects under way | |
| c) active development of new projects | |
| 92. Does your national strategy and action plan address the issue of alien species? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | √ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |

Decision V/8. Alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats or species

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 93. Is your country applying the interim guiding principles for prevention, introduction and mitigation of impacts of alien species in the context of activities aimed at implementing article 8(h) of the Convention, and in the various sectors? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) under consideration | |
| c) limited implementation in some sectors | |
| d) extensive implementation in some sectors | |
| e) extensive implementation in most sectors | |
| 94. Has your country submitted case-studies to the Executive Secretary focusing on thematic assessments? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) in preparation | |
| c) yes | |
| 95. Has your country submitted written comments on the interim guiding principles to the Executive Secretary? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 96. Has your country given priority to the development and implementation of alien invasive species strategies and action plans? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | √ |
| 97. In dealing with the issue of invasive species, has your country developed or involved itself in mechanisms for international co-operation, including the exchange of best practices? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) trans-boundary co-operation | |
| c) regional co-operation | |
| d) multilateral co-operation | |
| 98. Is your country giving priority attention to geographically and evolutionarily isolated ecosystems in its work on alien invasive species? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 99. Is your country using the ecosystem approach and precautionary and bio-geographical approaches as appropriate in its work on alien invasive species? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |
| 100. Has your country developed effective education, training and public-awareness measures concerning the issue of alien species? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) some initiatives | |
| c) many initiatives | |
| 101. Is your country making available the information which it holds on alien species through the CHM? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) some information | |
| c) all available information | |
| d) information available through other channels (please specify) | |
| 102. Is your country providing support to enable the Global Invasive Species Programme to fulfil the tasks outlined in the decision and its annexes? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) limited support | |
| c) substantial support | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

| |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>88. Some alien species were identified during scheduled scientific research into the country's flora and fauna. However the necessary in depth research was never carried out.</p> <p>90. In Armenia only some very insignificant measures are carried out by the State Quarantine Service, which implements controls over invasive species and illnesses.</p> <p>91-92. This Article does not currently raise any serious concerns at the regional level, therefore no no measures are being undertaken. The need to combat alien invasive species, along with several definite actions, is specified in the National Strategy.</p> <p>98. There are not many geographically or evolutionarily isolated ecosystems in Armenia, and according to our information, alien invasive species do not yet threaten those that do exist.</p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Article 8j Traditional knowledge and related provisions

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------|--|-------------|----------------------|
| 103. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | | b) Medium | | c) Low | √ |
| 104. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | | b) Adequate | | c) Limiting | d) Severely limiting |
| | | | | | √ |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| <p>103. The level of priority of this Article in Armenia is low because of an almost complete absence of any isolated communities possessing traditional knowledge. Besides this, there is a lack of information even on existing national communities. However the growing of several local landraces of cultivated plants does occur in some isolated areas. These landraces are of great importance with regard to agrobiodiversity, but there is a lack of information on their distribution.</p> <p>The low priority is also due to some peculiarities of Armenia, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The country has a small territory and a rather homogeneous population in terms of nationality (wholly indigenous). Thus, the notion of indigenous populations of other nationalities in terms of international law is not applicable in Armenia • The existing traditional knowledge on natural resource use does not generally belong to separate local communities owing to the small size of the country and active migration processes. It is the property of the people as a whole. Thus existing knowledge, innovation and practice can not be separated as a property of any community and there is no problem of "fair distribution of benefits". Some elements of agrobiodiversity (such as local landraces or breeds) could be considered as an exception, however they have either been superseded by imported breeds, or have been in centralised use for so long that the real primary owner can not be identified <p>At the same time the level of priority is not zero, since the generalisation of traditional knowledge in the field of sustainable use of biodiversity is undoubtedly very useful not only for the population of Armenia, but also for other Parties of the Convention. However, no resources have been allocated for the implementation of this Article.</p> | | | | | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 105. Has your country undertaken measures to ensure that the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity are respected, preserved and maintained? | |
| a) no measures | √ |
| b) some measures in place | |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| 106. Is your country working to encourage the equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge, innovations and practices? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) programme or policy in place | |

Decision III/4 and Decision IV/9. Implementation of Article 8(j)

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 107. Has your country developed national legislation and corresponding strategies for the implementation of Article 8(j)? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) legislation or other measures in place | |
| 108. Has your country supplied information on the implementation of Article 8(j) to other Contracting Parties through media such as the national report? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes - previous national report | |
| c) yes - CHM | |
| d) yes - other means (please give details below) | |
| 109. Has your country submitted case-studies to the Executive Secretary on measures taken to develop and implement the Convention's provisions relating to indigenous and local communities? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |
| 110. Is your country participating in appropriate working groups and meetings? | |
| a) none | |
| b) some | ✓ |
| c) all | |
| 111. Is your country facilitating the active participation of representatives of indigenous and local communities in these working groups and meetings? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |

Decision V/16. Article 8(j) and related provisions

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 112. Has your country reviewed the programme of work specified in the annex to the decision, and identified how to implement those tasks appropriate to national circumstances? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) under review | |
| c) yes (please provide details) | |
| 113. Is your country integrating such tasks into its ongoing programmes, taking into account the identified collaboration opportunities? | |
| a) no | |
| b) not appropriate to national circumstances | ✓ |
| c) yes - to a limited extent | |
| d) yes - to a significant extent | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 114. Is your country taking full account of existing instruments, guidelines, codes and other relevant activities in the implementation of the programme of work? | |
| a) no | |
| b) not appropriate to national circumstances | √ |
| c) yes - to a limited extent | |
| d) yes - to a significant extent | |
| 115. Has your country provided appropriate financial support for the implementation of the programme of work? | |
| a) no | |
| b) not appropriate to national circumstances | √ |
| c) yes - to a limited extent | |
| d) yes - to a significant extent | |
| 116. Has your country fully incorporated women and women's organizations in the activities undertaken to implement the programme of work contained in the annex to the decision and other relevant activities under the Convention? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 117. Has your country taken measures to facilitate the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the implementation of the Convention? | |
| a) no | |
| b) not appropriate to national circumstances | √ |
| c) yes - to a limited extent | |
| d) yes - to a significant extent | |
| 118. Has your country provided case studies on methods and approaches concerning the preservation and sharing of traditional knowledge, and the control of that information by indigenous and local communities? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) not relevant | |
| c) yes - sent to the Secretariat | |
| d) yes - through the national CHM | |
| e) yes - available through other means (please specify) | |
| 119. Does your country exchange information and share experiences regarding national legislation and other measures for the protection of the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) not relevant | |
| c) yes - through the CHM | |
| d) yes - with specific countries | |
| e) yes - available through other means (please specify) | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 120. Has your country taken measures to promote the conservation and maintenance of knowledge, innovations, and practices of indigenous and local communities? | |
| a) no | |
| b) not relevant | √ |
| c) some measures | |
| d) extensive measures | |
| 121. Has your country supported the development of registers of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities, in collaboration with these communities? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) not relevant | |
| c) development in progress | |
| d) register fully developed | |
| 122. Have representatives of indigenous and local community organizations participated in your official delegation to meetings held under the Convention on Biological Diversity? | |
| a) not relevant | √ |
| b) not appropriate | |
| c) yes | |
| 123. Is your country assisting the Secretariat to fully utilize the clearing-house mechanism to co-operate closely with indigenous and local communities to explore ways that enable them to make informed decisions concerning release of their traditional knowledge? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) awaiting information on how to proceed | |
| c) yes | |
| 124. Has your country identified resources for funding the activities identified in the decision? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) not relevant | |
| c) partly | |
| d) fully | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Article 9 Ex situ conservation

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------|---|----------------------|---|
| 125. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | | b) Medium | ✓ | c) Low | |
| 126. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | | b) Adequate | | c) Limiting | |
| | | | | d) Severely limiting | ✓ |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 127. Has your country adopted measures for the <u>ex situ</u> conservation of components of biological diversity <i>native</i> to your country (9a)? | |
| a) no measures | |
| b) some measures in place | ✓ |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| 128. Has your country adopted measures for the <u>ex situ</u> conservation of components of biological diversity <i>originating outside</i> your country (9a)? | |
| a) no measures | |
| b) some measures in place | ✓ |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| 129. If the answer to the previous question was yes, is this being done in active collaboration with organizations in the other countries (9a)? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | ✓ |
| 130. Has your country established and maintained facilities for the <u>ex situ</u> conservation of and research on plants, animals and micro-organisms that represent genetic resources <i>native</i> to your country (9b)? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | ✓ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 131. Has your country established and maintained facilities for the <u>ex situ</u> conservation of and research on plants, animals and micro-organisms that represent genetic resources <i>originating elsewhere</i> (9b)? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes - limited extent | |
| c) yes - significant extent | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 132. If the answer to the previous question was yes, is this being done in active collaboration with organizations in the other countries (9a)? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |
| 133. Has your country adopted measures for the reintroduction of threatened species into their natural habitats under appropriate conditions (9c)? | |
| a) no measures | |
| b) some measures in place | ✓ |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| 134. Has your country taken measures to regulate and manage the collection of biological resources from natural habitats for <u>ex situ</u> conservation purposes so as not to threaten ecosystems and <u>in situ</u> populations of species (9d)? | |
| a) no measures | |
| b) some measures in place | ✓ |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| <i>If a developed country Party -</i> | |
| 135. Has your country cooperated in providing financial and other support for <u>ex situ</u> conservation and in the establishment and maintenance of <u>ex situ</u> conservation facilities in developing countries (9e)? | |
| <i>If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -</i> | |
| 136. Has your country received financial and other support for ex situ conservation and in the establishment and maintenance of ex situ conservation facilities (9e)? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

In Armenia some flora and fauna species have been so severely affected by anthropogenic influences that they can be considered almost extinct. The ex-situ conservation of these species appears to be an essential precondition to their further existence.

Since 1935 more than ten botanical gardens and dendroparks have been established in the country: Yerevan, Vanadzor and Sevan botanical gardens, and Idjevan, Stepanavan and other dendroparks. In these sites the ex-situ conservation of plant biodiversity from Armenia and other countries takes place. As a result, the number of alien species in Yerevan Botanical Garden has reached 5,000, most of which (1,300 species) are tree species.

Currently Yerevan Zoo hosts 191 species of fauna, of which 98 species are recorded in International Red Lists. Representatives of Armenian fauna number 47 species, of which 27 species are included in the Armenian Red List.

Native Armenian flora comprises the majority of the ex-situ biodiversity collection. It forms a special scientific exhibition and provides for the conservation of one-third of the 850 species that constitute the entire floral biodiversity of Armenia. Special attention is paid to the conservation of those rare and threatened species recorded in the Armenian Red List. Ongoing work on the ex-situ conservation and regeneration of plant biodiversity is being implemented in the "Ecological Centre for Biodiversity Conservation" of the Institute of Botany of the Armenian National Academy of Sciences.

Unfortunately, work on the ex-situ conservation of plant biodiversity was almost stopped recently due to a lack of financing and the absence of appropriate material and technical equipment for the botanical gardens. Another very critical problem is the lack of teaching / training of both scientific researchers and young specialists. The only higher education institution where a limited number of specialists (forest specialists, landscape managers etc.) are trained is the Armenian Agricultural Academy.

Other difficulties faced in the field of ex-situ biodiversity conservation are: the halt in international co-operation and collaboration; an absence of joint scientific expeditions; and reduced possibilities for the exchange of seeds and planting materials. The only opportunity the botanical gardens currently have for international co-operation is the exchange of seed with more than 400 other botanical institutions, which is inefficient and does not ensure sustainable co-operation and the enrichment of the plant gene fund.

136. Armenia has not received any real financial support for ex-situ conservation and support measures. However some projects, such as the World Bank financed project "Improvement of the Lake Sevan Ecological Balance" have been carried out. Within the framework of this project, an action plan and appropriate recommendations on the conservation of valuable and endemic fish species in the Lake were developed. Further financing for the realisation of the recommended measures was not available or was too late.

The ex-situ conservation of micro-organisms is undertaken by the Republican Centre for Deposition of Micro-organisms, which was set up in December 1993 and is functioning within the National Academy of Sciences and the Ministry of Education and Science of Armenia. The Centre is considered the background for the creation of the Natural Culture Collection of Armenia for endangered micro-organisms and for the collection, study and maintenance of microbial strains of scientific and industrial importance.

The Centre currently holds over 6000 strains of bacteria, fungi, yeasts and streptomycetes. The activities of the Centre are sponsored by the Russian institution A-M Holding and by a grant from the INTAS Association of the European Community.

Both the Culture Collection and the Data Bank have been created on the basis of a detailed study and on the basis of the characteristics of micro-organisms. The Data Bank was created based on the morpho-physiological and biochemical characteristics of the cultures studied.

Article 10 Sustainable use of components of biological diversity

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| 137. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | | b) Medium | ✓ | c) Low | |
| 138. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | | b) Adequate | | c) Limiting | ✓ |
| d) Severely limiting | | | | | |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| 137-138. The sustainable use of components of biological diversity is officially recognised as an issue of high priority in Armenia. However current economic and institutional difficulties do not permit the use of all available resources in order to implement this Article and fulfil the obligations it sets out. The extent to which the activities described correspond to implementation of the obligations under this Article should be considered as strictly limited. | | | | | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 139. Has your country integrated consideration of the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources into national decision making (10a)? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of development | ✓ |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) programme or policy in place | |
| e) review of implementation available | |
| 140. Has your country adopted measures relating to the use of biological resources that avoid or minimize adverse impacts on biological diversity (10b)? | |
| a) no measures | |
| b) some measures in place | ✓ |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| 141. Has your country put in place measures that protect and encourage customary use of biological resources that is compatible with conservation or sustainable use requirements (10c)? | |
| a) no measures | ✓ |
| b) some measures in place | |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| 142. Has your country put in place measures that help local populations develop and implement remedial action in degraded areas where biological diversity has been reduced (10d)? | |
| a) no measures | ✓ |
| b) some measures in place | |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 143. Does your country actively encourage cooperation between government authorities and the private sector in developing methods for sustainable use of biological diversity (10e)? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) programme or policy in place | |
| e) review of implementation available | |

Decisions IV/15. Relationship of the Convention with the Commission on Sustainable Development and biodiversity-related conventions

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 144. Has your country submitted to the Secretariat information on tourism and its impacts on biological diversity, and efforts to effectively plan and manage tourism? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes - previous national report | |
| c) yes - case-studies | |
| d) yes - other means (please give details below) | |
| 145. Has your country submitted to the Secretariat information on biodiversity-related activities of the CSD (such as SIDS, oceans, seas and freshwater resources, consumption and production patterns)? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes - previous national report | |
| c) yes - correspondence | |
| d) yes - other means (please give details below) | |

Decision V/24. Sustainable use as a cross-cutting issue

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 146. Has your country identified indicators and incentive measures for sectors relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) assessment of potential indicators underway | ✓ |
| c) indicators identified (if so, please describe below) | |
| 147. Has your country assisted other Parties to increase their capacity to implement sustainable-use practices, programmes and policies at regional, national and local levels, especially in pursuit of poverty alleviation? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) not relevant | |
| c) to a limited extent | |
| d) to a significant extent (please provide details) | |
| 148. Has your country developed mechanisms to involve the private sector and indigenous and local communities in initiatives on sustainable use, and in mechanisms to ensure that indigenous and local communities benefit from such sustainable use? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) mechanisms under development | |
| c) mechanisms in place (please describe) | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 149. Has your country identified areas for conservation that would benefit through the sustainable use of biological diversity and communicated this information to the Executive Secretary? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |

Decision V/25. Biological diversity and tourism

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 150. Has your country based its policies, programmes and activities in the field of sustainable tourism on an assessment of the inter-linkages between tourism and biological diversity? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) to a limited extent | |
| c) to a significant extent | |
| 151. Has your country submitted case-studies on tourism as an example of the sustainable use of biological diversity to the Executive Secretary? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 152. Has your country undertaken activities relevant to biodiversity and tourism in support of the International Year of Ecotourism? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 153. Has your country undertaken activities relevant to biodiversity and tourism in support of the International Year of Mountains? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | √ |
| 154. Has your country undertaken activities relevant to biodiversity and tourism in support of the International Coral Reef Initiative? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 155. Has your country established enabling policies and legal frameworks to complement voluntary efforts for the effective implementation of sustainable tourism? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) to a limited extent | |
| c) to a significant extent (please describe) | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

139. Scientific results from research on biological diversity are used, to a certain extent, during the development of methods and approaches for the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources. For example, based on scientific data, industrial fishing and the recreational hunting of animals in the country are being controlled, and the quantities of various plant species collected are being determined (see Article 12, questions 175 – 179).

140. Recently a review of possible measures for the prevention of harmful influences on biological diversity in Armenia was carried out and was reflected in the “First National Report” and the “Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of Armenia” as well as in the project “Management of natural resources and mitigation of poverty in Armenia”. Within the framework of this project a comprehensive overview of measures for the conservation and encouragement of traditional ways of utilising biological resources in Armenia is to be performed.

142. In Armenia, in those areas that have suffered from earthquakes or other natural disasters, several support measures for the local population have been approved and are currently being implemented. They are aimed at restoring the biological diversity of these areas, and are carried out both at the state level, and with the assistance of the international community.

146. Indicators and incentive measures. A project proposal on the identification of biodiversity indicators has been developed in line with the provisions of the BSAP by the Ministry of Nature Protection. The project is included in the Ministry’s workplan for 2002-2003 and this Ministry will co-ordinate the work. Most significantly, the project includes the identification of indicators for the purpose of establishing new protected areas.

149. The appropriate information on the objectives of nature protection, from the viewpoint of the sustainable use of biodiversity, is included in the “Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of Armenia”. Besides this, annual interim reports containing current information are presented to the Secretariat.

153. An inter-institutional commission has been organised in Armenia in order to develop suggestions on promoting a list of activities to support ecotourism within the terms of UNEP’s International Year of the Mountain (IYM).

Armenia plans to hold a regional seminar on mountain wetlands to be attended by NIS countries in the European region. An application for funding has been submitted to the Ramsar small grants programme. The subjects to be discussed include; regional co-operation, wetland conservation, shared watersheds, transboundary wetlands and wetland biodiversity. Preliminary expressions of interest have been received from Russia, Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus and Georgia. Azerbaijan will still be sent an invitation although it is considered part of the Asian region according to the Ramsar Convention.

Article 11 Incentive measures

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------|---|----------------------|---|
| 156. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | | b) Medium | ✓ | c) Low | |
| 157. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | | b) Adequate | | c) Limiting | |
| | | | | d) Severely limiting | ✓ |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 158. Are programmes in place to identify and ensure the adoption of economically and socially sound measures that act as incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of components of biological diversity? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) programmes in place | |
| e) review of implementation available | |
| 159. Do these incentives, and the programmes to identify them and ensure their adoption, cover the full range of sectoral activities? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) some sectors | |
| c) all major sectors | |
| d) all sectors | |

Decision III/18. Incentive measures

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 160. Has your country reviewed legislation and economic policies to identify and promote incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of components of biological diversity? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) reviews in progress | |
| c) some reviews complete | |
| d) as far as practically possible | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 161. Has your country ensured the development of mechanisms or approaches to ensure adequate incorporation of both market and non-market values of biological diversity into plans, policies and programmes and other relevant areas, <i>inter alia</i> , national accounting systems and investment strategies? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of identifying mechanisms | √ |
| c) advanced stages of identifying mechanisms | |
| d) mechanisms in place | |
| e) review of impact of mechanisms available | |
| 162. Has your country developed training and capacity building programmes to implement incentive measures and promote private-sector initiatives? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) planned | |
| c) some | |
| d) many | |
| 163. Has your country incorporated biological diversity considerations into impact assessments as a step in the design and implementation of incentive measures? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 164. Has your country shared experience on incentive measures with other Contracting Parties, including making relevant case-studies available to the Secretariat? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes - previous national report | |
| c) yes - case-studies | |
| d) yes - other means (please give details below) | |

Decision IV/10. Measures for implementing the Convention [part]

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 165. Is your country actively designing and implementing incentive measures? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) measures in place | |
| e) review of implementation available | |
| 166. Has your country identified threats to biological diversity and underlying causes of biodiversity loss, including the relevant actors, as a stage in designing incentive measures? | |
| a) no | |
| b) partially reviewed | √ |
| c) thoroughly reviewed | |
| d) measures designed based on the reviews | |
| e) review of implementation available | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 167. Do the existing incentive measures take account of economic, social, cultural and ethical valuation of biological diversity? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes - limited extent | |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 168. Has your country developed legal and policy frameworks for the design and implementation of incentive measures? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | √ |
| d) frameworks in place | |
| e) review of implementation available | |
| 169. Does your country carry out consultative processes to define clear target-oriented incentive measures to address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) processes being identified | |
| c) processes identified but not implemented | |
| d) processes in place | |
| 170. Has your country identified and considered neutralizing perverse incentives? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) identification programme under way | |
| c) identified but not all neutralized | |
| d) identified and neutralized | |

Decision V/15. Incentive measures

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 171. Has your country reviewed the incentive measures promoted through the Kyoto Protocol to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 172. Has your country explored possible ways and means by which these incentive measures can support the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity in your country? | |
| a) no | |
| b) under consideration | √ |
| c) early stages of development | |
| d) advanced stages of development | |
| e) further information available | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Incentive measures for biodiversity conservation in Armenia are potentially very significant but not yet developed and applied. Although the "Law on Flora" and "Law on Fauna" contain Articles on the basic principles for biodiversity conservation incentive measures, their implementation is limited due to a lack of financial resources.

171. Armenia has submitted its First National Communication on climate change prepared under the Framework Convention on Climate Change. This First Communication contains a review of the adaptation of ecosystems to climate change but no review of incentive measures.

Article 12 Research and training

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 173. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | |
| a) High | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | b) Medium | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Low |
| 174. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | |
| a) Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | b) Adequate | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Limiting |
| | | | | d) Severely limiting |
| | | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | |
| <p>173-174. Armenian biodiversity is very rich and diverse. However, its study has been mainly related to the identification of species composition and some ecological-morphological characteristics of individual representatives of Armenian flora and fauna. Meanwhile, according to the requirements of the Convention, a complex approach at the ecosystem level is required, incorporating research on inventories, accounting, taxonomy, alien invasive species, etc. This type of research and the scientific potential necessary to carry it out are both currently absent in Armenia, hence the high priority for this area. Work on the identification, conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity are carried out in several academic and scientific institutions as well as in the state divisions of higher educational institutions of Armenia.</p> <p>Educational programmes, curricula and special courses, which include sections on biodiversity and which have been developed for teaching in the public sector, are in all cases endorsed by the Ministry of Education and Science of Armenia.</p> <p>However existing resources are insufficient for the tasks necessary to fulfil these obligations and recommendations, due to a reduction in budget allocations as a result of the general economic crisis. Furthermore foreign investments are not usually directed to this field.</p> | | | | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 175. Has your country established programmes for scientific and technical education and training in measures for the identification, conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and its components (12a)? | |
| a) no | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) early stages of development | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) advanced stages of development | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) programmes in place | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 176. Has your country provided support to other Parties for education and training in measures for the identification, conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and its components (12a)? | |
| a) no | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) yes | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 177. Does your country promote and encourage research which contributes to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (12b)? | |
| a) no | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) yes - limited extent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) yes - significant extent | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 178. Does your country promote and cooperate in the use of scientific advances in biological diversity research in developing methods for conservation and sustainable use of biological resources (12c)? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | ✓ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| <i>If a developed country Party -</i> | |
| 179. Does your country's implementation of the above activities take into account the special needs of developing countries? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes, where relevant | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

175-179. Currently a framework on ecological education is being developed by four authors: Sergei Shashikiyan from the Ministry of Nature Protection; the Head of the Department of Ecological Policy and Scientific Educational Strategy; an independent expert from the National Assembly; and a representative of the Centre of Educational reforms of the Ministry of Education and Science.

A law on ecological education is also being developed. This law will encompass ecological education for all educational institutions from kindergarten to postgraduate level and will even extend to a continuous process of ecological awareness raising until retirement.

Recently the "inter-institutional committee on ecological education" was established. Currently work has halted for structural changes, but once finished this committee will be responsible for endorsing ecological education courses. The committee includes a representative of the Ministry of Nature Protection.

In Armenia issues connected with biodiversity are already being considered mandatory in school curricula. A brief summary of information on the taxonomy of plants and animals, their geographical distribution and the ecological, economic and social importance of biodiversity is included in the textbooks on Botany (for the 5th grade), Zoology (for 6th-7th grades) and General Biology (for 9th-10th grades). One of the optional subjects currently offered in high schools, for which a textbook is supplied, covers the foundations of ecology and environmental protection and has been taught for the last two years to 9th and 10th Grade students. For 9th Grade pupils an optional book; "Foundations of Nature Use and Protection" is also available.

Also several NGOs are working in the area of environmental education. Brochures on water protection have been published and experimental classes have been held in some schools by the NGO Burakan. Another NGO has been involved with developing educational programmes for kindergarten level.

In many state and private higher educational institutions (such as Yerevan State Pedagogical University, Yerevan State Economic Institute, Armenian Agricultural Academy, etc.), within the framework of various subjects, students receive in-depth tuition on biodiversity at the global scale, and in particular on the biological diversity of Armenia and measures for its conservation and sustainable use. Taking into consideration the importance of this issue, the Faculty of Biology of Yerevan State University has been teaching a special course on "Conservation of Biodiversity" since 2000. It should also be mentioned that the introduction of this new subject is directly connected to the implementation of one of the actions of the Armenian "Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan".

Scientific research on biological diversity is traditional in Armenia and occupies a significant place in the total volume of scientific research in a number of the institutes of the National Academy of Sciences (such as the Institute of Botany, Institute of Zoology, Institute of Microbiology, Institute of Hydroecology and Fisheries, Institute of Agrochemistry and Hydrology), as well as in the Scientific divisions of the various ministries and higher education institutions. Within this research, questions on the ex-situ conservation of biodiversity are of particular importance. This is particularly promoted by a number of existing centres,

where the species of plants, animal and micro-organisms that are distributed throughout Armenia are collected and conserved. These centres include Yerevan Botanical Garden (with branches in Sevan and Vanadzor and dendroparks in Idjevan and Stepanavan), Yerevan Zoo and the Republican Centre for Deposition of Micro-organisms (in Abovyan town). Financing for the activities of these institutions comes from the state budget.

Scientific results received from research on biological diversity are used, to a certain extent, during the development of methods and approaches for the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources. For example, based on scientific data, industrial fishing and the recreational hunting of animals in the country are being controlled, and the quantities of various plant species collected are being determined.

Article 13 Public education and awareness

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|-------------|--|-------------|------------------------|
| 180. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | ✓ | b) Medium | | c) Low | |
| 181. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | | b) Adequate | | c) Limiting | d) Severely limiting ✓ |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| 180-181. Great importance is attributed to education and public awareness raising in Armenia. In confirmation of this fact, it is important to mention the signing of the "Convention on access to information, public participation in decision-making and access to justice on questions relating to the environment " by Armenia in 1998 in Aarhus (Denmark). This Convention has now reached the stage of ratification in the Parliament of Armenia. | | | | | |
| Resources for the implementation of activities in the field of education and awareness raising are strictly limited, since allocations from the state budget are insufficient, and there is no foreign investment in this area. | | | | | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 182. Does your country promote and encourage understanding of the importance of, and the measures required for, the conservation of biodiversity (13a) through media? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | ✓ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 183. Does your country promote and encourage understanding of the importance of, and the measures required for, the conservation of biodiversity (13a) through the inclusion of this topic in education programmes? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | ✓ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 184. Does your country cooperate with other States and international organizations in developing relevant educational and public awareness programmes (13b)? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes - limited extent | |
| c) yes - significant extent | |

Decision IV/10. Measures for implementing the Convention [part]

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 185. Are public education and awareness needs covered in the national strategy and action plan? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | |
| c) yes - significant extent | ✓ |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 186. Has your country allocated appropriate resources for the strategic use of education and communication instruments at each phase of policy formulation, implementation and evaluation? | |
| a) limited resources | ✓ |
| b) significant but not adequate resources | |
| c) adequate resources | |
| 187. Does your country support initiatives by major groups that foster stakeholder participation and that integrate biological diversity conservation matters in their practice and education programmes? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | ✓ |
| 188. Has your country integrated biodiversity concerns into education strategies? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of development | ✓ |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) yes | |
| 189. Has your country made available any case-studies on public education and awareness and public participation, or otherwise sought to share experiences? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |
| 190. Has your country illustrated and translated the provisions of the Convention into any local languages to promote public education and awareness raising of relevant sectors? | |
| a) not relevant | |
| b) still to be done | |
| c) under development | ✓ |
| d) yes | |
| 191. Is your country supporting local, national, sub-regional and regional education and awareness programmes? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | ✓ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| <i>If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -</i> | |
| 192. When requesting assistance through the GEF, has your country proposed projects that promote measures for implementing Article 13 of the Convention? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | ✓ |

Decision V/17. Education and public awareness

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 193. Does your country support capacity-building for education and communication in biological diversity as part of the national biodiversity strategy and action plans? | |
| a) no | |
| b) limited support | ✓ |
| c) yes (please give details) | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

182-184. Detailed information on current educational programmes relating to biodiversity in Armenia is given in the comments section regarding question 175 of the guidelines.

Taking into account the fact that the "Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan", together with the Ministry of Education and Science, require the development of programmes aimed at improving the teaching of environmental subjects at schools, as well as the creation of various manuals and textbooks on biodiversity conservation for further distribution in higher education institutions, it is clear that current activities in Armenia in this area can only be considered limited.

Regarding public awareness raising, it should be noted that a Department of Public Relations was created within the structure of the Ministry of Nature Protection in 1998. This Department provides information about environmental problems, including problems related to biodiversity, to newspapers, radio stations and television broadcasters, as well as to representatives of NGOs and private individuals. In the same year the Ministry of Nature Protection began to issue an official newspaper "Brutyun" ("Nature"), where, among other materials, articles devoted to various questions relating to biodiversity were published. Currently the newspaper is out of print due to financial difficulties.

It should be mentioned that in response to a lack of state resources directed towards implementation measures for education and public awareness raising, some non-governmental environmental organisations have become involved in this area to a limited extent, through the implementation of projects financed by different international organisations.

For example, the NGO "Ecological Survival" took part in two regional projects: "Environmental public awareness raising of the population of the Razdan river catchment area" (TACIS, 1999) and "Programme of ecological education and environmental public awareness raising for the population of the Northeast region of Armenia".

These projects took place within the framework of the larger programme: " Preservation of arid and semi-arid ecosystems in Transcaucasus" (GEF, 2001), which was almost entirely devoted to the problems of biodiversity conservation. The NGO "Eco-Tapan" ("Eco-Arch"), which is involved in this project, is conducting ecological education activities for children within the international project "March of Parks", which can be considered akin to gardening activities.

Under the TACIS programme, a video library has been set up for NGOs and for the Ministry of Nature Protection, which plays an important role in support of awareness raising issues.

187. The Women's Union in Armenia is responsible for promoting women's rights and providing ecological education and awareness-raising activities. Several projects by other NGOs also focus on environmental awareness raising. The Ministry of Nature Protection supports these initiatives as far as possible.

190. In recent years, several booklets were published in Armenia as materials for publicising biodiversity and the importance of its conservation and sustainable use. The publications include: with assistance of the Embassy of Great Britain - "Armenia: mountains, deserts, lakes" (authors: Sh. Mnatsakanyan, G. Fayvush, S. Shashikyan, K. Tamanyan, 1999); with support of UNDP - calendar "Alpine flowers of Armenia " (author: S. Baloyan, 2000) and " Especially protected natural territories of Armenia " (author: N.Khanjyan, 2001).

Article 14 Impact assessment and minimizing adverse impacts

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| 194. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | b) Medium | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Low | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 195. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | b) Adequate | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Limiting | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Severely limiting <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| 194. The "Law on Environmental Impact Expertise (Assessment)" was adopted in 1995. There are also three sub-laws and a Regulation of the Government of Armenia No. 193 "On marginal norms subject to environmental impact assessment of the activity". All these documents more or less relate to issues connected with and measures for the assessment of impacts on the flora and fauna of Armenia. The problem is an absence of several sub-laws and other normative regulations necessary to ensure the proper functioning of the Law. | | | | | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 196. Is legislation in place requiring an environmental impact assessment of proposed projects likely to have adverse effects on biological diversity (14 (1a))? | |
| a) no | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) early stages of development | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) advanced stages of development | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) legislation in place | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) review of implementation available | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 197. Do such environmental impact assessment procedures allow for public participation (14(1a))? | |
| a) no | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) yes - limited extent | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) yes - significant extent | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 198. Does your country have mechanisms in place to ensure that the environmental consequences of national programmes and policies that are likely to have significant adverse impacts on biological diversity are duly taken into account (14(1b))? | |
| a) no | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) early stages of development | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) advanced stages of development | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) fully compliant with current scientific knowledge | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 199. Is your country involved in bilateral, regional and/or multilateral discussion on activities likely to significantly affect biological diversity outside your country's jurisdiction (14(1c))? | |
| a) no | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) yes - limited extent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) yes - significant extent | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 200. Is your country implementing bilateral, regional and/or multilateral agreements on activities likely to significantly affect biological diversity outside your country's jurisdiction (14(1c))? | |
| a) no | |
| b) no, assessment of options in progress | |
| c) some completed, others in progress | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 201. Has your country mechanisms in place to notify other States of cases of imminent or grave danger or damage to biological diversity originating in your country and potentially affecting those States (14(1d))? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) mechanisms in place | |
| e) no need identified | |
| 202. Has your country mechanisms in place to prevent or minimize danger or damage originating in your State to biological diversity in other States or in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (14(1d))? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of development | √ |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) fully compliant with current scientific knowledge | |
| e) no need identified | |
| 203. Has your country national mechanisms in place for emergency response to activities or events which present a grave and imminent danger to biological diversity (14(1e))? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | √ |
| d) mechanisms in place | |
| 204. Has your country encouraged international cooperation to establish joint contingency plans for emergency responses to activities or events which present a grave and imminent danger to biological diversity (14(1e))? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | √ |
| c) no need identified | |

Decision IV/10. Measures for implementing the Convention [part]

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 205. Has your country exchanged with other Contracting Parties information and experience relating to environmental impact assessment and resulting mitigating measures and incentive schemes? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) information provided to the Secretariat | |
| c) information provided to other Parties | |
| d) information provided on the national CHM | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 206. Has your country exchanged with other Contracting Parties information on measures and agreements on liability and redress applicable to damage to biological diversity? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) information provided to the Secretariat | |
| c) information provided to other Parties | |
| d) information provided on the national CHM | |

Decision V/18. Impact assessment, liability and redress

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 207. Has your country integrated environmental impact assessment into programmes on thematic areas and on alien species and tourism? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) partly integrated | |
| c) fully integrated | |
| 208. When carrying out environmental impact assessments does your country address loss of biological diversity and the interrelated socio-economic, cultural and human-health aspects relevant to biological diversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) partly | ✓ |
| c) fully | |
| 209. When developing new legislative and regulatory frameworks, does your country have in place mechanisms to ensure the consideration of biological diversity concerns from the early stages of the drafting process? | |
| a) no | |
| b) in some circumstances | |
| c) in all circumstances | ✓ |
| 210. Does your country ensure the involvement of all interested and affected stakeholders in a participatory approach to all stages of the assessment process? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - in certain circumstances | |
| c) yes - in all cases | ✓ |
| 211. Has your country organised expert meetings, workshops and seminars, and/or training, educational and public awareness programmes and exchange programmes in order to promote the development of local expertise in methodologies, techniques and procedures for impact assessment? | |
| a) no | |
| b) some programmes in place | ✓ |
| c) many programmes in place | |
| d) integrated approach to building expertise | |
| 212. Has your country carried out pilot environmental impact assessment projects, in order to promote the development of local expertise in methodologies, techniques and procedures? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes (please provide further details) | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 213. Does your country use strategic environmental assessments to assess not only the impact of individual projects, but also their cumulative and global effects, and ensure the results are applied in the decision making and planning processes? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) to a limited extent | |
| c) to a significant extent | |
| 214. Does your country require the inclusion of development of alternatives, mitigation measures and consideration of the elaboration of compensation measures in environmental impact assessment? | |
| a) no | |
| b) to a limited extent | ✓ |
| c) to a significant extent | |
| 215. Is national information available on the practices, systems, mechanisms and experiences in the area of strategic environmental assessment and impact assessment? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes (please append or summarise) | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

197. According to the "Law on Environmental Impact Expertise (Assessment)", "three stages of public hearings during a project assessment should be performed". However, this is not always carried out. The "Order of implementation of public hearings related to Environmental Impact Expertise (Assessment)" has not yet been approved, even though it was developed by the "Closed State joint-stock company - Ecological examination" and submitted to the Government in 1998.

No institute of public ecological expertise, which could conduct independent ecological assessments, exists in Armenia. Several NGOs and private individuals are attempting to establish private impact assessment centres.

199. Armenia's rivers are tributaries of the two major transboundary rivers: the Kur (a basin of 700 square km) and the Araks (22,790 square km basin). There are no common management systems or environmental agreements for these rivers. Negotiations have started with Azerbaijan and Georgia on a joint project to clean up point sources of pollution, but have not been completed. Armenia has an agreement with Turkey, sharing the use of the transboundary Araks and Akhourian rivers in equal proportions (1,230 million m³ per year each), but Armenia has not been using its full share, and disputes between the two countries have occurred over their entitlements (see Article 5 question 14).

A series of hydroelectric dams on the Razdan river disturb its biodiversity.

Armenia supports, is a founder of, and an active contributor to the Regional Environmental Centre (REC) for the Caucasus region in Tbilisi, Georgia. An agreement on the regional REC was signed between Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan in the autumn of 1999 and all three republics are equal partners. The REC also encourages the development of regional cooperation and regional projects. Armenia plays an active part in the process and will be head of the council of the REC until 2003 when the position will be rotated to another partner.

The World Bank has proposed shutting down Armenia's one and only nuclear power station by 2004. However, until alternatives have been found this is unlikely to happen. Shutting down the power station would result in a return to the unsustainable felling of trees for use as fuel wood. Operating the nuclear power station represents a less serious threat to biodiversity than shutting it down. Armenia has signed the Aarhus Convention and will ratify very soon. Under this Convention there is an obligation to notify neighbouring countries of any potential adverse impacts on their biodiversity arising from activities undertaken in Armenia. Other than the Aarhus Convention there are no special bilateral or regional agreements on notification.

The Department of Energy is discussing the use of wind power but even this will have negative impacts on biodiversity as Armenian specialists have discovered during visits to wind power projects in the Netherlands. The development of hydroelectric power may also cause negative impacts on water biodiversity.

203. A Department of Extreme Situations exists under the Government of Armenia. One of its functions is providing an operational response to natural disasters and technological accidents and providing information on emergency situations generally. Thus, the activities of this department are indirectly connected to the elimination of ecological consequences of disasters, and, therefore the removal of threats to biodiversity. This department may also suggest emergency assistance to other countries and can provide emergency assistance for accidents both within Armenia and outside if invited. Recently a team from Armenia helped with the clear up after the Indian earthquake at the request of the Indian Government.

210. The involvement of all interested stakeholders in all stages of the assessment process is intended by the "Law on Environmental Impact Expertise (Assessment)".

211. The state institutions in Armenia do not carry out special meetings or seminars promoting the enrichment of the knowledge of local experts. However within the framework of certain projects financed by international organisations, experts do have an opportunity to expand their knowledge in this area. For example, ABA/CEELI and the non-governmental organisation EPAC (Armenia) conducted a seminar "Principles of environment impact assessment" with the assistance of USAID in 1999.

In 2000, the NGO "Ecological survival", with the support of USAID and the Armenian Assembly of America (Resource centre for NGOs in Armenia), prepared "Recommendations on public participation in Environmental Impact Assessment" (adviser: Ministry of Nature Protection).

In 2000, together with the Russian Federation under the auspices of the European Economic Commission, a seminar for experts on "participation in EIA in a transboundary context" was conducted.

The NGO Ecological Survival has published "Guidelines on Public Participation in Environmental Impact Assessment".

Armenia has participated in the Black Sea Economic Co-operation Forum since 1992.

214. The development of alternatives, mitigation measures, and the consideration of questions on measures for compensation are all made according to the "Law on Environmental Impact Expertise (Assessment)". This law states that if a project proposal does not mention expected environmental impacts, the project will not be considered.

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is not neglected and is also included under the law on Environmental Impact Expertise. According to this law all framework concepts / strategies should consider this issue. There may be some gaps, given that the process is passive, nevertheless those projects / concepts which have not passed a SEA are illegal. By law all should pass. The law is most efficient when applied to projects rather than to policies, plans or concepts.

Article 15 Access to genetic resources

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| 216. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | | b) Medium | ✓ | c) Low | |
| 217. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | | b) Adequate | | c) Limiting | ✓ |
| d) Severely limiting | | | | | |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| <p>216 – 217. By ratifying the CBD in 1993, in which the sovereign rights of Parties upon their biological resources and access to them are recognised, Armenia has undertaken a number of obligations on the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources and on the resolution of problems related to access to resources and fair sharing of benefits arising from their use. With the coming into force of the CBD the degree of priority of the issues related to access to genetic resources has increased and the need for the development of a strategy on free exchange of genetic resource samples and for open access to collections of plant germplasm has emerged. Currently the Republic owns sufficient resources to carry out the tasks related to the implementation of the suggested recommendations.</p> <p>Armenia took part in the development of the first Framework of Operating Principles during the first session of the commission of CBD experts on access and fair benefit sharing (San-Jose, Costa Rica, October 1999). Armenia also participated in discussions on the study of additional aspects of access to and fair sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources within the framework of the CBD and also on issues of user assessment, supplier experience, and identification approaches involving co-owners (Montreal, Canada, 2001). The main obstacle is the absence of an appropriate legislative and normative framework in the field of access to genetic resources and fair sharing of benefits arising from their use.</p> | | | | | |
| 218. Has your country endeavoured to create conditions to facilitate access to genetic resources for environmentally sound uses by other Contracting Parties (15(2))? | | | | | |
| a) no | | | | | |
| b) yes - limited extent | | | | ✓ | |
| c) yes - significant extent | | | | | |
| 219. Is there any mutual understanding or agreement in place between different interest groups and the State on access to genetic resources (15(4))? | | | | | |
| a) no | | | | | |
| b) yes - limited extent | | | | ✓ | |
| c) yes - significant extent | | | | | |
| 220. Has your country an open participation planning process, or any other process in place, to ensure that access to resources is subject to prior informed consent (15(5))? | | | | | |
| a) no | | | | | |
| b) early stages of development | | | | ✓ | |
| c) advanced stages of development | | | | | |
| d) processes in place | | | | | |
| 221. Has your country taken measures to ensure that any scientific research based on genetic resources provided by other Contracting Parties is developed and carried out with the full participation of such Contracting Parties (15(6))? | | | | | |
| a) no measures | | | | ✓ | |
| b) some measures in place | | | | | |
| c) potential measures under review | | | | | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | | | | | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 222. Has your country taken measures to ensure the fair and equitable sharing of the results of research and development and the benefits arising from the commercial and other use of genetic resources with any Contracting Party providing such resources (15(7))? | |
| a) no measures | |
| b) some measures in place | |
| c) potential measures under review | ✓ |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| If so, are these measures | |
| a) Legislation | |
| b) Statutory policy or subsidiary legislation | |
| c) Policy and administrative measures | |

Decision II/11 and Decision III/15. Access to genetic resources

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 223. Has your country provided the secretariat with information on relevant legislation, administrative and policy measures, participatory processes and research programmes? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes, within the previous national report | |
| c) yes, through case-studies | |
| d) yes, through other means (please give details below) | |
| 224. Has your country implemented capacity-building programmes to promote successful development and implementation of legislative, administrative and policy measures and guidelines on access, including scientific, technical, business, legal and management skills and capacities? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) some programmes covering some needs | |
| c) many programmes covering some needs | |
| d) programmes cover all perceived needs | |
| e) no perceived need | |
| 225. Has your country analysed experiences of legislative, administrative and policy measures and guidelines on access, including regional efforts and initiatives, for use in further development and implementation of measures and guidelines? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) analysis in progress | |
| c) analysis completed | |
| 226. Is your country collaborating with all relevant stakeholders to explore, develop and implement guidelines and practices that ensure mutual benefits to providers and users of access measures? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | ✓ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 227. Has your country identified national authorities responsible for granting access to genetic resources? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |
| 228. Is your country taking an active role in negotiations associated with the adaptation of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | ✓ |

Decision V/26. Access to genetic resources

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 229. Has your country designated a national focal point and one or more competent national authorities to be responsible for access and benefit-sharing arrangements or to provide information on such arrangements? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |
| c) yes, and Executive Secretary notified | |
| 230. Do your country's national biodiversity strategy, and legislative, administrative or policy measures on access and benefit-sharing, contribute to conservation and sustainable use objectives? | |
| a) no | |
| b) to a limited extent | ✓ |
| c) to a significant extent | |
| Parties that are recipients of genetic resources | |
| 231. Has your country adopted administrative or policy measures that are supportive of efforts made by provider countries to ensure that access to their genetic resources is subject to Articles 15, 16 and 19 of the Convention? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) other arrangements made | |
| c) yes | |
| 232. Does your country co-operate with other Parties in order to find practical and equitable solutions supportive of efforts made by provider countries to ensure that access to their genetic resources is subject to Articles 15, 16 and 19 of the Convention, recognizing the complexity of the issue, with particular consideration of the multiplicity of prior informed consent considerations? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes (please provide details) | |
| 233. In developing its legislation on access, has your country taken into account and allowed for the development of a multilateral system to facilitate access and benefit-sharing in the context of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) legislation under development | |
| c) yes | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 234. Is your country co-ordinating its positions in both the Convention on Biological Diversity and the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources? | |
| a) no | |
| b) taking steps to do so | |
| c) yes | ✓ |
| 235. Has your country provided information to the Executive Secretary on user institutions, the market for genetic resources, non-monetary benefits, new and emerging mechanisms for benefit sharing, incentive measures, clarification of definitions, <i>sui generis</i> systems and "intermediaries"? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) some information provided | |
| c) substantial information provided | |
| 236. Has your country submitted information on specific issues related to the role of intellectual property rights in the implementation of access and benefit-sharing arrangements to the Executive Secretary? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |
| 237. Has your country provided capacity-building and technology development and transfer for the maintenance and utilization of ex situ collections? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes to a limited extent | ✓ |
| c) yes to a significant extent | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

218 – 237. In Armenia a number of projects relating to access to information on plant genetic resources are currently being implemented. These projects, which receive financial support from international donor organisations, are aimed at the creation of information systems / databases on the plant genetic resources of the country. They anticipate not only the further use of these data by scientists, students, farmers and other stakeholders at the national level, but also broader information exchange among other countries, both project collaborators as well as a number of international organisations involved in the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources.

In Armenia at present there are no barriers to access to genetic resources providing that they do not belong to rare and endangered species. Before the implementation of joint research projects with other countries on the collection of vegetative resources and their further study, conditions for the distribution of results are agreed, on a case by case basis, by stakeholder parties (ministries, scientific centres, research laboratories) taking into consideration the standard system for preliminary qualified agreement of the parties involved. In general, such projects provide for the equal sharing of collected materials between the genetic banks of the countries participating, equal copyrights on publication and long-term storage of geneplasm in duplicated collections.

Participation in conferences, symposiums and working group meetings at the international level provides an opportunity to collaborate with appropriate stakeholders and to exchange knowledge regarding the development and implementation of operational principles and practical approaches that ensure fair benefit sharing between the supplier and users of genetic resources. Armenian specialists are only able to participate in these meetings as part of funded projects.

Armenian specialists have participated in training exchange programs with Japan. Specialists from Armenian Scientific Research Institutes received training and in turn exchanged information on the maintenance and utilisation of ex-situ collections with specialists from similar Japanese institutions. The State contributes to this area through the provision of continued support for the maintenance of the Armenian Scientific Research Institutes.

238 – 239. A gene bank for the long-term conservation of seed collections of plant genetic resources does not exist in the Republic. Thus there is a priority need for the establishment of a National Gene Bank and the introduction of technologies to maintain existing collections.

Armenia has received the relevant documents on Access and Benefit Sharing from the CBD secretariat and these are being reviewed by Armenian specialists. Armenia will be represented at COP 6 by either the Minister for the Environment or another State Representative.

Armenia is a member of a Transcaucasian co-operation programme between botanical gardens, including those in Central Asia. The co-operation deals with research into and the exchange of genetic resources.

Article 16 Access to and transfer of technology

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| 238. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | | b) Medium | ✓ | c) Low | |
| 239. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | | b) Adequate | | c) Limiting | ✓ |
| d) Severely limiting | | | | | |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 240. Has your country taken measures to provide or facilitate access for and transfer to other Contracting Parties of technologies that are relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity or make use of genetic resources and do not cause significant damage to the environment (16(1))? | |
| a) no measures | |
| b) some measures in place | |
| c) potential measures under review | ✓ |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| 241. Is your country aware of any initiatives under which relevant technology is transferred to your country on concessional or preferential terms (16(2))? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes (please give brief details below) | |
| 242. Has your country taken measures so that Contracting Parties which provide genetic resources are provided access to and transfer of technology which make use of those resources, on mutually agreed terms (16(3))? | |
| a) not relevant | |
| b) relevant, but no measures | |
| c) some measures in place | |
| d) potential measures under review | ✓ |
| e) comprehensive measures in place | |
| If so, are these measures | |
| a) Legislation | |
| b) Statutory policy or subsidiary legislation | |
| c) Policy and administrative arrangements | |
| 243. Has your country taken measures so that the private sector facilitates access to joint development and transfer of relevant technology for the benefit of government institutions and the private sector of developing countries (16(4))? | |
| a) no measures | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| b) some measures in place | |
| c) potential measures under review | ✓ |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| If so, are these measures | |
| a) Legislation? | |
| b) Statutory policy and subsidiary legislation? | |
| c) Policy and administrative arrangements? | |
| 244. Does your country have a national system for intellectual property right protection (16(5))? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes - law on protection of selectional achievements? | |
| 245. If yes, does it cover biological resources (for example, plant species) in any way? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | |
| c) yes - significant extent | |

Decision III/17. Intellectual property rights

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 246. Has your country conducted and provided to the secretariat case-studies of the impacts of intellectual property rights on the achievement of the Conventions objectives? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) some | |
| c) many | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

240 – 245. Although Armenia does not have a National system of intellectual property right protection, in 1999 the National Assembly approved the "Law on protection of plant breeding achievements", which regulates relationships related to the creation of new plant breeds, their legal protection and use. The Law is consistent with the requirements of UPOV, as presented at the 1997 international Geneva conference on the protection of new breeds of plants. The law regulates questions connected with the rights of the patent holder, the rights of the author of the new plant breed and entitlement to use of the new plant breed.

Armenia does not currently have a gene bank and is therefore looking for the modern technology necessary to set one up. Armenian specialists have been co-operating with the Institute of Agronomy in Hungary, with a gene bank in Germany, and with the Agricultural Research Centre of the USDA in order to study the relevant processes. Projects have been prepared and international support is being sought in order to provide the equipment and training needed for the installation and operation of the gene bank. Once constructed the gene bank would be open to other countries. Free exchange of seed material for the purposes of research is currently granted. Currently seed material, mostly of agricultural importance, is sent to St Petersburg in Russia for conservation.

243. There are no private research institutes in Armenia, only State Research Centres and State Scientific Research Institutes under the National Academy of Science. Some of these Centres are funded by grants from the World Bank for the purposes of agricultural reform.

Article 17 Exchange of information

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| 247. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | b) Medium | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Low | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 248. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | b) Adequate | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Limiting | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Severely limiting <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| <p>247 – 248. The importance of information exchange in the field of genetic resources, both at the national, and at the international level, is recognised in the Republic. Information on the existence of genetic resources, their role in the maintenance of the ecological balance in nature, and the characteristic properties of plant or animal taxa is widely presented in various appropriate publications, including scientific articles and monographs, popular scientific journals and reports from the appropriate departments and agencies. In general, they are broadly available for a wide range of users and scientists in the fields of botany, vegetation, zoology, animal industries, plant breeding, farming, and for various NGOs.</p> <p>A number of NGOs issue their own magazines and bulletins containing scientific and popular information on the location of species (sites), their status, distribution and necessary measures for their protection. Besides publications within the country, the first steps towards the creation of information systems and databases on existing genetic resources and ex-situ and in-situ collections of vegetative genetic resources are being undertaken.</p> <p>The proposed gene bank will include a database that may be integrated into the clearing-house mechanism and so be made more widely accessible in the future.</p> | | | | | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 249. Has your country taken measures to facilitate the exchange of information from publicly available sources (17(1))? | |
| a) no measures | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) restricted by lack of resources | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) some measures in place | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) potential measures under review | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) comprehensive measures in place | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If a developed country Party - | |
| 250. Do these measures take into account the special needs of developing countries (17(1))? | |
| a) no | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) yes - limited extent | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) yes - significant extent | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 251. If so, do these measures include all the categories of information listed in Article 17(2), including technical, scientific and socio-economic research, training and surveying programmes, specialized knowledge, repatriation of information and so on? | |
| a) no | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) yes - limited extent | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) yes - significant extent | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Article 18 Technical and scientific cooperation

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| 252. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | | b) Medium | √ | c) Low | |
| 253. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | | b) Adequate | | c) Limiting | √ |
| d) Severely limiting | | | | | |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 254. Has your country taken measures to promote international technical and scientific cooperation in the field of conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (18(1))? | |
| a) no measures | |
| b) some measures in place | √ |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | |
| 255. Do the measures taken to promote cooperation with other Contracting Parties in the implementation of the Convention pay special attention to the development and strengthening of national capabilities by means of human resources development and institution building (18(2))? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes - limited extent | |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 256. Has your country encouraged and developed methods of cooperation for the development and use of technologies, including indigenous and traditional technologies, in pursuance of the objectives of this Convention (18(4))? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of development | √ |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) methods in place | |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 257. Does such cooperation include the training of personnel and exchange of experts (18(4))? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | √ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 258. Has your country promoted the establishment of joint research programmes and joint ventures for the development of technologies relevant to the objectives of the Convention (18(5))? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | √ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |

Decision II/3, Decision III/4 and Decision IV/2. Clearing House Mechanism

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 259. Is your country cooperating in the development and operation of the Clearing House Mechanism? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 260. Is your country helping to develop national capabilities through exchanging and disseminating information on experiences and lessons learned in implementing the Convention? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | √ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 261. Has your country designated a national focal point for the Clearing-House Mechanism? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | √ |
| 262. Is your country providing resources for the development and implementation of the Clearing-House Mechanism? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes, at the national level | |
| c) yes, at national and international levels | |
| 263. Is your country facilitating and participating in workshops and other expert meetings to further the development of the CHM at international levels? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) participation only | |
| c) supporting some meetings and participating | |
| 264. Is your CHM operational | |
| a) no | |
| b) under development | √ |
| c) yes (please give details below) | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 265. Is your CHM linked to the Internet | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 266. Has your country established a multi-sectoral and multi-disciplinary CHM steering committee or working group at the national level? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |

Decision V/14. Scientific and technical co-operation and the clearinghouse mechanisms (Article 18)

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 267. Has your country reviewed the priorities identified in Annex I to the decision, and sought to implement them? | |
| a) not reviewed | √ |
| b) reviewed but not implemented | |
| c) reviewed and implemented as appropriate | |

Further comments on implementation of these Articles

254-255. Technical and scientific co-operation is incorporated in several of the actions proposed in the BSAP. Within the Framework of the Pan-European Strategy of Biological and Landscape Diversity there is a Program Element entitled "Establishment of potential for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Central and East Europe (CEE) and Newly Independent States (NIS)". This Program Element contains a separate action "Development of regional co-operation (Armenia, Russia, Georgia, Azerbaijan) aimed at better management and sustainable use of biodiversity in transboundary territories" (included in Strategy during the conference "Biodiversity in Europe" in March 2000). For this purpose, a regional seminar will be organised in Armenia in June, 2001.

256. Armenia is currently launching a program of support for the development of methods for co-operation for the development and use of biotechnology. Up till now this co-operation has been limited to exchanges between the scientific-research institutes of Armenia and other countries.

In 2001, following five years of negotiations, an Agreement on International Co-operation in the field of Biotechnology Development was signed in Yerevan between the Armenian Institute of Biotechnology and Institute of Microbiology of Urumchi City, China, with the support of the Armenian Ministry of Industry and Trade. This agreement will soon be signed in Urumchi and will result in a two-year project as part of a long-term collaboration planned to last 15 years dealing with the same issues.

The project's aim is the production of biotechnological products, L and D amino acids and other enzymes, through selection and genetic engineering methods using Chinese technology. Armenia is providing the genetic resources and China is providing the expertise and technology for this project. The project provides for an exchange of scientists between China and Armenia; three postgraduate students from China will come to Armenia for three years postgraduate study and several Armenian specialists will go to China for development of the technologies necessary for the project.

Work on the establishment of an International Biotechnology Centre in Armenia is also in progress with the financial and technical support of the US. In recognition of Armenia's importance as a centre for biotechnological research, an American delegation selected Armenia as the preferred country in the Transcaucasus for the establishment of a regional centre for biotechnology.

At the same time a project proposal, which includes collaborative contributions from five institutes in Armenia, has been sent to the USA. The project is in four main parts, one of which is environmental protection. This includes obtaining new micro-organisms, amino acids and enzymes, and will be carried out by the Armenian institutes.

The project is proposed within the framework of the International Scientific Technological Centre, whose members include representatives from the USA, Japan, Korea and the European Union. Armenia has previously received funding for several different collaborative projects from this centre but not in this area. This biotechnology project is the first application for financing in this area that Armenia has made. It is hoped that the above-mentioned project proposal is the first step towards establishing the regional centre on biotechnology in Armenia.

Another planned project envisages developing micro-organisms to decompose the waste from a vitamin factory. Currently the waste from this factory is not naturally used and amounts to some 3-5 tonnes of waste each year.

259-266. The structures of the Clearing House Mechanism will be established by February 2002, as part of the Biodiversity Enabling Activity Phase II "Assessment of biodiversity capacity building needs and establishment of Clearing House Mechanism structures in Armenia".

Article 19 Handling of biotechnology and distribution of its benefits

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| 268. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | b) Medium | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Low | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 269. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | b) Adequate | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Limiting | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Severely limiting <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| <p>268-269. Armenia has sufficient scientific and industrial capacity in the field of biotechnology relating to micro-organisms to be able to resolve most significant national problems. The Republican Centre for Deposition of Micro-organisms at the Institute of Microbiology presently holds more than 6,000 strains of bacteria, fungi, yeast and streptomycetes. The strains are stored in optimal conditions, i.e. in mineral oil, freeze-dried and in liquid nitrogen.</p> <p>The biotechnological research that is carried out in the country in the field of agriculture mainly concerns the selection of cultivated plants and their accelerated reproduction for the purpose of obtaining new healthy agricultural breeds with a higher resistance to traditional invasive species and factors of an exogenic nature. The biotechnological research carried out in this area is not wide ranging and currently does not deal with problems relating to the distribution of benefits between the donor country and executor country. Prior to the implementation of scientific projects in the field of biotechnology which are based on genetic materials provided by other parties (donor countries), agreement is sought on equal copyright for publication of the results of scientific research.</p> | | | | | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 270. Has your country taken measures to provide for the effective participation in biotechnological research activities by those Contracting Parties which provide the genetic resources for such research (19(1))? | |
| a) no measures | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) some measures in place | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) potential measures under review | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If so, are these measures: | |
| a) Legislation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Statutory policy and subsidiary legislation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Policy and administrative measures | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 271. Has your country taken all practicable measures to promote and advance priority access on a fair and equitable basis by Contracting Parties to the results and benefits arising from biotechnologies based upon genetic resources provided by those Contracting Parties (19(2))? | |
| a) no measures | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) some measures in place | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) potential measures under review | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) comprehensive measures in place | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Decision IV/3. Issues related to biosafety and Decision V/1. Work Plan of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 272. Is your country a Contracting Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety? | |
| a) not a signatory | ✓ |
| b) signed, ratification in progress | |
| c) instrument of ratification deposited | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

270. Armenia is currently launching a program of support for the development of methods for co-operation for the development and use of biotechnology. This has not yet included measures to provide for the effective participation in biotechnological research activities by those Contracting Parties that provide the genetic resources for such research (see Article 18 question 256).

272. Armenia is not a party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Currently a process of harmonisation of Armenian provisions with the main issues of the protocol is underway with the intention of signing the protocol in the next one or two years.

Article 20 Financial resources

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 273. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | b) Medium | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Low | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 274. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | b) Adequate | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Limiting | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | d) Severely limiting | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 275. Has your country provided financial support and incentives in respect of those national activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of the Convention (20(1))? | |
| a) no | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) yes - incentives only | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) yes - financial support only - protected areas support? art | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) yes - financial support and incentives | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If a developed country Party - | |
| 276. Has your country provided new and additional financial resources to enable developing country Parties to meet the agreed incremental costs to them of implementing measures which fulfil the obligations of the Convention, as agreed between you and the interim financial mechanism (20(2))? | |
| a) no | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) yes | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition - | |
| 277. Has your country received new and additional financial resources to enable you to meet the agreed full incremental costs of implementing measures which fulfil the obligations of the Convention (20(2))? | |
| a) no | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| If a developed country Party - | |
| 278. Has your country provided financial resources related to implementation of the Convention through bilateral, regional and other multilateral channels (20(3))? | |
| If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition - | |
| 279. Has your country used financial resources related to implementation of the Convention from bilateral, regional and other multilateral channels (20(3))? | |
| a) no | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Decision III/6. Additional financial resources

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 280. Is your country working to ensure that all funding institutions (including bilateral assistance agencies) are striving to make their activities more supportive of the Convention? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | ✓ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 281. Is your country cooperating in any efforts to develop standardized information on financial support for the objectives of the Convention? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes (please attach information) | |

Decision V/11. Additional financial resources

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 282. Has your country established a process to monitor financial support to biodiversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) procedures being established | ✓ |
| c) yes (please provide details) | |
| 283. Are details available of your country's financial support to national biodiversity activities? | |
| a) no | |
| b) not in a standardized format | ✓ |
| c) yes (please provide details) | |
| 284. Are details available of your country's financial support to biodiversity activities in other countries? | |
| a) not applicable | ✓ |
| b) no | |
| c) not in a standardized format | |
| d) yes (please provide details) | |
| Developed country Parties - | |
| 285. Does your country promote support for the implementation of the objectives of the Convention in the funding policy of its bilateral funding institutions and those of regional and multilateral funding institutions? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | |
| Developing country Parties - | |
| 286. Does your country discuss ways and means to support implementation of the objectives of the Convention in its dialogue with funding institutions? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | ✓ |
| 287. Has your country compiled information on the additional financial support provided by the private sector? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes (please provide details) | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 288. Has your country considered tax exemptions in national taxation systems for biodiversity-related donations? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) not appropriate to national conditions | |
| c) exemptions under development | |
| d) exemptions in place | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The Republic of Armenia suffered severe economic hardships at the beginning of the 1990s. Economic recovery has now started, aided by a reasonably low level of international debt. The financing of biodiversity conservation programs is supported by a number of mechanisms, including the State budget and foreign contributions to projects. While environmental problems are recognised, the environment is not considered as a national priority for public expenditure.

Limited State resources, and the low priority placed on environmental issues, have meant that public expenditure in this sector has to date been minimal.

The current State budget meets less than 35% of the basic needs of biodiversity conservation, and the existing expenditure is primarily for payment of staff salaries. Almost no investment is made into equipment or other capital costs, and there is inadequate support for scientific research on biodiversity.

Environmental spending is focused on three principal areas: (1) Fisheries; (2) Forestry; and (3) Protected areas. Additional activities covered include the funding of the Environmental Inspectorate, which is responsible for the enforcement of relevant legislation and regulations and for the collection of payments for natural resource use.

Fisheries. For the year 2000 the Government had planned to allocate AMD 10,500,000 from the State budget for the protection and regeneration of fish stocks, but actually allocated nothing. Thus it is currently impossible to make an effective assessment of fish stocks, and to set sustainable levels of fishing so as to ensure the recovery of stocks.

Forest protection activities are financed from the State budget (AMD 108,700,000 in 2000). However, the costs of sustainable forest protection are estimated to be 4-5 times greater than current expenditures, and are likely to grow substantially.

Protected areas. The State budgets for the various protected areas operated under the Ministry for Nature Protection are shown in the table below.

| Protected Area | Expenditure in 2000 (in AMD) |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Lake Sevan National Park | 20,840,000 |
| Reserve-park complex (including Sevlich State Reserve) | 2,257,200 |
| Dilijan State Reserve | 853,200 |
| Khosrov State Reserve | 24,122,900 |
| Shikahogh State Reserve | 341,200 |
| Department of Protected Areas | 5,000,000 |
| TOTAL | US\$ 326,000 |

Current State budgets are insufficient for the needs of biodiversity conservation in Armenia. At present government budgets are supplemented by funds from international donors. The biological diversity of Armenia represents an important economic asset, although the true values of biological resources are rarely considered in economic policy and pricing structures. Armenia is clearly on the way to developing a market economy and, sooner or later, the pricing of biological resources is likely to be determined by market forces.

275. The annual volume of financial support allocated from the State Budget for forest protection activities

and protected areas has not changed as a result of Armenia's ratification of the CBD.

279 Armenia has received funds from various international organisations including the World Bank, UN FAO, GEF, Ramsar Small Grants Fund, SIDA, UNEP and the McArthur Foundation.

In 1997 Armenia received GEF assistance amounting to USD \$174,800 in order to implement the project "First National Report, Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan to the CBD". In 1999, the combined work of eight groups of specialists resulted in the "First National Report on Biodiversity of Armenia" and the "Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan" (BSAP), which were prepared in line with CBD guidelines and the priority development goals of Armenia (See Article 6).

The World Bank financed the project, "Improvement of the Lake Sevan Ecological Balance". Within the framework of this project, an action plan and appropriate recommendations on the conservation of valuable and endemic fish species in the Lake were developed. Further financing for the realisation of the recommended measures was not available or was too late (see Article 9 question 136).

The ex-situ conservation of micro-organisms is undertaken by the Republican Centre for Deposition of Micro-organisms. The activities of the Centre are sponsored by the Russian institution A-M Holding and by a grant from the INTAS Association of the European Community (see Article 9 question 136).

There are a number of projects under development on the management of water ecosystems of the neighbouring countries of Southern Caucasus, financed by USAID and TACIS (see question 309).

With the financial support of SIDA in 1997-1999 the Forest Research and Experimental Centre implemented the Forest Resources Assessment Project (see question 361).

288. According to the "Law on Value Added Tax", benevolent payments for environment protection are exempted from VAT.

Article 21 Financial mechanism

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 289. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country? | | | | | |
| a) High | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | b) Medium | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Low | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 290. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made? | | | | | |
| a) Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | b) Adequate | <input type="checkbox"/> | c) Limiting | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | d) Severely limiting | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 291. Has your country worked to strengthen existing financial institutions to provide financial resources for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity? | |
| a) no | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) yes | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Decision III/7. Guidelines for the review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 292. Has your country provided information on experiences gained through activities funded by the financial mechanism? | |
| a) no activities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) no, although there are activities | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) yes, within the previous national report | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) yes, through case-studies | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) yes, through other means (please give details below) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

| |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>291. The Republic of Armenia suffered severe economic hardships at the beginning of the 1990s. Economic recovery has now started, aided by a reasonably low level of international debt. The financing of biodiversity conservation programs is supported by a number of mechanisms, including the State budget and foreign contributions to projects.</p> <p>The current State budget meets less than 35% of the basic needs for biodiversity conservation funding, and the existing expenditure is primarily for the payment of staff salaries. Almost no investment is made into equipment or other capital costs, and there is inadequate support for scientific research on biodiversity.</p> <p>The biological diversity of Armenia represents an important economic asset, although the true values of biological resources are rarely considered in economic policy and pricing structures. Armenia is clearly on the way to developing a market economy and, sooner or later, the pricing of biological resources is likely to be determined by market forces (see Article 20).</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Article 23 Conference of the Parties

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 293. How many people from your country participated in each of the meetings of the Conference of the Parties? | |
| a) COP 1 (Nassau) | - |
| b) COP 2 (Jakarta) | 1 |
| c) COP 3 (Buenos Aires) | 1 |
| d) COP 4 (Bratislava) | - |
| e) COP 5 (Nairobi) | 1 |

Decision I/6, Decision II/10, Decision III/24 and Decision IV/17. Finance and budget

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 294. Has your country paid all of its contributions to the Trust Fund? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | ✓ |

Decision IV/16 (part) Preparation for meetings of the Conference of the Parties

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 295. Has your country participated in regional meetings focused on discussing implementation of the Convention before any meetings of the Conference of the Parties? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes (please specify which) | ✓ |
| If a developed country Party - | |
| 296. Has your country funded regional and sub-regional meetings to prepare for the COP, and facilitated the participation of developing countries in such meetings? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes (please provide details below) | |

Decision V/22. Budget for the programme of work for the biennium 2001-2002

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 297. Did your country pay its contribution to the core budget (BY Trust Fund) for 2001 by 1 st January 2001? | |
| a) yes in advance | |
| b) yes on time | ✓ |
| c) no but subsequently paid | |
| d) not yet paid | |
| 298. Has your country made additional voluntary contributions to the trust funds of the Convention? | |
| a) yes in the 1999-2000 biennium | |
| b) yes for the 2001-2002 biennium | |
| c) expect to do so for the 2001-2002 biennium | |
| d) no | ✓ |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

| |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 295. Armenia attended several meetings in 1999; the CEE regional meeting in Bratislava, Eastern European Meetings and the Riga Meeting on Biodiversity in Europe. Armenia also attended a GEF organised meeting on financial mechanisms in 2000 in Prague. Armenia has participated in several PEBLDS meetings from 1997 – 2000 and a representative from the Ministry for Nature Protection, Tatyana Danielyan, will participate in the 5 th Meeting in Strasbourg in May 2001. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Article 24 Secretariat

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 299. Has your country provided direct support to the Secretariat in terms of seconded staff, financial contribution for Secretariat activities, etc? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Article 26 Reports

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 301. What is the status of your first national report? | |
| a) Not submitted | |
| b) Summary report submitted | |
| c) Interim/draft report submitted | |
| d) Final report submitted | ✓ |
| If b), c) or d), was your report submitted: | |
| by the original deadline of 1.1.98 (Decision III/9)? | |
| by the extended deadline of 31.12.98 (Decision IV/14)? | |
| Later (please specify date) Dec. 2000 | ✓ |

Decision IV/14 National reports

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 302. Did all relevant stakeholders participate in the preparation of this national report, or in the compilation of information used in the report? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | ✓ |
| 303. Has your country taken steps to ensure that its first and/or second national report(s) is/are available for use by relevant stakeholders? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | ✓ |
| If yes, was this by: | |
| a) informal distribution? | ✓ |
| b) publishing the report? | ✓ |
| c) making the report available on request? | ✓ |
| d) posting the report on the Internet? | |

Decision V/19. National reporting

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 304. Has your country prepared voluntary detailed thematic reports on one or more of the items for in-depth consideration at an ordinary meeting of the parties, following the guidelines provided? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes - forest ecosystems | |
| c) yes - alien species | |
| d) yes - benefit sharing | |

Further comments on implementation of this Article

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Decision V/6. Ecosystem approach

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 305. Is your country applying the ecosystem approach, taking into account the principles and guidance contained in the annex to decision V/6? | |
| a) no | |
| b) under consideration | |
| c) some aspects are being applied | √ |
| d) substantially implemented | |
| 306. Is your country developing practical expressions of the ecosystem approach for national policies and legislation and for implementation activities, with adaptation to local, national, and regional conditions, in particular in the context of activities developed within the thematic areas of the Convention? | |
| a) no | |
| b) under consideration | |
| c) some aspects are being applied | √ |
| d) substantially implemented | |
| 307. Is your country identifying case studies and implementing pilot projects that demonstrate the ecosystem approach, and using workshops and other mechanisms to enhance awareness and share experience? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) case-studies identified | |
| c) pilot projects underway | |
| d) workshops planned/held | |
| e) information available through CHM | |
| 308. Is your country strengthening capacities for implementation of the ecosystem approach, and providing technical and financial support for capacity-building to implement the ecosystem approach? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes within the country | |
| c) yes including support to other Parties | |
| 309. Has your country promoted regional co-operation in applying the ecosystem approach across national borders? | |
| a) no | |
| b) informal co-operation | √ |
| c) formal co-operation (please give details) | |

Inland water ecosystems

Decision IV/4. Status and trends of the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems and options for conservation and sustainable use

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 310. Has your country included information on biological diversity in wetlands when providing information and reports to the CSD, and considered including inland water biological diversity issues at meetings to further the recommendations of the CSD? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 311. Has your country included inland water biological diversity considerations in its work with organizations, institutions and conventions affecting or working with inland water? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | √ |
| If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition - | |
| 312. When requesting support for projects relating to inland water ecosystems from the GEF, has your country given priority to identifying important areas for conservation, preparing and implementing integrated watershed, catchment and river basin management plans, and investigating processes contributing to biodiversity loss? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | √ |
| 313. Has your country reviewed the programme of work specified in annex 1 to the decision, and identified priorities for national action in implementing the programme? | |
| a) no | |
| b) under review | |
| c) yes | √ |

Decision V/2. Progress report on the implementation of the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems (implementation of decision IV/4)

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 314. Is your country supporting and/or participating in the River Basin Initiative? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | √ |
| 315. Is your country gathering information on the status of inland water biological diversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) assessments ongoing | √ |
| c) assessments completed | √ |
| 316. Is this information available to other Parties? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - national report | √ |
| c) yes - through the CHM | |
| d) yes - other means (please give details below) | √ |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 317. Has your country developed national and/or sectoral plans for the conservation and sustainable use of inland water ecosystems? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - national plans only | |
| c) yes - national plans and major sectors | √ |
| d) yes - national plans and all sectors | |
| 318. Has your country implemented capacity-building measures for developing and implementing these plans? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | √ |

Decision III/21. Relationship of the Convention with the CSD and biodiversity-related conventions

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 319. Is the conservation and sustainable use of wetlands, and of migratory species and their habitats, fully incorporated into your national strategies, plans and programmes for conserving biological diversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | √ |

Further comments on implementation of these decisions and the associated programme of work

305. The ecosystem approach has not been explicitly applied to biodiversity conservation. However this type of approach is used intuitively in the decision-making process by Armenian scientists who are highly qualified in this area.

Although the ecosystem approach was put forward as a leading principle only in 2000, there is a separate action in the BSAP entitled "Conservation and protection of landscapes and ecosystems" along with several appropriate measures.

309. Currently the application of the ecosystem approach through informal co-operation is carried out at a regional level through joint projects carried out by NGOs or the Ministry of Nature Protection. Examples of such projects include the following: "Vertebrate Animal Biodiversity Conservation in Transboundary Regions of the Transcaucasus" and "Analysis of the present condition and development of priority measures for the protection and rational use of the biological resources of the Caucasus". In addition to these there are a number of projects at the project development stage concerning the management of water ecosystems in the neighbouring countries of the Southern Caucasus, financed by USAID and TACIS.

311. The Government of Armenia, on behalf of the Ministry of Nature Protection, closely co-operates with stakeholder research institutes and NGOs. It should be noted that the Armenian National Academy of Sciences is an official scientific consultant of the Government and Parliament of Armenia.

Armenia is planning to hold regional seminars on wetlands and mountain wetlands this year. These will cover various subjects including wetland biodiversity.

314. Most projects, both at the national and regional level, in support of the Initiative on River Basins are now at the stage of being presented or launched. The majority of financing for these projects is provided by international funds and donor organisations.

315. Only vague information is available regarding the condition of biodiversity in the main water ecosystems of Armenia. The most studied aquatic ecosystem is Lake Sevan, where ecological monitoring has been frequently carried out. However here also research into the condition of aquatic fauna and flora

populations has recently practically stopped and only very limited data exists. Information on other internal water ecosystems is only gathered when needed.

316. Other Parties have access to information on inland waters through the National Report and also through the publication of scientific articles in international journals, participation in joint projects and international seminars and conferences.

318. Capacity building for the purposes of developing and implementing plans is carried out through both official and public channels, by means of increasing ecological awareness and providing ecological education for the general public, as well as improving the ecological legislative framework. In spite of these measures there are currently insufficient economic tools and mechanisms in Armenia to support the capacity building needed for the implementation of conservation plans, and the achievement of sustainable use of inland water ecosystems.

319. Wetland conservation is a separate strategic component of the BSAP, and several wetland areas in Armenia are currently protected under the Ramsar Convention to which Armenia is a Party. The Armenian National Focal Point for the Ramsar Convention is a member of the Ramsar Standing Committee and Chair of the finance sub-group. Although Armenia is not currently a Party to the Bonn Convention on Migratory Species, there are plans to accede to the African and Eurasian Waterbirds Agreement (AEWA) in recognition of the fact that Armenia hosts several areas of great importance for migratory waterbirds.

Marine and coastal biological diversity - Not Applicable to Armenia
Decision II/10 and Decision IV/5. Conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biological diversity

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 320. Does your national strategy and action plan promote the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biological diversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 321. Has your country established and/or strengthened institutional, administrative and legislative arrangements for the development of integrated management of marine and coastal ecosystems? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) arrangements in place | |
| 322. Has your country provided the Executive Secretary with advice and information on future options concerning the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biological diversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | |
| 323. Has your country undertaken and/or exchanged information on demonstration projects as practical examples of integrated marine and coastal area management? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - previous national report | |
| c) yes - case-studies | |
| d) yes - other means (please give details below) | |
| 324. Has your country programmes in place to enhance and improve knowledge on the genetic structure of local populations of marine species subjected to stock enhancement and/or sea-ranching activities? | |
| a) no | |
| b) programmes are being developed | |
| c) programmes are being implemented for some species | |
| d) programmes are being implemented for many species | |
| e) not a perceived problem | |
| 325. Has your country reviewed the programme of work specified in an annex to the decision, and identified priorities for national action in implementing the programme? | |
| a) no | |
| b) under review | |
| c) yes | |

Decision V/3. Progress report on the implementation of the programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (implementation of decision IV/5)

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 326. Is your country contributing to the implementation of the work plan on coral bleaching? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | |
| c) not relevant | |
| 327. Is your country implementing other measures in response to coral bleaching? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes (please provide details below) | |
| c) not relevant | |
| 328. Has your country submitted case-studies on the coral bleaching phenomenon to the Executive Secretary? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | |
| c) not relevant | |

Further comments on implementation of these decisions and the associated programme of work

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Agricultural biological diversity

Decision III/11 and Decision IV/6. Conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biological diversity

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 329. Has your country identified and assessed relevant ongoing activities and existing instruments at the national level? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of review and assessment | |
| c) advanced stages of review and assessment | √ |
| d) assessment completed | |
| 330. Has your country identified issues and priorities that need to be addressed at the national level? | |
| a) no | |
| b) in progress | |
| c) yes | √ |
| 331. Is your country using any methods and indicators to monitor the impacts of agricultural development projects, including the intensification and extensification of production systems, on biological diversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | √ |
| d) mechanisms in place | |
| 332. Is your country taking steps to share experiences addressing the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biological diversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - case-studies | √ |
| c) yes - other mechanisms (please specify) | |
| 333. Has your country conducted case-studies on the issues identified by SBSTTA: i) pollinators, ii) soil biota, and iii) integrated landscape management and farming systems? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes - pollinators | |
| c) yes - soil biota | |
| d) yes - integrated landscape management and farming systems | |
| 334. Is your country establishing or enhancing mechanisms for increasing public awareness and understanding of the importance of the sustainable use of agrobiodiversity components? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of development | |
| c) advanced stages of development | √ |
| d) mechanisms in place | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 335. Does your country have national strategies, programmes and plans which ensure the development and successful implementation of policies and actions that lead to sustainable use of agrobiodiversity components? | |
| a) no | |
| b) early stages of development | ✓ |
| c) advanced stages of development | |
| d) mechanisms in place | |
| 336. Is your country promoting the transformation of unsustainable agricultural practices into sustainable production practices adapted to local biotic and abiotic conditions? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | ✓ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 337. Is your country promoting the use of farming practices that not only increase productivity, but also arrest degradation as well as reclaim, rehabilitate, restore and enhance biological diversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | ✓ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 338. Is your country promoting mobilization of farming communities for the development, maintenance and use of their knowledge and practices in the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | ✓ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 339. Is your country helping to implement the Global Plan of Action for the Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |
| 340. Is your country collaborating with other Contracting Parties to identify and promote sustainable agricultural practices and integrated landscape management? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |

Decision V/5. Agricultural biological diversity: review of phase I of the programme of work and adoption of a multi-year work programme

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 341. Has your country reviewed the programme of work annexed to the decision and identified how you can collaborate in its implementation? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 342. Is your country promoting regional and thematic co-operation within this framework of the programme of work on agricultural biological diversity? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) some co-operation | |
| c) widespread co-operation | |
| d) full co-operation in all areas | |
| 343. Has your country provided financial support for implementation of the programme of work on agricultural biological diversity? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) limited additional funds | |
| c) significant additional funds | |
| <i>If a developed country Party -</i> | |
| 344. Has your country provided financial support for implementation of the programme of work on agricultural biological diversity, in particular for capacity building and case-studies, in developing countries and countries with economies in transition? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes within existing cooperation programme(s) | |
| b) yes, including limited additional funds | |
| c) yes, with significant additional funds | |
| 345. Has your country supported actions to raise public awareness in support of sustainable farming and food production systems that maintain agricultural biological diversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes, to a limited extent | √ |
| c) yes, to a significant extent | |
| 346. Is your country co-ordinating its position in both the Convention on Biological Diversity and the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources? | |
| a) no | |
| b) taking steps to do so | |
| c) yes | √ |
| 347. Is your country a Contracting Party to the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade? | |
| a) not a signatory | |
| b) signed - ratification in process | √ |
| c) instrument of ratification deposited | |
| 348. Is your country supporting the application of the Executive Secretary for observer status in the Committee on Agriculture of the World Trade Organisation? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |
| 349. Is your country collaborating with other Parties on the conservation and sustainable use of pollinators? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 350. Is your country compiling case-studies and implementing pilot projects relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of pollinators? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes (please provide details) | |
| 351. Has information on scientific assessments relevant to genetic use restriction technologies been supplied to other Contracting Parties through media such as the Clearing-House Mechanism? | |
| a) not applicable | |
| b) no | √ |
| c) yes - national report | |
| d) yes - through the CHM | |
| e) yes - other means (please give details below) | |
| 352. Has your country considered how to address generic concerns regarding such technologies as genetic use restriction technologies under international and national approaches to the safe and sustainable use of germplasm? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes - under consideration | |
| c) yes - measures under development | |
| 353. Has your country carried out scientific assessments on <i>inter alia</i> ecological, social and economic effects of genetic use restriction technologies? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) some assessments | |
| c) major programme of assessments | |
| 354. Has your country disseminated the results of scientific assessments on <u>inter alia</u> ecological, social and economic effects of genetic use restriction technologies? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes - through the CHM | |
| c) yes - other means (please give details below) | |
| 355. Has your country identified the ways and means to address the potential impacts of genetic use restriction technologies on the <u>in situ</u> and <u>ex situ</u> conservation and sustainable use, including food security, of agricultural biological diversity? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) some measures identified | |
| c) potential measures under review | |
| d) comprehensive review completed | |
| 356. Has your country assessed whether there is a need for effective regulations at the national level with respect to genetic use restriction technologies to ensure the safety of human health, the environment, food security and the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) yes - regulation needed | |
| c) yes - regulation not needed (please give more details) | |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 357. Has your country developed and applied such regulations taking into account, <i>inter alia</i> , the specific nature of variety-specific and trait-specific genetic use restriction technologies? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes - developed but not yet applied | |
| c) yes - developed and applied | |
| 358. Has information about these regulations been made available to other Contracting Parties? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes - through the CHM | |
| c) yes - other means (please give details below) | |

Further comments on implementation of these decisions and the associated programme of work

330. A number of projects were developed, concerning priority tasks such as the in-situ and ex-situ conservation of endemic breeds of plants and agricultural animals and the gene fund of their relatives, the intensive reproduction and global use of these breeds through the application of biotechnological methods.

331. There are no incentive measures currently in place. Some tools are being applied in order to intensify and improve outputs from agriculture, but there are currently no indicators being used to monitor what effect this intensification of agriculture has had on the landscape.

Indirect measures – In addition to those legislative regulations on the conservation, reproduction, sustainable and global use of biodiversity existing since the Soviet period, the following legislative acts have been adopted by the National Assembly in the last 2-3 years:

- 1) "Law on Nature Specially Protected Areas" (1991), "Forest Code" (1994)
- 2) "Law on Veterinary Practice" (October 26, 1999)
- 3) "Law on plant conservation and plant quarantine" (March 20, 2000)
- 4) "Law on food security" (December 8, 1999)
- 5) "Law on the protection of plant breeding achievements" (November 23, 1999)
- 6) "Law on the decentralisation of state owned lands located within the administrative territories of towns and village communities" (November 24, 1998)
- 7) "Law on Fauna" (2000)
- 8) "Law on Flora" (1999)
- 9) Government Decree No. 282 of April 16, 1991 provides a framework for "Renting fees and regulation of the utilisation of natural pastures, grasslands and other land in Armenia"

These legislative documents address issues of:

- conservation and effective use of Armenian flora and fauna genetic resources
- environment protection
- diagnosis and prevention of virus-caused and parasite diseases of plants and animals

The Law also defines the stakeholder institution responsible for control of:

- primary and processed food security,
- the requirements for imported and exported plants and animals,
- norms of quarantine, etc.

335. Programmes concerning the strategic agricultural development of the country have been developed and implemented. In particular the program on "Reform of the Agro-industrial sector of Armenia for 1998-2002" that was developed and then adopted by the Government of Armenia on April 28, 1997.

336. Promotion of the use of sustainable agricultural technologies takes place but is very limited due to a

lack of state financing. In the last years a serious risk of desertification of the Ararat valley has arisen. With the assistance of the World Bank the "Irrigation Rehabilitation Project" (51,000,000 USD), as well as the "Natural Resource Management and Poverty Reduction Project" (15,000,000 USD) are being implemented. The latter emphasises the sustainable use and reproduction of biodiversity, particularly forest resources, through the development of traditional methods.

Due to improper privatisation practices some soil types have been used in a very inefficient way. From 1990 onwards the use of agricultural chemicals decreased as a result of the blockade of roads into Armenia and a worsening of the social conditions of farmers. Today, the state has no strategy or policy on the use or provision of alternatives to pesticides / fertilizers. Farmers are using the pesticide application methods of the Soviet Union. International support has been aimed at the introduction of more efficient farming methods, although there have been no incentives or any strategic planning from the State.

346. Armenia, in the framework of international conventions, closely collaborates with ICARDA, in the field of conservation of plant genetic resources.

357. The scientific research institutes of Armenia, in response to the provisions of international projects and programs on plant genetic resources for food production, actively co-operate with those scientific centres included in the CGIAR system, and jointly implement a number of projects with organisations such as ICARDA, CIMMYT, CIP and IPGRI.

Forest biological diversity

Decision II/9 and Decision IV/7. Forest biological diversity

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 359. Has your country included expertise on forest biodiversity in its delegations to the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |
| c) not relevant | |
| 360. Has your country reviewed the programme of work annexed to the decision and identified how you can collaborate in its implementation? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) under review | |
| c) yes | |
| 361. Has your country integrated forest biological diversity considerations in its participation and collaboration with organizations, institutions and conventions affecting or working with forest biological diversity? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | ✓ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 362. Does your country give high priority to allocation of resources to activities that advance the objectives of the Convention in respect of forest biological diversity? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |
| For developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition - | |
| 363. When requesting assistance through the GEF, Is your country proposing projects which promote the implementation of the programme of work? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | ✓ |

**Decision V/4. Progress report on the implementation of the programme of work
for forest biological diversity**

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 364. Do the actions that your country is taking to address the conservation and sustainable use of forest biological diversity conform with the ecosystem approach? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |
| 365. Do the actions that your country is taking to address the conservation and sustainable use of forest biological diversity take into consideration the outcome of the fourth session of the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | ✓ |
| 366. Will your country contribute to the future work of the UN Forum on Forests? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes | ✓ |
| 367. Has your country provided relevant information on the implementation of this work programme? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes - submission of case-studies | |
| c) yes - thematic national report submitted | |
| d) yes - other means (please give details below) | |
| 368. Has your country integrated national forest programmes into its national biodiversity strategies and action plans applying the ecosystem approach and sustainable forest management? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - limited extent | ✓ |
| c) yes - significant extent | |
| 369. Has your country undertaken measures to ensure participation by the forest sector, private sector, indigenous and local communities and non-governmental organisations in the implementation of the programme of work? | |
| a) no | |
| b) yes - some stakeholders | ✓ |
| c) yes - all stakeholders | |
| 370. Has your country taken measures to strengthen national capacities including local capacities, to enhance the effectiveness and functions of forest protected area networks, as well as national and local capacities for implementation of sustainable forest management, including restoration? | |
| a) no | |
| b) some programmes covering some needs | |
| c) many programmes covering some needs | ✓ |
| d) programmes cover all perceived needs | |
| e) no perceived need | |
| 371. Has your country taken measures to implement the proposals for action of the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests and the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests on valuation of forest goods and services? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) under consideration | |
| c) measures taken | |

Biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands

Decision V/23. Consideration of options for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in dryland, Mediterranean, arid, semi-arid, grassland and savannah ecosystems

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 372. Has your country reviewed the programme of work annexed to the decision and identified how you will implement it? | |
| a) no | |
| b) under review | √ |
| c) yes | |
| 373. Is your country supporting scientifically, technically and financially, at the national and regional levels, the activities identified in the programme of work? | |
| a) no | √ |
| b) to a limited extent | |
| c) to a significant extent | |
| 374. Is your country fostering cooperation for the regional or subregional implementation of the programme among countries sharing similar biomes? | |
| a) no | |
| b) to a limited extent | √ |
| c) to a significant extent | |

Further comments on implementation of these Decisions and the associated programme of work

361. Considerations related to biological diversity are being addressed during the preparation of project proposals and the implementation of projects by a number of organisations. At the national level several scientific-research institutions, such as the Institute of Botany and the Forest Research and Experimentation Centre, conduct research on forestry.

The largest department of the Ministry of Nature Protection is the Forestry Department. This department supervises the State Forest Enterprise Hayantar. According to the World Bank, Hayantar employed 1,614 seasonal workers and had 1,014 permanent employees in 1996. Forest protection is implemented through the Hayantar State Forest Service, which consists of 31 forest offices. Hayantar is responsible for all forestry-related activities, including advisory services, plant production, forestry planning and operations, public and technical information and forestry statistics.

As part of the planning process for medium and long-term socio-economic development programs in the regions (Marzes) of Armenia, the development of the forest sector is being taken into consideration. For example, in Tavush and Syunik Marzes the strengthening of forest management, especially within Protected Areas, was planned and is currently in progress. All these activities are implemented with the active involvement of regional administrative structures (marzpetaran).

At the international level, with the financial support of SIDA, the Forest Research and Experimental Centre implemented the Forest Resources Assessment Project in 1997-1999. The following are the summarised results of the work:

- assessment of the scale of the damage caused by tree felling during the years of crisis, the extent of the violation of natural reforestation, the undesirable change of tree species composition connected with these processes;
- elaboration of measures for reforestation
- evaluation of the reserves of mature valuable timber (3,000,000 m³), oak, beech, and other species, that can become the basis for the sustainable management of forests in the future.

Within the framework of the project, "Introduction of fast-growing tree species in Armenia", which started in 1994 and was sponsored by the "Association of Armenian engineers and scientists of US", 50 clones of Armenian hybrid poplars were tested. Based on the results of this experiment, industrial plantations of hybrid poplars were planted on state and collective farm lands (about 100 ha).

The problems of forest biodiversity and forest conservation are considered in the "First National Communication on Climate Change" prepared within the framework of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change as well as in the "National Action Program to combat Desertification in Armenia".

363. In recent years, several projects that were either directly aimed at forest conservation and preservation or included components relating to this, were submitted to GEF. For example, the "Project on the Prevention of degradation of forest ecosystems in Armenia", which has not yet received funding, and "Natural Resources Management and Poverty Reduction Project", a significant component of which is dedicated to the conservation of forest biodiversity.

368. The BSAP contains a number of activities relating to the conservation and sustainable use of forests. These activities are grouped under the categories; "development of mechanisms to regenerate forest resources", "reduction of pressure on forests" and "promotion of sustainable use of forest resources". Some of the activities included within these categories foresee the use of the ecosystem approach.

372-373. This decision has a high priority in Armenia, as a significant part of the territory of the Republic is covered by arid and semi-arid areas. Furthermore the most biologically diverse areas, including the majority of endemic species, are found in these regions. These lands should be considered as the most valuable storehouse of genetic resources in Armenia.

Until now the conservation of biodiversity in the arid and semi-arid territories of the country has attracted insufficient attention. A review of the intended activities under this decision has recently begun and it is still too early to speak about both measures for its implementation and opportunities for scientific, technical and financial support at the national level.

374. Special actions for the organisation of co-operation have not been implemented. Armenia participated in a regional project with Georgia and Azerbaijan which included a component entitled: "Arid and Semi-Arid Eco-system Conservation in the Caucasus".

Decision V/20. Operations of the Convention

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 375. Does your country take into consideration gender balance, involvement of indigenous people and members of local communities, and the range of relevant disciplines and expertise, when nominating experts for inclusion in the roster? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) yes | |
| 376. Has your country actively participated in subregional and regional activities in order to prepare for Convention meetings and enhance implementation of the Convention? | |
| a) no | ✓ |
| b) to a limited extent | |
| c) to a significant extent | |
| 377. Has your country undertaken a review of national programmes and needs related to the implementation of the Convention and, if appropriate, informed the Executive Secretary? | |
| a) no | |
| b) under way | ✓ |
| c) yes | |

Please use this box to identify what specific activities your country has carried out as a DIRECT RESULT of becoming a Contracting Party to the Convention, referring back to previous questions as appropriate:

Armenia ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1993.

In 1997 Armenia received GEF assistance to implement the project "First National Report, Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan to CBD". In 1999, the combined work of eight groups of specialists resulted in the First National Report on the Biodiversity of Armenia and the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP), which were prepared in line with CBD guidelines and the priority development goals of Armenia.

The Government has endorsed the BSAP, which will be the basis for national biodiversity policy and will soon be adopted officially. It aims at ensuring the conservation, sustainable use and regeneration of Armenia's landscape and biological diversity. It includes a budget for its implementation, identifying what can be funded in Armenia and what needs international funding, indicating possible sources of finance.

Since March 2001 a project has been launched as a second phase of the Biodiversity Enabling Activity. It received additional support from the GEF and includes the assessment of capacity-building needs, the establishment of a Clearing House Mechanism in Armenia and the preparation of the Second National Report (see Article 6, questions 18 – 29).

Several new laws have also recently been adopted and numerous projects have been funded (see under Article 8, questions 81, 82 and 84).

In many state and private higher educational institutions, students receive thorough teaching on biodiversity at the global level, for example at the Faculty of Biology of Yerevan State University, a special course on "Conservation of Biodiversity" has been taught since 2000. The introduction of this new subject is directly connected with the implementation of one of the actions of the Armenian "Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan" (see Article 12 questions 173-174).

Armenia has undertaken to fulfil a number of obligations on the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources and on the resolution of problems related to access to genetic resources and equitable sharing of benefits arising from their use. With the coming into force of the CBD the priority of issues related to access to genetic resources has increased and the need for the development of a strategy on the free exchange of gene fund samples and open access to collections of plant geneplasm has emerged (see Article 15).

Technical and scientific co-operation is reflected in several actions of the BSAP (see Article 18, questions 254-255).

Please use this box to identify joint initiatives with other Parties, referring back to previous questions as appropriate:

Armenia has signed or is in the process of negotiating several agreements and is participating in several joint projects.

Armenia has participated in the Black Sea Economic Co-operation Forum since 1992. Armenia also co-operates with the Interstate Ecological Council for the CIS Region, and has signed the following agreements within the CIS region:

- "Agreement on co-operation in the field of ecology and environment protection" (1992)
- "Agreement on co-operation in the field of information exchange for ecology and environment protection" (1998);
- "Agreement on co-operation in the field of forestry and forest industry" (1998)
- "Agreement on co-operation in the field of ecological monitoring" (1999).

Agreements between the Governments of the Russian Federation and Armenia, and between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Armenia are at the stage of being signed. In these agreements the conservation of rare and endangered species of flora and fauna is selected as a priority. An agreement on the establishment of a regional environmental centre (REC) in Georgia for the Caucasus was signed between Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan in the autumn of 1999.

Negotiations have started with Azerbaijan and Georgia on a joint project to clean up point sources of pollution, but have not been completed. Armenia has an agreement with Turkey, dividing the use of the transboundary Araks and Akhourian rivers in equal proportions (see Article 5 questions 13-14).

In 2000, together with the Russian Federation under the auspices of the European Economic Commission, a Seminar of experts on "participation in EIA in transboundary aspects" was conducted (see Article 14 question 211).

In the Framework of the Pan-European Strategy for Biological and Landscape Diversity there is a Program Element "Establishment of potential for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) and Newly Independent States (NIS)", which contains a separate action "Development of regional co-operation (Armenia, Russia, Georgia, Azerbaijan) aimed at better management and sustainable use of biodiversity in transboundary territories" (included in Strategy during the conference "Biodiversity in Europe" in March, 2000). For this purpose, a regional seminar will be organised in Armenia in June, 2001 (see Article 18 questions 254-255).

Armenia participated in a regional project with Georgia and Azerbaijan which included a component entitled: "Arid and Semi-Arid Eco-system Conservation in the Caucasus" (see question 374).

Please use this box to provide any further comments on matters related to national implementation of the Convention:

The wording of these questions is based on the Articles of the Convention and the decisions of the Conference of the Parties. Please provide information on any difficulties that you have encountered in interpreting the wording of these questions

The wording and structure of the reporting guidelines were rather difficult for some National Experts to understand as they were not used to such formats. The Ministry of Nature Protection was called on to explain some elements of the guidelines.

During the process of writing the report the National Experts came to the Ministry in order to discuss the answers to the questions and so all the final answers have been discussed by both the Ministry and the experts.

Initially it was thought that this report would be easier to write than the first report. However it proved more difficult because in contrast to the first report the experts did not provide a review of the current situation so readily. Nevertheless, expertise and human resources capacity in the area of biodiversity conservation in Armenia remains at a high level.

The process of compiling this report has helped through the addition of orientation and direction to the BSAP. The report has helped clarify priorities. It has also helped to identify trends and changes occurring since the First National Report.

The Second National Report will help with gathering more support for biodiversity conservation in Armenia in that it draws the attention of the Convention Secretariat to the problems and needs of Armenia. The report will be followed up with an assessment of capacity building needs as part of an ongoing GEF Enabling Activity project, which will further highlight priority needs in Armenia.

It is important to stress that realistically biodiversity conservation organisations in Armenia do not expect support from the state, but rely instead on support from international donor organisations.

If your country has completed its national biodiversity strategy and action plan (NBSAP), please give the following information:

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|--|
| Date of completion: | Process started 1998, ended in 2000. Delivered in March 2000 to CBD Secretariat, Montreal. Officially presented in Armenia in April 2000. | | |
| If the NBSAP has been adopted by the Government | | | |
| By which authority? | Not yet adopted. Official presentation (by Minister with UNDP) is first step towards adoption. | | |
| On what date? | | | |
| If the NBSAP has been published please give | | | |
| Title: | Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of Armenia. | | |
| Name and address of publisher: | Ministry of Nature Protection of the Republic of Armenia, 35 Moscovian Street, Yerevan, 375002, Republic of Armenia. | | |
| ISBN: | | | |
| Price (if applicable): | First 500 copies distributed free of charge. | | |
| Other information on ordering: | Further reprint planned at the beginning 2002. | | |
| If the NBSAP has not been published | | | |
| Please give full details of how copies can be obtained: | No copies currently available. | | |
| If the NBSAP has been posted on a national website | | | |
| Please give full URL: | | | |
| If the NBSAP has been lodged with an Implementing Agency of the GEF | | | |
| Please indicate which agency: | UNDP | | |
| Has a copy of the NBSAP been lodged with the Convention Secretariat? | | | |
| Yes | √ | No | |

Please provide similar details if you have completed a Biodiversity Country Study or another report or action plan relevant to the objectives of this Convention

Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change a national implementation strategy and the first national communication were prepared in 1998 as part of the project "Armenia – Country Study on Climate Change". The communication contains a specific activity related to biodiversity, which is formulated as "An assessment of vulnerability and adaptation measures for natural ecosystems, water resources, agriculture and health issues related to climate change" (see Article 5 question 13).

Following the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992, a process to develop a National Environmental Action Plan was initiated in 1996 and finished in 1998. It included two chapters related to biodiversity: "Forest conservation" and "Biodiversity conservation" (see Article 5 question 13).

An Environmental Action Plan for Lake Sevan has been developed, funded by the World Bank.

As part of the "Environment for Europe" process a national report in the framework of "Europe's Environment: the Second Assessment" (Dobris +3) was prepared with financial support from EU/TACIS (see Article 5 question 13).

Several donors are financing the "Management of Natural Resources and Poverty Reduction" project which also includes a biodiversity conservation component.

Please provide details of any national body (e.g. national audit office) that has or will review the implementation of the Convention in your country

Under the Second Phase Enabling Activities project, "Assessment of Priority Capacity Building Needs for Biodiversity and Establishment of a Clearing House Mechanism in Armenia", the first step was to create a National Steering Committee on Biodiversity. The Steering Committee was created in early April by decree of the Minister for Nature Protection and first met on the 11th April 2001.

The Committee functions as the co-ordinator of implementation of the Convention and is responsible for the co-ordination of the project itself and all further projects in this area. The Minister for Nature Protection is Head of the Committee, which includes the head of the International Development Ministry, the head of the Fauna and Flora Conservation and Protected Areas department, the CBD focal point, GEF focal point, CHM focal point and the UNDP Officer for Environmental Affairs, Anahit Simonian. NGOs, the Academy of Science and other stakeholders are also represented on the Steering Committee.

Abbreviations Used

| | |
|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ABA / CEELI | Armenian Bar Association / Central and Eastern Europe Legislative Initiative |
| AEWA | African and Eurasian Waterbirds Agreement |
| AMD | Armenian Drams |
| BSAP | Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan |
| CBD | Convention on Biological Diversity |
| CEE | Central and Eastern Europe |
| CGIAR | Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research |
| CHM | Clearing House Mechanism |
| CIMMYT | International Maize and Wheat Improvement Centre |
| CIP | International Potato Centre |
| CIS | Commonwealth of Independent States |
| COP | Conference of Parties |
| EIA | Environmental Impact Assessment |
| EPAC | Environmental Public Advocacy Centre |
| EU | European Union |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organisation |
| GEF | Global Environmental Facility |
| ICARDA | International Centre for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas |
| INTAS | International Technical and Scientific Association |
| IPGRI | International Plant Genetic Resources Institute |
| IYM | International Year of the Mountain |
| MEA | Multilateral Environmental Agreement |
| NACRES | Noah's Ark Centre for Recovery of Endangered Species (a Georgian NGO) |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organisation |
| NIS | Newly Independent States |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| PEBLDS | Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy |
| REC | Regional Environmental Centre |
| SEA | Strategic Environmental Appraisal |
| SIDA | Swedish International Development Agency |
| TACIS | EU's Technical Assistance to CIS Countries |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNECE | United Nations Economic Commission for Europe |
| UNEP | United Nations Environment Programme |
| UPOV | Union for Protection of Varieties |
| US | United States |
| USAID | United States Aid for International Development |
| USD | American Dollars |
| USDA | United States Department of Agriculture |
| WTO | World Trade Organisation |