

Please provide the following details on the origin of this report

Contracting Party	Finland
National Focal Point	
Full name of the institution:	Ministry of the Environment, Finland
Name and title of contact officer:	Anneli Sund, Senior Adviser
Mailing address:	P.O.Box 380 Kasarmikatu 25 FIN-00131 Helsinki
Telephone:	+ 358 - 9 - 1991 9486
Fax:	+ 358 - 9 - 1991 9602
E-mail:	<u>anneli.sund@vyh.fi</u>
Contact officer for national report (if different)	
Full name of the institution:	Ministry of the Environment, Finland
Name and title of contact officer	Marina von Weissenberg, Senior Adviser
Mailing address:	P.O.Box 380 Kasarmikatu 25 FIN - 00131 Helsinki
Telephone:	+ 358 - 9 - 1991 9372
Fax:	+ 358 - 9 - 1991 9364
E-mail:	<u>marina.weissenberg@vyh.fi</u>
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting national report:	Pekka Kangas, Director General Ministry of the Environment, Finland
Date of submission:	15.5.2001

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

This report has been drafted by the Finnish National Biodiversity Committee established in 1996 by the Ministry of the Environment.

All government ministries, economic sectors, research and environmental organisations and NGO's have been represented in the National Committee for Biodiversity in Finland.

Draft reports were circulated, an ad hoc working group established and comments given by members of the Committee.

The Committee's tasks are to liaise and promote cooperation between the various sectors involved, to coordinate and assess the implementation of the National Action Plan and the monitoring of the state of biodiversity in Finland, and to supervise the preparation of summary reports.

Broad participation

The Finnish work for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use is distinguished by its broad participation. The work has involved the Ministry of the Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, the Ministry of Transport and Communications, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Defence, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, the Ministry of Trade and Industry, the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Finance, Metsähallitus - Forest and Park Service, the Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities, the Confederation of Finnish Industry and Employers, the Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners, the indigenous Sami people and the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation.

Sources:

- National Action Plan for Biodiversity in Finland 1997-2005.
- The implementation of the National Action Plan for Biodiversity in Finland 1997-1999.
- Finland's Country study on Biodiversity, 1998.
- Third list of threatened species in Finland, 2000.
- Alien species in Finland, 2000.
- Nordic research report: Introduced species in the Nordic Countries, 2000.
- The Finnish Biodiversity Research Programme (FIBRE), Mid-term evaluation. Panel report, 1999.
- Finland's National Forest Programme 2010, 2/1999.
- National report for CSD/Rio+10, 2001.
- National report of Finland on Forest ecosystems for CBD, 2001.
- Signs of sustainability. Finland's indicators for sustainable development, 2000.
- Criteria and indicators for Sustainable Forest Management in Finland, 2001.
- Indicators for the use of Natural resources, 1999.
- Everyman's right in Finland, Public access to the countryside: right and responsibilities, 1999.

The Sami peoples' sustainable development programme, 1998.

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

In 1996-97 the National Committee for Biological Diversity drafted the National Action Plan for Biodiversity in Finland, 1997-2005, in accordance with a decision-in-principle made by the Finnish Government in 1995. The National Action Plan sets out 124 specific measures to be taken by 2005 to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and also allocates responsibility to various sectors and defines the costs and resources required. The plan is based on the ministries' sectoral programmes and biodiversity reports.

The plan attempts to integrate the maintenance of biodiversity into national, regional and local planning and decision-making, and into cooperation between different sectors. The measures the plan sets out should gradually make the activities of administrative and business sectors more sustainable in terms of the conservation and use of biological resources and in ways that do not hinder Finland's economic competitiveness in the longer term. The plan also allocates the responsibility for meeting the costs of preserving biodiversity, which should mainly consist of the costs of measures taken by administrative authorities. From the point of view of biodiversity, achieving sustainable development requires changes in environmentally harmful production and consumption patterns above all else.

The need to conserve and to use sustainably biodiversity in Finland, the National Action Plan is also designed to meet the requirements of the EU's nature conservation directives and Finland's obligations under international agreements on nature conservation, particularly the UN Convention on Biological Diversity. The objective of the Convention on Biological Diversity(1) (Rio de Janeiro, 1992) is to conserve the diversity of ecosystems, plant and animal species and their genes, and to promote the sustainable use of natural resources and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilisation of biological resources.

The Ministry of the Environment have set up a Committee for the FINAP and two groups of specialist consultants to help with the monitoring of the implementation of the National Action Plan and to coordinate the measures taken in their respective fields.

The two working groups together monitor the implementation of the National Action Plan and the Convention on Biological Diversity. Their work is designed to support and develop cooperation between the administrative and business sectors on biodiversity. The National Committee will draft progress reports summarising the results of the monitoring of the various stages of the Finnish National Action Plan (FINAP) (1997-1999, 2000-2001, 2002-2003 and 2004-2005).

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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
d) Not relevant	
10. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?	
a) Good	
b) Adequate	X
c) Limiting	
d) Severely limiting	

Further comments on work programmes and priorities

Additional information: National report of Finland for the CBD on forest ecosystems, 2001.

Article 5 Cooperation

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

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)	X
b) international programmes (please give details below)	X
c) international agreements (please give details below)	X

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)	X
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)	X
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	X
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	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Finland puts special emphasis on the implementation, monitoring and updating of international environmental conventions, and takes part in this work together with other EU member states. Finland is a party to more than one hundred environmental or environmentally-related multi- or bilateral agreements.

The main partners in regional cooperation have been Russian Federation, Baltic countries and the Nordic Council of Ministers. Important areas for cooperation include protection of biological diversity in the marine environment, reduction of transboundary air pollution, environmental information and monitoring. Other projects have also involved central and eastern European countries, such as Poland, Belarus and Moldova. The inclusion of natural diversity protection in agriculture, forestry and fishing, for example, is being promoted through joint Nordic efforts.

Finland has i.e. bilateral environmental agreements with the Russian Federation, Baltic states, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine and China.

Finland co-operates with Kyrgyzstan, Peru, Tanzania, Namibia and South-Africa in biodiversity programs within the framework of bilateral development co-operation.

A central theme of the Barents council of Foreign ministers has been the Barents forest sector initiative. Within this framework new projects based on economic cooperation have been created, mainly covering the Russian parts of the Barents region.

IV/4: HELCOM

The states around the Baltic Sea have long been involved in cooperation on pollution prevention in the Baltic Sea through the framework of the intergovernmental Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM) set up by the Helsinki Convention in 1974. In 1992 the conservation of the biodiversity of the marine environment was added to the Helsinki Convention's goals.

The aim is to reduce pollution in the Baltic Sea by agreeing on the phase-out of all sources of pollution. HELCOM also convenes meetings of environment ministries to support and further the implementation of the Convention and the Baltic Sea Joint Comprehensive Environmental Action Programme.

Finland is cooperating in the work of implementation and reporting requirements to the CBD and the CSD, both tasks are coordinated by the Ministry of the Environment.

Finland has striven systematically to promote sustainable development by integrating environmental consideration into sectoral policies. In 1993, the **Finnish National Commission on Sustainable Development (FNCS)** was established to promote and co-ordinate the implementation of sustainable development at different levels. In practice this means that the commission gives political impetus and guidance to these issues as well as makes practical proposals and follows their implementation.

The principle of broad stakeholdership is also an important part of all the strategic work on sustainable development done in different sectors. The main actors from the NGOs and business organisations are also involved in preparing Finland's positions for international negotiations on sustainable development issues.

The FNCS has prepared an action plan Finnish Agenda 21 - a summary of various measures to promote sustainable development during 1995 - 1997 (in English "Finnish Action for Sustainable Development", 1995). The National report to CSD/Rio+10 was drafted in spring 2001.

The Finnish Government's Programme for Sustainable Development was adopted on 4 June 1998. The sectors concerned were responsible for preparing the programme and the Ministry of the Environment coordinated the work.

The programme includes an analysis of different aspects (ecological, economic, social and cultural) of sustainable development from the Finnish perspective. The programme identifies both short and long-term goals, strategic targets and guidelines for action for sectors that are central to sustainable development (i.e. production, products and consumption patterns, transport and human settlements, rural development and energy).

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	b) Medium	<input type="checkbox"/>	c) Low	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. 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					

20. What is the status of your national biodiversity strategy (6a)?	
a) none	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) early stages of development	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) advanced stages of development	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) completed ₁	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) completed and adopted ₂	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) reports on implementation available	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
21. What is the status of your national biodiversity action plan (6a)?	
a) none	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) early stages of development	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) advanced stages of development	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) completed ₂	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) completed and adopted ₂	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) reports on implementation available	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
22. Do your national strategies and action plans cover all articles of the Convention (6a)?	
a) some articles only	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) most articles	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) all articles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

23. Do your national strategies and action plans cover integration of other sectoral activities (6b)?	
a) no	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) some sectors	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) all major sectors	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) all sectors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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	X
c) regional meetings	X
25. Do all of your country's strategies and action plans include an international cooperation component?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
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	X
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	X
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)?	

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	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Sustainable development concerns all sectors of the society. Therefore, broad cooperation has been emphasised between various sectors and levels. Finland has striven systematically to promote sustainable development by integrating environmental consideration into sectoral policy.

The work to engage various sectors and major groups and actors in the promotion of sustainable development is well under way. The Finnish Government's Programme for Sustainable Development was adopted on 4 June 1998. In addition, some of the most important sectors both in the central government as well as in the private sector already have or will have in near future strategies and programmes on sustainable development.

In Finland, the promotion of sustainable development has been comprehensively adopted as the goal of broad cooperation between the government, the private sector, interest groups and NGOs, the scientific community, the education system and the media.

On June 3 1993, the Finnish National Commission on Sustainable Development (FNCSO) was set up to promote cooperation for this purpose. The mandate of the FNCSO is extended to the end of year 2002.

The Nordic co-operation and coordination has been important in the implementation of the CBD and other biodiversity related conventions. Finland is participating i.e. in projects run by the Nordic Council of Ministers.

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	X	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	X
d) Severely limiting					
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources					

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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X

36. Does your country have ongoing monitoring programmes at ecosystem level (7b)?	
a) minimal activity	
b) for ecosystems of particular interest only	X
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	X

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	X
d) comprehensive understanding	
e) reports available	X
39. Is your country monitoring these activities and their effects (7c)?	
a) no	
b) early stages of programme development	X
c) advanced stages of programme development	
d) programme in place	
e) reports on implementation available	X
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	X
e) reports on implementation available	X

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)	X

42. Is your country using rapid assessment and remote sensing techniques?	
a) no	
b) assessing opportunities	
c) yes, to a limited extent	X
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	X
44. Is your country cooperating with other Contracting Parties on pilot projects to demonstrate the use of assessment and indicator methodologies?	
a) no	X
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	X
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)	X

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	X
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	X
c) yes - through the national CHM	X
d) yes - other means (please specify)	X
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	X
e) other (please describe)	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

A Finnish National monitoring system is being set up to evaluate the state of biodiversity and related trends, as stipulated in EU legislation, Finland's Nature Conservation Act and the National Action Plan for Biodiversity. New aspects of monitoring will be developed and there may be changes in existing monitoring schemes. The research, monitoring and information systems working group will publish a report on the current state of biodiversity monitoring in Finland during the summer 2001.

The report will include proposals for the organisation of the national monitoring of the state of biodiversity. It will also suggest how the monitoring work should be shared between the organisations concerned and estimate the resources required for the monitoring work.

The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry is also monitoring the sustainability of the use of natural resources and attempting to guide agriculture, fisheries, game management and reindeer husbandry and the use of water resources in the right direction through a series of indicators of the sustainable use of natural resources (1999). The national criteria and indicators for sustainable forestry in Finland are also being developed on the basis of experiences with their application, and new research data. Pan-European criteria and indicators are being developed through the framework of the Pan-European ministerial conference on forests.

An important part of the work of the CBD is to develop scientifically trustworthy indicators for monitoring biodiversity.

Many sectors making use of living natural resources need indicators of biodiversity to help them assess the environmental impacts of their activities. Because of the varied nature of biodiversity, constituent parts can only be measured relative to others. Even then, developing trustworthy measurement techniques requires methodical analyses. The prerequisites for finding reliable biodiversity indicators are better understood as a result of increased research. Simultaneously new data on species and habitats is being obtained, gradually also long time data series.

A series of indicators of sustainable development in Finland were published in April 2000 by the Ministry of the Environment. The publication on sustainable development indicators for Finland includes some preliminary indicators for biodiversity. Suitable species and habitat data were available, but not interpretations on their relationship with biodiversity overall, or on questions of scale. Indicators for whole ecosystems or for genetic diversity have not yet been sufficiently elaborated. New information on different habitats will, however, be available in the near future.

Indicators that describe biodiversity are:

- Numbers of threatened species
- Population trends in farmland and forest birds

- Numbers of grey seals
- Area of nature reserves
- Implementation of nature conservation programmes

The ministry of Agriculture and Forestry published a set of Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management in Finland in January 2001. One criteria in this indicator set is maintenance, conservation and appropriate enhancement of biological diversity in forest ecosystems and it contains 8 indicators which describe biological diversity in production forests. The indicators handle e.g. endangered species, protection of valuable biotopes and tree species composition.

The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry drafted a preliminary set of indicators for the sustainable use of renewable natural resources (agriculture, game husbandry, reindeer husbandry, fisheries, rural areas and water resources) which were approved in February 1999.

Through these indicators it is possible to gather nationally reliable data on renewable natural resources and obtain information on pressures and threats, including on qualitative and quantitative future trends for the resources. The rural landscape (countryside) and biodiversity are also considered as important natural resources. There are few indicators which try to describe the change of biodiversity in agriculture. These indicators are e.g. the number of certain key farmland birds and the known distribution of the butterfly violet copper (*Lycaena helle*).

Finland has actively participated in the development of the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF). The GBIF is an interoperable network of biodiversity databases (taxonomy) and information technology tools that will enable users to use biodiversity information for national, economic, environmental and social benefits. The purpose of establishing GBIF has been to promote, co-ordinate, design and implement the compilation, linking, standardization, digitization and global dissemination of biodiversity data.

Finland signed the Memorandum of understanding for the GBIF in 2001.

The signers of the MoU have decided that a co-ordinated international scientific effort is needed to enable users throughout the world to discover and put to vast quantities of global biodiversity data, thereby advancing scientific research in many disciplines, promoting technological and sustainable development, facilitating the equitable sharing of the benefits of biodiversity, and enhancing the quality of life of members in society.

GBIF is an open-ended international co-ordinating body set up with the overall aim of furthering technical and scientific efforts to develop a global digitised information facility for biodiversity data.

Association with the MoU is open to any country, economy, inter-governmental organisation or other organisation, or to an entity designated by a country, economy, inter-governmental organisation or other organisation. Such association becomes effective upon signature of the MoU.

Finland assists Kyrgystan, Peru, Tanzania and Namibia to develop monitoring systems for biodiversity assessments.

Finnish Clearing-House Mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity, known as LUMONET, was set up 1998 by the environmental administration as part of the Clearing-House Mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD/CHM). LUMONET is a multi-disciplinary information system which provide data for

decision-making, increase the availability of data and to facilitate the comparison of various existing data, monitoring, assessments and the preparation of new data.

For more information <http://www.vyh.fi/eng/environ/bdclearh/kansi.htm>
(in English)

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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
c) significant investment	
55. Is your country encouraging partnerships between taxonomic institutions in developed and developing countries?	
a) no	X
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	X
d) being implemented by all major collections	

57. Has your country provided training programmes in taxonomy?	
a) no	
b) some	X
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)	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
b) basic assessment	
c) thorough assessment	
64. Has your country established or consolidated taxonomic reference centres?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
65. Has your country worked to increase its capacity in the area of taxonomic research?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
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	X
b) yes	
67. Has your country designated a national Global Taxonomy Initiative focal point linked to other national focal points?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
68. Has your country participated in the development of regional networks to facilitate information-sharing for the Global Taxonomy Initiative?	
a) no	X
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

- GBIF and Finland (see page 22)

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Severely limiting <input type="checkbox"/>					
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources					
<p>Finland has a network of nature reserves established under the Nature Conservation Act, including legal protection programmes for various habitat types. In 1998 and 1999 the Government approved Finland's Natura 2000 protected area network proposals for the EC Commission. Further sites has been added to the proposals according to the Commission's requirements concerning certain habitat types and species. The proposal for additions to the Natura 2000 area network will be finalized in May 2001.</p> <p>A ministerial committee under Prime Minister Lipponen's first Government approved funding of 3.2 billion marks (0.54 bn euro) for confirmed nature conservation programmes over a period of ten years from 1996.</p>					

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 type="checkbox"/>
c) yes	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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	X
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	X
77. Has your country undertaken measures to rehabilitate and restore degraded ecosystems (8f)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	X
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	X
c) potential measures under review	X
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	X
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	X
e) reports on implementation available	X
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	X
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	X
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)	X

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	X
c) regional meetings	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Finland has a network of nature reserves established under the Nature Conservation Act (national parks, strict nature reserves and other protected areas on state-owned and private land), to which legal protection programmes for various habitat types have added between the 1970s and 1990s.

Metsähallitus - Forest and Park Service has revised the principles of protected area management in Finland (<http://www.metsa.fi/julkaisut/pdf/luo/b54.pdf>). Metsähallitus has also developed a preliminary indicators of management effectiveness of protected areas.

In 1998 and 1999 the Government approved Finland's Natura 2000 protected area network proposals for the EC Commission. Environmental impact assessments were carried out, partly to examine the representativeness of the protection programme, but particularly concerning the programme's economic costs and benefits. Further sites will be added to the proposals according to the Commission's requirements concerning certain habitat types (e.g. internationally important bird areas) and species. A ministerial working group has prepared proposals for additions to the network by spring 2001.

Different ministries have worked to ensure, that the requirements of biodiversity are considered in all the legislation on the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources which has been renewed during the 1990s (The Nature Conservation Act, the Water Act, Land Use and Building Act, the Forests Act, the Act on the Financing of Sustainable Forestry, Forestry Centres, and legislation on the Forestry Development Centre Tapio, Metsähallitus - Forest and Park Service and the Forestry Associations). Other

legislation has also recently been revised to promote the conservation of biodiversity. Also, the opportunities for local authorities to consider biodiversity in their activities have improved thanks to new legislation.

The Ministry of the Environment's working group on the need for protection of forests in Southern Finland has examined the conservation status of forests in Southern Finland during 1999-2000 and made proposals regarding the need to develop the protection of the region's forests. Based on this report and the National Forest Programme for 2010, a programme of action, funding and aims will be prepared for forests in Southern Finland, and implemented on its completion. Economic and social factors concerning the use of forests will be considered along with ecological factors when the need for protection is defined.

Since 1997 the Finnish Environment Institute has been assessing the state of the whole network of nature conservation areas and its ability to guarantee the preservation of various habitat types and threatened and seriously declining species. The report will be published in 2001.

The Ministry of the Environment's second working group monitoring Finland's threatened species has been compiling data over the period 1997-2000 a third list of threatened species. This involved following trends in the populations of Finland's threatened animals and plants, and applying the categories of the IUCN classification of threatened species (1999, 1994) in Finland. This classification system has been designed for worldwide use, and Finland is one of the first countries to adopt it widely by applying both the old and new IUCN categories for threatened species. The threatened species report will be published in autumn 2001. The results shows that there are a number of threatened species, of which critically endangered are about 250, 450 endangered, and 800 vulnerable. One in ten of the total number of assessed is threatened. However, more than half of all species could not be assessed at all. 188 species have become extinct in Finland (2000).

Forests hold the greatest number of threatened species in Finland, about 38 per cent of the total. The changes in countryside landscapes such as the overgrowing of meadows have caused a one third rise in the number of threatened species in these habitats. Species from traditional habitats are getting threatened more rapidly than species from other habitats.

Finland co-operates in the area of in situ conservation with e.g. South-Africa, Namibia, Peru, Tanzania, China, Hungary, Estonia and Russian Federation.

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	X	c) Low	
87. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?					
a) Good		b) Adequate	X	c) Limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources					

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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
c) limited implementation in some sectors	X
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	X
95. Has your country submitted written comments on the interim guiding principles to the Executive Secretary?	
a) no	X
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	X
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	X
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	X

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	X
100. Has your country developed effective education, training and public-awareness measures concerning the issue of alien species?	
a) no	
b) some initiatives	X
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	X
c) all available information	
d) information available through other channels (please specify)	X
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	X
b) limited support	
c) substantial support	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Alien species in Finland (National report provided to the Secretariat in 2001)

(Available at: <http://www.vyh.fi/luosuo/lumo/lumonet/aliens.htm>)

The Nature Conservation Act (1096/1996) restricts the introduction of non-native species into Finland. Non-native plant species are not to be planted or sown outside gardens, fields or other sites designated for special purposes. If a non-native plant or animal species is known to spread rapidly in the wild, and there is a reasonable cause to suspect that it might constitute a health hazard or have a detrimental effect on indigenous Finnish species, the Ministry of Environment may issue any regulations as prove necessary to prevent the spread of such species. In accordance with the Hunting Act (615/1993, 1268/1993), wild bird or mammal species of foreign origin can not be imported or released in the wild without a permission of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.

The Plant Protection Law (1203/1994) lays down provisions to prevent the introduction of pests and diseases of plants into Finland. In addition, pests and pathogens which are present in Finland as native or introduced, but which are not widely distributed, can be controlled in order to prevent their further spread. Secondary legislation lays down

detailed provisions for import, monitoring, eradication, control and containment, and is enforced by a central authority, the Plant Production Inspection Centre.

See also: Multilateral/Nordic research cooperation on alien species.
Publication: Introduced Species in the Nordic Countries, Nord 2000:13.
<http://www.skovognaturstyrelsen.dk/natur/nnis>

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	X	b) Medium		c) Low			
104. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate	X	c) Limiting		d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							

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	X
c) potential measures under review	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
c) yes - CHM	X
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	X
110. Is your country participating in appropriate working groups and meetings?	
a) none	
b) some	
c) all	X
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	X

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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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)	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
c) yes	
124. Has your country identified resources for funding the activities identified in the decision?	
a) no	
b) not relevant	
c) partly	X
d) fully	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The sustainable use of biological resources in the northern hemisphere, and the traditional rights of indigenous Samí people are subjected to careful scrutiny as an aspect of land use in northern parts of Finland. This pertains particularly to reindeer husbandry, fishing, hunting, gathering and other Samí forms of land use in relation to forestry, mining, tourism and the regulation of land use in large protected areas within the Samí region.

The Samí Parliament is underlining that the basis of Samí peoples cultural, material and administrative autonomy should be realised through legislation, administration and funding according to the Finnish constitution and international agreements (e.g. ILO). See also: The Samí peoples sustainable development programme, 1998.

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	X	c) Low			
126. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate	X	c) Limiting		d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							

127. Has your country adopted measures for the <i>ex situ</i> conservation of components of biological diversity <i>native</i> to your country (9a)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	X
128. Has your country adopted measures for the <i>ex situ</i> conservation of components of biological diversity <i>originating outside</i> your country (9a)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	X
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	X
130. Has your country established and maintained facilities for the <i>ex situ</i> 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	X
c) yes - significant extent	X
131. Has your country established and maintained facilities for the <i>ex situ</i> 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	X

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	X
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	X
c) potential measures under review	X
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	X
<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 <u>ex situ</u> conservation and in the establishment and maintenance of <u>ex situ</u> conservation facilities (9e)?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The protection of the genetic diversity of Finnish domestic animals and cultivated plants combines both in situ and ex situ conservation. Certain breeds of domestic animals are conserved both in living populations and embryo banks. Finland is contributing actively to the Nordic Gene Bank of domesticated animal species.

At the Nordic Gene Bank (NGB) species used in Nordic agriculture and horticulture and their wild relatives are preserved. In addition, species of current interest to biotechnology, as well as landscape plants, medicinal plants, culinary herbs and plants with industrial uses are being considered for preservation. Species that are cultivated elsewhere and found in the wild in the Nordic countries, are also considered. (www.ngb.se).

The Nordic Council of Ministers accepted the Nordic gene strategy in year 2000 (English summary will be available in year 2001).

Ex situ conservation is gaining global importance. Education services provided by biological parks or centres are being increased, as are practical demonstrations of ecosystems and conservation biology. Korkeasaari Zoo, for example, has already increased its cooperation with international organisations and institutions.

Some reintroduction projects of threatened species are ongoing (e.g. butterflies, Golden eagles) and some fish species

The Nature Conservation Act (1096/1996) regulates any naturally occurring threatened species or species under strict protection including trade in Finland.

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	b) Medium	<input type="checkbox"/>	c) Low	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
138. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Adequate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	c) Limiting	<input type="checkbox"/>	d) Severely limiting	<input type="checkbox"/>
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							

139. Has your country integrated consideration of the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources into national decision making (10a)?	
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) review of implementation available	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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	<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"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>

b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	X
d) programme or policy in place	X
e) review of implementation available	X

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	X
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	X
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	X
c) indicators identified (if so, please describe below)	X
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)	X
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)	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
b) yes	
152. Has your country undertaken activities relevant to biodiversity and tourism in support of the International Year of Ecotourism?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
153. Has your country undertaken activities relevant to biodiversity and tourism in support of the International Year of Mountains?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
154. Has your country undertaken activities relevant to biodiversity and tourism in support of the International Coral Reef Initiative?	
a) no	X
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	X
c) to a significant extent (please describe)	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

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	X	c) Low			
157. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate	X	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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X

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	X
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	X
164. Has your country shared experience on incentive measures with other Contracting Parties, including making relevant case-studies available to the Secretariat?	
a) no	X
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	X
d) measures in place	X
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	X
c) thoroughly reviewed	
d) measures designed based on the reviews	X
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	X
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	X
e) review of implementation available	X
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	X
c) processes identified but not implemented	
d) processes in place	X
170. Has your country identified and considered neutralizing perverse incentives?	
a) no	
b) identification programme under way	
c) identified but not all neutralized	X
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	X
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	X
c) early stages of development	
d) advanced stages of development	
e) further information available	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Finland has largely based its environmental policy on administrative regulations, on site-based emission permits and mandatory reporting systems. In the beginning of the 1990s, however, a number of economic instruments were introduced for environmental purposes. During the 1990s, the system has been further developed so that the emphasis in taxation could gradually be shifted from taxation of labour to taxation of the use of natural resources and of activities polluting the environment.

The requirements of biodiversity are considered in all the legislation on the use of natural resources which has been renewed during the 1990s (The Nature Conservation Act, the Water Act, Land Use and Building Act, the Forests Act, the Act on the Financing of Sustainable Forestry, Forestry centres, and legislation on the Forestry Development Centre Tapio, Metsähallitus - Forest and Park Service and the Forestry associations). Other legislation has also recently been revised to promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Also, the opportunities for local authorities to consider

biodiversity in their activities have improved thanks to the new legislation, education and information sharing.

Guidelines for the promotion of sustainable consumption patterns are set in the Consumer Policy Programme for 2000-2004. The suggested measures include information dissemination, product labelling and consumer motivation.

The proposed energy conservation measures can be divided into the following seven categories: 1) funding the development and commercialisation of energy-efficient technology, 2) using economic steering methods, e.g., taxation, 3) improving the efficient use of control by norms, 4) further enforcing voluntary energy conservation agreements, 5) further developing energy audits and analyses, 6) supporting energy conservation measures with information services, training and motivation as well as 7) supporting energy conservation activities of the EU and international organisations.

Finland's energy taxation system

Finnish energy taxation system consists of taxes levied on transport and heating fuels and electricity.

Economic instruments for water pollution control

Municipalities have the primary responsibility for providing delivery of fresh water and treatment of waste water. These services are financed by charges collected from the users. Municipal water charges are based on a "full-cost principle". This means that the total cost of providing the water services should be paid by the users.

Economic instruments for waste management

In Finland municipalities are responsible for the collection, treatment and reuse of household waste.

Waste service charges are set and collected by the municipalities.

There is also a national waste tax. There was a sharp rise in waste charges in 1996-97 when the Waste Tax came into force. The Tax applies to waste deposited in the municipal landfills.

Deposit refund systems for beverage containers as well as the recycling fee for old tyres have been introduced in the late 1990`s.

To improve energy efficiency, voluntary agreements have been signed with industry and municipal sectors, covering the use, production, transfer and distribution of energy. Companies joining an agreement must perform an energy audit, appoint an energy manager and prepare an energy conservation plan. Then, they must implement the measures identified in the plan and report annually to the sectoral association. The Government will provide funding for the energy audits and for the investments of companies participating in the agreements. Some companies have also participated in the EMAS (Eco-management and Audit Scheme) Programme of the EU (see chart on www.vyh.fi/eng/environ/sustdev/indicat/emas.htm).

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	X	b) Medium		c) Low	
174. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?					
a) Good		b) Adequate	X	c) Limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources					

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	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	
d) programmes in place	X
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	
b) yes	X
177. Does your country promote and encourage research which contributes to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (12b)?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	X
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	X

If a developed country Party -

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

The Convention on Biological Diversity has created new needs for knowledge when states endeavour to act in accordance with the agreements signed. New information is needed in research, administration as well as in economy. The Ministries of Trade and Industry, Transport and Communications, Agriculture and Forestry, the Environment and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, inter alia, have under their respective jurisdictions started to prepare actions needed in implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity. Versatile and scientifically profound research is an essential prerequisite for these actions. One of the objectives of the Academy of Finland is to advance high-quality research in issues related to biodiversity.

The Council of State decision of 21 December 1995 stressed the importance of a multidisciplinary research programme for biological diversity, which were prepared by the Academy of Finland.

The programme aims at promoting knowledge of biological diversity as well as of conserving biological diversity when using the natural resources. Furthermore, the research programme should produce information on social, juridical and economic issues, as well as strengthen Finnish know-how in fields defined in the Convention on Biological Diversity.

The objective of the research programme is to produce internationally high-quality research results on biological diversity, with the applicability of results as a central goal. Applicability refers to all those activities aiming at the protection of diversity as well as at the compatibility between the protection and use of diversity. Thus, in accordance with the Convention on Biological Diversity, the fundamental theme of the programme is the protection and sustainable use of biodiversity.

The Finnish Biodiversity Research Programme FIBRE (1997-2002) is a six-year research programme for applied interdisciplinary research on biological diversity. The programme is the first international research initiative aimed at the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, as identified in the National Action Plan for Biodiversity in Finland 1997-2005.

The goal of the Finnish Biodiversity Research Programme is "to produce internationally high-quality research results on biological diversity, with the applicability of the results as a central goal". Applicability refers to all those activities aiming at the conservation of biological diversity as well as the compatibility between conservation and sustainable use.

The funding for the first three years was 62 million Finnish marks (appr. 12 million USD), and the total funding for the six years is 120 million FIM (appr. 22 million USD).

Applicability of biodiversity research - integration project BITUMI

BITUMI is an integration project for the Finnish Biodiversity Research programme FIBRE (1997-2002), which funds interdisciplinary research projects covering biological and socio-economic aspects of biological diversity.

One of the main goals of FIBRE is to promote research that produces results that can be applied in practice.

BITUMI is divided into four themes that cover all the research projects of FIBRE. The themes are: (a) forest biodiversity and forestry, (b) biodiversity of agroecosystems, traditional agricultural landscapes and built environment, (c) biodiversity of aquatic environments, and (d) biodiversity of developing countries. Each theme has a researcher who will be responsible for the activities. In practice, BITUMI researchers will synthesize research by discussions with researchers of the FIBRE projects and with end-users of research, arrange workshops to bring together scientists and stake-holders, and promote in various other ways the application of FIBRE research in the society. More information: <http://www.fibre@utu.fi>

Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry has financed several research studies concerning biodiversity mainly through the FIBRE-research programme. Also separate research studies concerning biodiversity has been financed, e.g. a study about the abundance of butterflies in agricultural biotopes which is just under way in the Finnish Environment Institute.

The Ministry of the Environment is funding biodiversity research in accordance to different needs and obligations, i.e. threaten species and habitats, restoration of habitats, and Natura 2000 -network.

See also chapter: Education and awareness building, art. 13, pages 56-58.

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	X	b) Medium	c) Low
181. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?			
a) Good		b) Adequate	X
		c) Limiting	
		d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources			

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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
188. Has your country integrated biodiversity concerns into education strategies?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	
d) yes	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
<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)	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

In 1997 the National Board of Education in Finland drew up a programme (1998-2000) for promoting sustainable development including biodiversity. The programme proposed 17 measures to be implemented by schools and other educational establishments over a four-year period. According to the programme, the aims of environmental education are awareness building promoting sustainable development, positive attitudes towards sustainability.

Preschool education

Finland has revised preschool education. The objective is to encourage children to take an interest in nature, to learn to observe natural phenomena and to become aware of the consequences of their own actions. The main content for these objectives are also outlined in the curriculum.

Basic and upper secondary education

The curricula for basic and upper secondary education will be gradually revised by 2008. The current core curricula (adopted in 1994) raise the question of environmental education. The largest amount of material relating to biodiversity is included in natural sciences, but it is also treated in connection with economics and arts.

The National Board of Education reviewed 183 primary and 80 lower secondary curricula applied between 1994 and 1999 in order to find out what themes were discussed in comprehensive schools. Environmental education was the most frequently treated theme at both stages. It was an integrated theme in 72% of the lower stages and 83% of the upper stages reviewed.

There are some upper secondary schools specialising in environmental sciences.

Vocational schools

Vocational curricula are also being revised at the moment. The objective of sustainable development is stressed in the new curricula, which also include environmental know-how in vocational competence. In addition, there are two new vocational qualifications in the environmental field: in vocational schools and as an option for adults, who can take a competence-based examination in environmental care.

Universities and polytechnics

Finland has 20 universities. The programmes, which are offered by approximately 30 university units, cover all aspects of sustainable development. During the academic year 1998/99 there were some 170 graduates majoring in environmental subjects. Many university departments seek to integrate the environmental dimension and the principle of sustainable development into their teaching as far as possible. All universities offer modules in sustainable development/ecology and biodiversity. A number of universities also provide environmental education for their staff.

The Finnish CHM is promoting the implementation of article 13 together with some other European CHM-countries. The objective is to develop biodiversity education in primary and secondary levels with the help of Internet and international co-operation networks. The framework to implement these ideas, are based on the "Naturdetektive" - and - "Eurodets" - concepts of the German CHM (<http://www.dainet.de/bmu-cbd/workshop/bonn.htm> and <http://www-unesco.org/mab/CBD/index.htm>)

The Finnish CHM has also focused on the public awareness raising at national level. Finnish CHM is designed not only for biodiversity experts, but also for the needs of general audience.

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	X	b) Medium		c) Low	
195. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?					
a) Good		b) Adequate	X	c) Limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources					

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	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	
d) legislation in place	X
e) review of implementation available	X
197. Do such environmental impact assessment procedures allow for public participation (14(1a))?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	X
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	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	
d) fully compliant with current scientific knowledge	X

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	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X

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	X
c) many programmes in place	
d) integrated approach to building expertise	X
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)	X
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	X
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	X
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)	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The Act on Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was adopted in 1994. It mainly regulates the project EIA procedure but has a general supervising duty of policies, plans and programmes (strategic EIA= SEA). The Ministry of the Environment has issued general guidelines for SEA by the authority given in the Act.

Environmental impact assessment (EIA) is applied to various types of projects. Biological diversity is one of the impacts required to be assessed in the procedure. Also a proposal of action to prevent and mitigate adverse environmental impact and monitoring is required. This applies also to the SEA. Significant SEAs have been carried out (e.g. Finland's Natura 2000 network proposal, the National Forest Programme for 2010, SEAs in the transport sector). A monitoring system programme has been developed to follow-up actual impacts of the National Forest Programme. Prior to the implementation of the National Forest Programme 2010 detailed estimation of its environmental impact was made. More information: National report of Finland on Forest ecosystems, 2001.

The Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a transboundary context (Espoo Convention) was ratified in 1995.

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	b) Medium	<input type="checkbox"/>	c) Low	<input type="checkbox"/>		
217. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Adequate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	c) Limiting	<input type="checkbox"/>	d) Severely limiting	<input type="checkbox"/>
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) yes - limited extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) yes - significant extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) yes - limited extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) yes - significant extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) early stages of development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) advanced stages of development	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) processes in place	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<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"/>

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	X
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	X
c) yes, through case-studies	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
c) yes - significant extent	

227. Has your country identified national authorities responsible for granting access to genetic resources?	
a) no	X
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	X

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	X
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	X
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	X
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)	X

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	X
b) legislation under development	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
b) yes to a limited extent	
c) yes to a significant extent	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Finland is co-operating and participating in the international negotiations on the revised IU/FAO.

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	b) Medium	<input type="checkbox"/>	c) Low	<input type="checkbox"/>		
239. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Adequate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	c) Limiting	<input type="checkbox"/>	d) Severely limiting	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) some measures in place	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) potential measures under review	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) comprehensive measures in place	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) yes (please give brief details below)	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) relevant, but no measures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) some measures in place	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) potential measures under review	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) comprehensive measures in place	<input type="checkbox"/>
If so, are these measures	
a) Legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Statutory policy or subsidiary legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Policy and administrative arrangements	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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	X
245. If yes, does it cover biological resources (for example, plant species) in any way?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
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	X
b) some	
c) many	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

--

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	c) Limiting	<input type="checkbox"/>	d) Severely limiting	<input type="checkbox"/>
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	b) Medium	<input type="checkbox"/>	c) Low	<input type="checkbox"/>		
253. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Adequate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	c) Limiting	<input type="checkbox"/>	d) Severely limiting	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) some measures in place	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) potential measures under review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) comprehensive measures in place	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) yes - limited extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) yes - significant extent	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) early stages of development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) advanced stages of development	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) methods in place	<input type="checkbox"/>

257. Does such cooperation include the training of personnel and exchange of experts (18(4))?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
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	X

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	X
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	X
261. Has your country designated a national focal point for the Clearing-House Mechanism?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
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	X
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	X
c) supporting some meetings and participating	

264. Is your CHM operational	
a) no	
b) under development	
c) yes (please give details below)	X
265. Is your CHM linked to the Internet	
a) no	
b) yes	X
266. Has your country established a multi-sectoral and multi-disciplinary CHM steering committee or working group at the national level?	
a) no	X
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	X

Further comments on implementation of these Articles

The Finnish CHM was established in 1998. CHM is available in Finnish (<http://www.vyh.fi/luosuo/lumo/lumonet/kansi.htm>) and in English (<http://www.vyh.fi/eng/environ/bdclearh/kansi.htm>). The information system is based on the articles of CBD, and the Finnish National Strategy and Action Plan for Biodiversity. Finnish CHM is designed for researchers, decision-makers, civil servants, teachers, journalists and other specialists, but also for the general public.

Finnish CHM is part of the European Community Clearing-House Mechanism (EC CHM) and the Coordinator of Finnish CHM is a member of EC CHM Steering group and Task Force. Finnish CHM will take actively part in the future work and cooperation of CBD CHM.

Finnish biodiversity researchers are supporting the development of biodiversity information systems in some developing countries (e.g. Peru, Nicaragua and Guatemala). Finnish CHM has tried to establish a CHM - partnership project with the CHM of Ecuador. See also GBIF (page 22).

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		b) Medium	X	c) Low	
269. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?					
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X
d) Severely limiting					
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources					

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	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	
If so, are these measures:	
a) Legislation	X
b) Statutory policy and subsidiary legislation	
c) Policy and administrative measures	
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	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	X
d) comprehensive measures in place	

**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	X
c) instrument of ratification deposited	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Finland is willing to consider its possibilities to assist developing countries in Cartagena Protocol process via bi- and multi-lateral instruments.

The biosafety aspect as far as GMO is concerned is currently under scrutiny in the Government. Finland participated in coordination with the EU in the preparation of the international Cartagena protocol on biosafety. As President of the EU in 1999 Finland played a central role in defining the EU's negotiating strategy. Finland also supported the protocol negotiations by financing the participation expenses of the representatives of developing countries out of development cooperation funds. The safe application of genetic technology in Finland is controlled by the Gene Technology Act (377/1995) and the Gene Technology Decree (821/1995). The aim of this legislation has been to prevent any damage to the environment or people's health which might be caused by genetically modified organisms (GMOs, LMOs). The EU-directives are accordingly adopted in Finland.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	c) Limiting	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Severely limiting <input 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 type="checkbox"/>
b) yes - incentives only	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) yes - financial support only	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) yes - financial support and incentives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>If a developed country Party -</i>	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -</i>	
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 type="checkbox"/>
<i>If a developed country Party -</i>	
278. Has your country provided financial resources related to implementation of the Convention through bilateral, regional and other multilateral channels (20(3))?	
<i>If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -</i>	
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	X
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)	X

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	X
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	X
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	X
d) yes (please provide details)	X
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	X
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

Finland is supporting financially the Biodiversity Service project for CEE-countries in 2001, coordinated by UNEP/ERO. Finland has also actively supported the biosafety protocol negotiations, participation of developing countries and countries with economics in transition.

The Department of Development Cooperation of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs is in a process of adopting a strategy paper how to support International Environmental Conventions via development cooperation.

Finlands support to the CBD:

<http://global.finland.fi/julkaisut/taustat/biodiversity/navi.html>

The EU's LIFE Nature funding is allocated for the conservation of the species and habitats listed in the EC Bird and Habitats directives, particularly in areas proposed for the Natura 2000 network of protected areas (partial funding of up to 50%, and in special cases funding up to 75% of total costs). In 1999 the EU distributed about 380 million marks (about 65 m Euro) of funding for LIFE Nature projects, of which Finland obtained over 27 million marks (about 4,6 m Euro) for seven different nature conservation projects, incl. the 1999 project funding. Finland recieved a total of about 106 million marks (about 17,8 , Euro) of LIFE Nature funding for 25 projects over the period 1995-99.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	c) Limiting	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Severely limiting <input 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 type="checkbox"/>
b) yes	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>
b) no, although there are activities	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) yes, within the previous national report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) yes, through case-studies	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) yes, through other means (please give details below)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Finland is an active supporter of GEF since its establishment contributing about 1% of GEF total funding. Finland has also given an additional donation to GEF capacity development initiative (CDI) in year 2000. Finland has been advocating stronger role for GEF in the future.

Finlands support to the CBD:

<http://global.finland.fi/julkaisut/taustat/biodiversity/navi.html>

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)	6
b) COP 2 (Jakarta)	6
c) COP 3 (Buenos Aires)	5
d) COP 4 (Bratislava)	10
e) COP 5 (Nairobi)	7

**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	X

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)	X
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)	X

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	X
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	X
b) yes for the 2001-2002 biennium	X
c) expect to do so for the 2001-2002 biennium	X
d) no	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Finland has supported financially i.e. the preparation of the European biodiversity regional meeting (Biodiversity in Europe) held in Riga, Latvia in 2000. Additionally, Finland has supported both Nordic and regional (Baltic states) biodiversity meetings held in the region, and the negotiations of the biosafety protocol 1999-2000.

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	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Forest biodiversity expert for year 2001-2002.

Article 25 Subsidiary body on scientific, technical and technological advice

300. How many people from your country participated in each of the meetings of SBSTTA?	
a) SBSTTA I (Paris)	2
b) SBSTTA II (Montreal)	2
c) SBSTTA III (Montreal)	3
d) SBSTTA IV (Montreal)	5
e) SBSTTA V (Montreal)	6

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	X
If b), c) or d), was your report submitted:	
by the original deadline of 1.1.98 (Decision III/9)?	X
by the extended deadline of 31.12.98 (Decision IV/14)?	
Later (please specify date)	

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	X
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	X
If yes, was this by:	
a) informal distribution?	
b) publishing the report?	X
c) making the report available on request?	
d) posting the report on the Internet?	X

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	X
c) yes - alien species	X
d) yes - benefit sharing	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

National Action Plan for Biodiversity 1997-2005, Country study on biodiversity 1998, and the First implementation report of the National Action Plan for Biodiversity 1997-1999.

National report for CBD on forest ecosystems (May 2001).

Alien species in Finland (February 2001).

Available: (<http://www.vyh.fi/eng/environ/bdclearh/kansi.htm>).

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	X
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	X
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	X
c) pilot projects underway	
d) workshops planned/held	
e) information available through CHM	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
b) yes	
315. Is your country gathering information on the status of inland water biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) assessments ongoing	X
c) assessments completed	
316. Is this information available to other Parties?	
a) no	
b) yes - national report	X
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	X
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	X

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	X

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

The third national water protection programme which defined the objectives to the year 2005, was approved by the Council of State in 1998. In 2000 the Ministry of the Environment approved a plan of action to implement the national water protection programme. The water protection measures presented in the programme cover inland waters, ground waters and the marine environment.

The EU adopted in 2000 a new Water Framework Directive which sets a legally binding objective of good state for all waters in the Union. It also obligates Member States to use pricing of water-related services as a tool for promoting water conservation. This will allow the environmental costs of water to be reflected in the price of water. The water directive puts emphasis on the actors at different levels (national, regional and local) to taking responsibility in water protection. *River basin management plans* will be prepared and published within next nine years. Public information and participation are important to the planning process. Proper implementation of the water directive will lead to significant improvements in surface waters and groundwaters.

The relationship and implementation of biodiversity related conventions (Ramsar, CMS, CITES) are important. Finland has co-ordinated its work in drafting National plans, programs and reports i.e. Natura 2000 -network and National CSD reports, incl. National report for Rio+10.

Marine and coastal biological diversity

**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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
328. Has your country submitted case-studies on the coral bleaching phenomenon to the Executive Secretary?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
c) not relevant	

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

During last year a specific Baltic Sea protection programme of Finland has been under elaboration. The programme is based on the implementation of the Decision-in-Principle on the Water Protection Targets to 2005 and the Baltic Agenda 21. The overall goal of this long-term programme is to secure the natural functioning of the Baltic Sea and its ecosystem. Special attention is paid to the Gulf of Finland, the Archipelago Sea and inland waters.

Finland supports Western Indian Ocean coral bleaching programme CORDIO. See also above Baltic Sea Protection Programme.

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	X
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	X
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	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) mechanisms in place	X
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	X
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	X
c) yes - soil biota	X
d) yes - integrated landscape management and farming systems	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
340. Is your country collaborating with other Contracting Parties to identify and promote sustainable agricultural practices and integrated landscape management?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

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	X
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	X
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	X
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)	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X

349. Is your country collaborating with other Parties on the conservation and sustainable use of pollinators?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
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)	X
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	X
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	X
b) yes - under consideration	
c) yes - measures under development	
353. Has your country carried out scientific assessments on <u>inter alia</u> ecological, social and economic effects of genetic use restriction technologies?	
a) no	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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

The Finnish Environment Institute (FEI) has carried out a pilot study in cooperation with Estonia on the diversity and monitoring methods of pollinator communities in Eastern Fennoscandia and Eastern Baltics. (Publication: Söderman, Guy 1999: Diversity of pollinator communities in Eastern Fennoscandia and Eastern Baltics. Results from pilot monitoring with Yellow traps in 1997 - 1998. The Finnish Environment 355. 69 pp. Helsinki).

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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X

366. Will your country contribute to the future work of the UN Forum on Forests?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
367. Has your country provided relevant information on the implementation of this work programme?	
a) no	
b) yes - submission of case-studies	X
c) yes - thematic national report submitted	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
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	X
c) to a significant extent	

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

Finland supports programs through bilateral development co-operations in Namibia, Burkina Faso and North Africa/Middle East which include components on biodiversity conservation within the framework of these Decisions.

See also Finland's National report for CBD on Forest ecosystems (May 2001).

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	X
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	X
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	X
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:

- Finland's revised constitution recognises the biodiversity obligations in section 20 as follows: "Nature, its biodiversity, the environment and the national heritage are the responsibility of everyone".
- Legislative reforms (see above). In the last few years, Finland has made encouraging progress in the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of resources and in revising the legislative requirements accordingly.
- The international cooperation (EU, multi- and bi-lateral) activities has developed in line with the principle of sector integration and sectoral responsibility i.e. The EU Biodiversity Strategy (1998) and its Action plans (2001).

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

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

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

Date of completion:	30.6.1997		
If the NBSAP has been adopted by the Government			
By which authority?	Ministry of the Environment		
On what date?	1.11.1997		
If the NBSAP has been published please give			
Title:	National Action plan for Biodiversity in Finland, 1997-2005		
Name and address of publisher:	Ministry of the Environment, Finland Land Use Department P.O.Box 380 FIN - 00131 Helsinki		
ISBN:	951 - 731 - 025 - 0		
Price (if applicable):	150 FIM		
Other information on ordering:	Edita Oy/Ab (Finnish Version) http://www.edita.fi/netmarket		
If the NBSAP has not been published			
Please give full details of how copies can be obtained:			
If the NBSAP has been posted on a national website			
Please give full URL:	http://www.biodiv.org/natrep/finland/finland.pdf		
If the NBSAP has been lodged with an Implementing Agency of the GEF			
Please indicate which agency:			
Has a copy of the NBSAP been lodged with the Convention Secretariat?			
Yes	X	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

First progress report: The Implementation of the National Action Plan for Biodiversity in Finland 1997-1999.

Date of completion: 15.1.2000 by the National Biodiversity Committee chaired by Ministry of the Environment.

Delivered to the COP5 in Nairobi 2000 and lodged with the Convention secretariat.

(Available at <http://www.vyh.fi/eng/environ/bdclearh/follow.htm>)

National Country Study on Biodiversity (Edita, Helsinki, 1998 only in Finnish):

Suomen luonnon monimuotoisuus. Toimittanut Iris Lappalainen.

(Biological Diversity in Finland. Country study. Editor Iris Lappalainen)

1. BIODIVERSITY RESEARCH PROJECTS - The Finnish Clearing-House

Mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity

<http://www.vyh.fi/eng/environ/bdclearh/programm.htm>

2. NEWS - The Finnish Clearing-House Mechanism of the Convention on

Biological Diversity

<http://www.vyh.fi/eng/environ/bdclearh/current.htm>

3. BIODIVERSITY LEGISLATION - The Finnish Clearing-House Mechanism of

the Convention on Biological Diversity

<http://www.vyh.fi/eng/environ/bdclearh/lait.htm>

4. BIODIVERSITY POLICY IN FINLAND - The Finnish Clearing-House

Mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity

<http://www.vyh.fi/eng/environ/bdclearh/policy.htm>

5. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION - The Finnish Clearing-House Mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity

<http://www.vyh.fi/eng/environ/bdclearh/kv.htm>

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

The National Action Plan for Biodiversity in Finland (1997-2005) and its related programmes are being monitored by the Finnish National Biodiversity Committee, which involves all relevant sectors of society under the process of monitoring the implementation of CBD in Finland.

The Committee includes: all Finnish ministries, the Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities, the Confederation of Finnish Industry and Employers, the Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners, the Sami Parliament and the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation. The First National Progress Report on implementation was published in May 2000. The report was distributed to all Contracting Parties of the Convention in COP 5 in Nairobi 2000.

See more information: process of drafting this report page 7-8.