

# **EU submission to the CBD notification 2012-023 on Methodological and Implementation Guidance for the 'Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Convention's Strategy for resources Mobilization'.**

**6 July 2012**

*The submission for this Notification has a mixed format. The common EU chapeau contains the EU views and general statements, followed by individual inputs from Member States.*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The EU and its Member States are committed to providing robust information on mobilisation of resources within the EU to the extent that is possible. We believe this is important information for all Parties to provide to support the discussion on resource mobilisation in Hyderabad.

This submission addresses both contributions from the EU budget and from individual EU Member States. Information on the national budgets of several Member States is included in annex.

EU Member States have their own internal methodology for accounting resources. In addition, using the 2006-2010 yearly average has not always been possible at national level, and the years or periods of years chosen for reporting differ across countries depending on data availability. This makes it difficult to compile and compare the data. As many details as possible are provided on each methodology for the sake of transparency and to account for possible differences. These issues might be addressed through further iterations of this process. The EU stresses that continued efforts will be made to further refine accounting methods, using the guidance of the CBD decisions as well as the on-going work on the utilisation of OECD-DAC indicators and Rio-markers.

The Rio marker, including the marker on biodiversity, are qualitative and intended to help the monitoring the aid targeting the objectives of the CBD. Given that the common guidelines for the methodology to account for the quantitative amounts for biodiversity support is are still to be developed, the data provided might still be difficult to be compared. The development of methodological guidance, in accordance with the invitation made to the OECD/DAC by paragraph 12 of Decision X/3 of the CBD, would be needed in order to ensure solid and robust information on biodiversity-related ODA.

Quality and guidelines for reporting biodiversity-related ODA have improved since 2006.

## **2. EU BUDGET**

This part of the submission focuses on resources within the EU budget. Identifying biodiversity-related expenses is only possible to a limited extent in the current financing framework (2007-2013), and the figures provided below have therefore a low level of confidence. This should be seen as a first attempt to apply the Preliminary Reporting Framework, to be improved in future exercises. The European Commission is planning to develop a methodology to track biodiversity-related expenses in the next EU budget (2014-2020), which will help improve estimates and provide more consistency.

## 1. International Flows of Financial resources

International Flows of Financial resources at EU level mainly related to ODA, which is the focus of this section.

### ODA from the EU budget

It was not possible to distinguish between categories A, B, C and D at this stage, nor to differentiate between bilateral and multilateral ODA as there is no marker for this in the EU or OECD database. The table below therefore reports a single figure for ODA per year.

The European Commission tags systematically its contribution to biodiversity with the OECD DAC Rio markers in all its external financial instruments since 2008. To avoid overestimation of the financial support for meeting the obligations of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the European Commission applies a fixed adjustment factor to account for activities that are only partially relevant to the objectives of the CBD. Only 40% of the allocated budget is accounted if biodiversity conservation is only a significant objective (i.e. Rio Marker 1) whereas 100% is accounted if biodiversity is a principal objective (i.e. Rio Marker 2). This method also applies for climate finance. The figures below have been calculated following this methodology.

EU institutions	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Average 2007-2010
1	-	61	64	187	162	
2	-	72	95	59	98	
Total	-	134	158	246	259	199

**EU's institutions biodiversity-related Official Development Assistance, 2006-2010 adjusted deflators (Commitments, EUR million at constant 2010 prices) Source: OECD DAC/CRS.**

## 2. Information on the availability of financial resources in each country

The submissions of each EU Member State are included in annex. They follow the structure of the preliminary reporting framework (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add.1).

The information used in this table is mostly taken from the commitments made in the 2007-2013 EU budget, averaged over one year. This is taken as a reasonable approximation of yearly average expenditure over the period 2006-2010. Most of the EU funds do not finance the total envelope of projects and EU Member States also provide co-financing. While the table presented here only covers spending at EU level and excludes national level biodiversity spending, it is important to note that when aggregating funding from the EU budget and from EU Member States, there is therefore a risk of double counting. Reporting in the annexes has to the extent possible concentrated on national co-financing to limit this risk.

Year: average 2006-2010		Currency: Euro (unit: million EUR)									
		Activity categories								Total	
Source: EU budget commitments		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable prod. and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1 Government budgets	Central	597.4	low	29.3	low	6371.1	low	14880.2	low	21878.0	low
	State/Provincial										
	Local/Municipal										
2.2 Private/Markets											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, academia)											
Total:		597.4		29.3		6371.1		14880.2		21878.0	

Comments: yearly average of commitments 2007-2013 taken as an estimate of average for 2006-2010.

- Category A includes EAFRD Natura 2000 payments (84.3); EFF payments for 'protection of aquatic flora and fauna'; Category 51 'Promotion of biodiversity and Nature protection' from ERDF and CF (384); LIFE+ Nature and Biodiversity (119.5). This is likely to be a strong underestimate of total expenses directly related to biodiversity, but these are currently difficult to track in the EU budget.
- Category B includes FP6 and FP7 spending on biodiversity-related research projects (yearly average 2006-2010). Other funds provide funding for developing biodiversity management plans (e.g. EARDF, axis3), which are not included here.
- Category C includes EARDF agri-environment (3200) and forest-environment payments (2800) - EAFRD non productive investments also have some biodiversity impacts but the proportion is difficult to estimate and therefore not included; CF and ERDF category 55 "Promotion of natural assets" (162) and 56 "Protection and development of natural heritage" (201); EFF aqua-environmental measures (8.1) - EFF is contributing more widely to mainstreaming biodiversity in fisheries management, but quantitative data are only available at MS level.
- Category D includes CF and ERDF for direct (water treatment, etc.: 5900 ) and indirect (e.g. developing green transport, sustainable energy and urban rehabilitation: 8571.4) environmental investments; LIFE+ environment projects other than biodiversity and nature (408.8); The Common Agricultural Policy also contributes through pillar 1 (not included here) through compulsory cross compliance, including good agricultural and environment condition (GAEC) on avoiding the deterioration of habitats. Some EARDF measures on training, advisory services are also related to biodiversity. The ESF also contributes through promoting employment and better prepared workforce for biodiversity protection. The EFF also supports schemes for diversification of activities, which could include biodiversity protection.

**EARDF: European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development; EFF: European Fisheries Fund; CF: Cohesion Fund; ERDF: European Regional Development Fund; ESF: European Social Fund; FP6 and FP7: 6th and 7th Research Framework Programme**

**Table 2: Resources for financing domestic biodiversity within the EU budget**

For many EU financing instruments, and national Member States budgets, it is difficult to distinguish within budget lines what is specifically targeting biodiversity protection. Therefore only the budget lines which are clearly targeted to biodiversity protection (e.g. Natura 2000) have been included in category A. As other budget lines also contribute to biodiversity protection, but not in totality, the amounts in category A in particular are likely to be significantly underestimated.

The outcome of this exercise and the reporting from Member States in annex shows that the reporting framework needs to be further developed based on the experience of the first round.

### 3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	Yes	2008 - 2010	EC contribution to TEEB	TEEB Reports
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps, and funding priorities	Yes	Ongoing		Preliminary estimations in EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020; further assessment ongoing.
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	Yes	2009-2011		Resource mobilisation sections of EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 adopted on 11 May 2011; biodiversity considerations integrated in European Commission Proposals for 2014-2020 budget
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies				
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	Yes	2010-2011		Biodiversity considerations integrated in European Commission Proposals for 2014-2020 budget
<b>Comments: see</b> <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/comm2006/pdf/2020/1_EN_ACT_part1_v7%5B1%5D.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/comm2006/pdf/2020/1_EN_ACT_part1_v7%5B1%5D.pdf</a>				

### 4. Information on specific issues related to Resource availability.

#### 4.1 Technical cooperation, capacity building and south-south cooperation

These figures have been included in section 1.

#### 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies

Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out		
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced		

**Comments:** The last reform of the Common Agricultural Policy, and the current reforms of the Common Agricultural Policy and the Common Fisheries Policy aim at reducing support which has a negative environmental impact, whilst rewarding practices that deliver public goods, including biodiversity. It is however very difficult to estimate values associated with these reforms. Important efforts are being made as well at national level by EU Member States and are reported in the annexes attached to this submission.

#### 4.3 New and innovative financing mechanisms

Year:

Currency:

Type of Initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
Comments: Innovative financing mechanisms are being explored at EU level. The next financial budget will include financial instruments which may apply to biodiversity, and innovative financing mechanisms such as payments for ecosystem services and biodiversity offsets are being explored in the context of policy initiatives such as a Green Infrastructure strategy and a No Net Loss initiative. Important efforts are being made as well at national level by EU Member States and are reported in the annexes attached to this submission.			

#### 4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
<b>Comments:</b> Under development	

#### Identification of respondent:

Country: European Union	Name of respondent: Laure Ledoux
Please indicate of whose behalf this is being completed:	Focal point for resource mobilization
Title and department of respondent:	Policy Officer, Unit B2 - Biodiversity, DG Environment, European Commission
Organization of respondent:	European Commission
Email address:	<a href="mailto:Laure.Ledoux@ec.europa.eu">Laure.Ledoux@ec.europa.eu</a>
Telephone contact:	+32 229 57384
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	01/07/2012

### 3. NATIONAL SUBMISSIONS BY EU MEMBER STATES

See individual submissions in annex.

## BELGIUM

### SUBMISSION BY BELGIUM TO THE CBD NOTIFICATION 2012-23 ON THE METHODOLOGICAL AND IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE FOR THE “INDICATORS FOR MONITORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION’S STRATEGY FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION”

#### Identification of respondent

<b>Country: Belgium</b>	<b>Name of respondent: Els Van de Velde</b>
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focal point for resource mobilization <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify
Title and Department of respondent:	Advisor International Environmental Policy Environment, Nature and Energy Department
Organization of respondent:	Flemish government
Email address:	Els.vandevelde@lne.vlaanderen.be
Telephone contact:	+32 2 553 81 76 +32 499 86 52 91
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	

#### Introduction

**Belgium provided data for the year 2010, where possible. In some cases we provided data for the period 2006-2010.** We provided the figures in **EURO**. Belgium did not use the categorization of biodiversity activities.

The implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity is carried out by the federal government, the regions and communities (Flemish, Brussels-Capital and Walloon) and the local authorities (provinces and municipalities).

The regions are in charge of territorial matters. They have therefore the greatest amount of responsibilities on biodiversity-related issues: nature conservation, forest management, agriculture, exploitation of natural resources, land use and spatial planning, hunting, fisheries, etc. They are also in charge of tourism, which is a competence that has been delegated to them by the communities.

The Federal government is more specifically involved in the international dimension, the external relations and in matters related to the North Sea. It is the Federal government that undertakes the follow-up of trade in threatened species and that takes measures relating to the trade of exotic species.

The Communities take care of issues linked to culture, research, education and public awareness. The Regions and the Federal government can also raise public awareness in their own fields of competence.

The provinces and the municipalities play an important role at the local level, in accordance with regional policy.

<b>Information on international flows for biodiversity</b>	
ODA Bilateral	<b>17.520.219€in 2010</b>  Information is available on ODA-dBase (public). Calculation has been done on the basis of the CRS-system (Credit Reporting System, OECD/DAC), where weighing factors per sub-sector are applied. The sum of the weighing factors for climate change, biodiversity and desertification never exceeds the 100%. Thereafter a manual control has been imposed and corrections done. Bilateral includes the indirect sector (NGO's, universities, institutes...), not the private sector.
ODA Multilateral	<b>28.267.882€in 2010</b>  Information is available on ODA-dBase (public). Calculation has been done on the basis of the CRS-system (Credit Reporting System, OECD/DAC), where weighing factors per sub-sector are applied. The sum of the weighing factors for climate change, biodiversity and desertification never exceeds the 100%. Thereafter a manual control has been imposed and corrections done (eg. for GEF and other multilateral agencies). Multilateral does not include the transfers to the EU (European Union).
Other public funds	This information is not automatically available on our ODA-dBase. BE is working on this to include these figures in the general dBase.
Private/Market	Notavailable.
Notforprofitorganizations	Part of this is included in ODA Bilateral. Other information is not available.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>45.788.101 € in 2010</b>
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Division by sector/type :</b>  The main sectors where biodiversity is a major concern are: agriculture (30%), water (14%), forestry(10%), environment (31%)and multisectoralprogrammes(14%). The bilateral part is divided in governmental activities (16%) and activities from non-governmental actors (NGA'S) (22%). The multilateral activities comprise 62% of the Belgian efforts for biodiversity.

<b>Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country</b>	
<b>Government budgets</b>	
Central level	<b>Directorate General for Development (DGD)</b> is a part of the Federal Public Service (FPS) Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation. <b>428.882 € in 2010</b>  This amount includes: overhead costs (missions and evaluations) and rough salary estimates.
Central level	<b>The Federal Public Service Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment</b> <b>4.325.750 € in 2010</b>  This amount reflects the contribution of the FPS to the implementation of

	CITES, the Cartagena Protocol and the CBD, in particular for the marine environment. It covers mainly rough salary estimates, subsidies, studies and working expenses. Mission costs were not included.
Central level	<p><b>Belgian Federal Science Policy Office (BELSPO)</b> is a government institution responsible for coordinating science policy at a federal level.  <b>32.270.000 € for the period 2006-2010</b></p> <p>This amount includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- amounts of money (rough estimates) allocated to 9 projects carried out within the framework of the STEREOII programme "support to exploitation and research in Earth Observation data (using remote sensing techniques)" during the period 2006-2010. Projects mainly deal with Ecosystem Services (ES) and habitats monitoring and classification or aim at providing scientific support tools to Ecosystem Services management.</li> <li>- amount of money allocated to 11 research projects in the framework of the programme "a Science for sustainable management" during the period 2006-2010. The projects aim at providing scientific support to BD management policies.</li> <li>- BCCM : Belgian coordinated collection of microorganisms (2006-2010)</li> <li>- Belgian Biodiversity platform (2006-2010)</li> </ul>
Central level	<p><b>The Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences (RBINS):4.335.815 € in 2010.</b></p> <p>The RBINS is one of the 10 scientific institutions of the federal government. It hosts the national Museum of natural history and is National Focal Point to the CBD. The amount provided for 2010 corresponds to 'research' and 'scientific service' projects related to biodiversity and ecosystems.</p> <p>What is included in the total:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- salaries, equipment and functioning of research and expertise projects for which, as far as we know, have not been taken into account elsewhere.</li> <li>- functioning of the National Focal Point to the CBD (except for the capacity building aspects sponsored by the Belgian Development Cooperation, which are included in amounts mentioned by DGD).</li> </ul> <p>What is not included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- subsidies coming from federal and regional administrations in Belgium and coming from European and international sources for which we are sure they have been taken into account elsewhere (e.g. projects sponsored by the Belgian Development Cooperation, by BELSPO or by the regional administrations and covered by the programmes mentioned above or below).</li> <li>- activities of the Museum, educational and public awareness activities.</li> </ul>
Regional level	<p><b>Flemish region:132.858.164€ in 2010</b></p> <p>At this point in time data is only available from the Environment, Nature and Energy Policy Area. This includes data from the Environment, Nature and Energy Department (LNE) and the 3 agencies: the Agency for Nature and Forests (ANB), Institute for Nature and Forest Research (INBO) and the Flemish Land Company (VLM).</p>
Regional level	<p><b>Walloon region:60.244.834,47 € in 2010</b></p> <p>This includes budgets related to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in the different activities of the Directorate General for Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment (D GARNE) and the Walloon Air and Climate Agency (AWAC), including the staff. This includes, in addition to the nature budget, part of the budget dedicated to the management of forest, watercourses, hunting, fisheries, waste..., but also part of the budget for policy</p>



	areas such as air, climate and agriculture.
Regional level	<b>Brussels region: 1.088.000 € in 2012</b> (could serve as estimate for 2010) This includes budgets related to biodiversity conservation, forest and nature reserves management, staff not included.
Local level: Provinces and municipalities	Not available
Private/market	Not available
NGO	Not available
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>209 745 445,47 in 2010</b>
<b>Comments</b>	To calculate the total amount for 2010 only 1/5th of the BELSPO budget was taken into account.

### Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization

Assessment of values of biodiversity	<p><b>Belgian Federal Science Policy Office (BELSPO)</b></p> <p>BEES project : BElgium Ecosystem Services - A new vision for society–nature interactions (2010-2012). (100.000 €)</p> <p><i>Objectives:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bring together key scientists, policy makers and organizations that are either already involved with Ecosystem Services (ES) research or who might catalyze the ES research.</li> <li>- Make an inventory of the ES expertise</li> <li>- Obtain an overview of ES related research in Belgium and bring forward a methodology that could be used as a basis for an ecosystem assessment of Belgium.</li> <li>- Evaluate the opportunity to establish a “virtual” research institute on ES research in Belgium, covering the necessary expertise to contribute to large international research initiatives.</li> <li>- Formulate recommendations for scientific programs and policy objectives.</li> </ul> <p>Support of several research projects aimed at providing tools for assessing the values of biodiversity and ecosystems services (2010-2012)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BIOSERF (800.000 €) <a href="http://www.belspo.be/belspo/SSD/science/projects/BIOSERF_EN.pdf">http://www.belspo.be/belspo/SSD/science/projects/BIOSERF_EN.pdf</a></li> <li>- ECOFRESH (350.000 €) <a href="http://www.belspo.be/belspo/SSD/science/projects/ECOFRESH.E.pdf">http://www.belspo.be/belspo/SSD/science/projects/ECOFRESH.E.pdf</a></li> <li>- VOTES (350.000 €) <a href="http://www.belspo.be/belspo/fedra/proj.asp?l=en&amp;COD=SD/TE/05A">http://www.belspo.be/belspo/fedra/proj.asp?l=en&amp;COD=SD/TE/05A</a></li> <li>- INVALUABLE ( EU biodivERsA project) (100.000 €) <a href="http://www.biodiversa.org/118">http://www.biodiversa.org/118</a></li> <li>- smallFOREST ( EU biodivERsA project) (100.000 €) <a href="http://www.biodiversa.org/119">http://www.biodiversa.org/119</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Studies on assessments Flanders:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Ecosysteemdiensten in Vlaanderen: Een verkennende inventarisatie van ecosysteemdiensten en potentiële ecosysteemwinsten”. The study describes the main ecosystems and their services in Flanders and gives a first mapping and inventory of the potential benefits and of 5 site specific pilot projects.</li> </ul>
--------------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- De handleiding "Economischewaardering van ecosysteemdiensten": a guideline for economic valuation of ecosystem services – a social cost-benefits analysis of development projects.</li> <li>- On-line system for assessing nature values: an instrument to quantify and value the main ecosystem services for the assessment of projects with an impact on nature.</li> <li>- feasibility study for the development of a TEEB report for Flanders (ongoing).</li> </ul>
Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	/
Development of national financial plans for biodiversity (refer to financial plans developed as part of national biodiversity strategies and action plans)	/
Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	The Federal Public Services Public Health, Security of the Food Chain and Environment, the Belgian Development Cooperation and the Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences undertake since 2010 activities for the mainstreaming of biodiversity into policies and programmes of the federal government. These activities include the training of civil servants on understanding the critical role played by biodiversity and ecosystem services in their fields of activities.
Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	/

#### 4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability

##### 4.1 Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation

North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided	<p>See ODA. Most of the ODA-activities contain components of capacity building (CB) and/or technology transfer (TT). <b>For the moment it's not possible to calculate the total part on CB and TT.</b></p> <p>The Belgian Development Cooperation sponsors a programme by the Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences to build capacities in the field of biodiversity and ecosystem services. This includes support to research institutions as well as to National Focal Points (CBD, CHM, GTI) in developing countries.</p> <p><b>855.089 € in 2010</b></p>
Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity building through triangular cooperation	This kind of cooperation is not well developed in the Belgian Development Cooperation. Planning in the future could be considered.

## 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies

Removed, reformed or phased-out	Not available.
---------------------------------	----------------

Positive incentives introduced	Not available.
--------------------------------	----------------

**Flanders** – positive incentives and subsidies: with the view to enhance and support participation by NGO's and private land owners in the conservation and management of Natura 2000, a review of the existing financial instruments was carried out. The goal is to adapt mechanisms and develop new instruments. As this process is ongoing, values are not yet defined.

## New and innovative financial mechanism

In the future the new service of **Directorate General for Development** (inclusive growth) will provide the necessary follow-up. Until now the only kind of activities in this field consisted in the participation in workshops and conferences.

## Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention

Not available.

## BULGARIA

### **PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK**

#### **Identification of respondent**

**Please complete the following table:**

Country: Bulgaria	Name of respondent: Ministry of Environment and Water (MOEW)
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed: Stoyan Vergiev	<input type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input type="checkbox"/> Focal point for resource mobilization <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify: Public servant
Title and Department of respondent:	National Nature Protection Service – Directorate (NNPS)
Organization of respondent:	MOEW
Email address:	<a href="mailto:stojan_ver@moew.government.bg">stojan_ver@moew.government.bg</a>
Telephone contact:	+3592 940 61 09
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	20.06.2012

#### **1. Information on International Flows of Financial Resources**

This section of the Framework relates to the flows of financial resources from all sources to developing countries.

For **developed countries** (members of OECD-DAC): **Please indicate the amount of resources provided in support of biodiversity in developing countries through ODA, other public funds, private/market mechanisms and through not-for profit organizations.** For **developing countries** (countries, not members of OECD -DAC): **Please indicate the amount of resources received from external sources through ODA, other public funds, private/market mechanisms and through not-for profit organizations.**

For each of the expenditure sources listed please indicate the total amount of financial resources spent as well as an assessment of your confidence in the estimated amount (high, medium low; alternatively provide a range of estimates). ***Please take care to avoid double counting; expenditure included in one row of the table should not also be included in another.*** You may indicate expenditures according to the four categories, or provide an estimate of the total without categorization. A list of indicative activities for each of the four categories is provided in section 5. Please provide data for multiple years if possible (duplicate the table as necessary).

Year: 2011			Currency: USD									
Type of financial flows			Activity categories <sup>1</sup>								Total	
			Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management.		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
1.1Official Development Assistance <sup>2</sup>	1.1.1 Bilateral <sup>3</sup>			50136	medium							
	1.1.2 Multilateral <sup>4</sup>											
1.2 Other public funds <sup>5</sup>												
1.3 Private/ Market <sup>6</sup>												
1.4 Not for profit organizations												
Total:										50136	low	
Comments: The financial support is provided d by programme Short term financing of European Commission for realization of Project Bulgarian contribution to Short term financing 2011-2012: Assistance for capacity building in former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for realization of monitoring, reporting and verification of emissions of hothouse gasses.												

## **2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country**

This section of the Framework relates to the financial resources available to implement the Convention and its Strategic Plan in your country. It relates specifically to the end use of financial resources regardless of whether the source of the funds is domestic or external.

**Please indicate the financial support to domestic activities intended to achieve the objectives of this Convention from all sources.** For each of the expenditure sources listed please indicate the total amount of financial resources spent as well as an assessment of your confidence in the estimated amount (high, medium low; alternatively provide a range of estimates). You may indicate expenditures according to the four categories, or provide an estimate of the total without

<sup>1</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>2</sup> **Official Development Assistance (ODA)** refers to flows of official financing administered with the purpose of promoting economic development and welfare of developing countries as the main objective, and which are concessional in character with a grant element of at least 25 per cent (using a fixed 10 per cent rate of discount). ODA can be bilateral or multilateral. Where resources are provided or received for general budget support rather than for specific activities, an estimate of resources provided/received for biodiversity may be calculated from the proportion of the recipient country's budget devoted to such activities.

<sup>3</sup> **Bilateral ODA** refers to contributions of donor government agencies, at all levels, to developing countries

<sup>4</sup> **Multilateral ODA** refers to funds provided through international financial institutions such as the Global Environment Facility, the World Bank and United Nations funds and programmes.

<sup>5</sup> This category includes **non-ODA public funding**, also called "other official flows" (OOFs), which refers to transactions by the official sector with countries on the List of Aid Recipients which do not meet the conditions for eligibility as Official Development Assistance. The category also includes resources provided from other "non-donor" countries i.e. through "**South-South Cooperation**".

<sup>6</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transaction mediated through a market.

categorization. A list of indicative activities for each of the four categories is provided in section 5. Please provide data for multiple years if possible (duplicate the table as necessary).

*Please take care to avoid double counting; expenditure included in one row of the table should not also be included in another.* As this question specifically relates to domestic expenditures *if you are representing a developed country (members of OECD-DAC) please do not include any funding provided to other countries.* However, *if you are representing a developing country (not a members of OECD -DAC) please include the money received from other countries.*

Year: 2006			Currency: USD									
Source			Activity categories <sup>7</sup>								Total	
			Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets <sup>8</sup>	2.1.1 Central		207449	low			13862501	low	59698	low	14129648	low
	2.1.2 State/Provincial											
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal											
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>9</sup>												
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>10</sup>												
Total:											14129648	low
Comments:												

<sup>7</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>8</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for “central” and for “local/municipal”. When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>9</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>10</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.

Year: 2007			Currency: USD									
Source			Activity categories <sup>11</sup>								Total	
			Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets <sup>12</sup>	2.1.1 Central		646529	medium	3726491	medium	15343708	medium	414791	medium	20131519	medium
	2.1.2 State/Provincial											
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal											
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>13</sup>												
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>14</sup>												
Total:											20131519	low
Comments: В следващите табл. - също												

<sup>11</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>12</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for “central” and for “local/municipal”. When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>13</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>14</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.

Year: 2008			Currency: USD									
Source			Activity categories <sup>15</sup>								Total	
			Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets <sup>16</sup>	2.1.1 Central		716096	medium	9086217	medium	21275527	medium	575197	medium	31653037	medium
	2.1.2 State/Provincial											
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal											
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>17</sup>												
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>18</sup>												
Total:											31653037	low
Comments:												

<sup>15</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>16</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for “central” and for “local/municipal”. When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>17</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>18</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.



Year: 2009			Currency: USD									
Source			Activity categories <sup>19</sup>								Total	
			Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets <sup>20</sup>	2.1.1 Central		784455	medium	2948401	medium	162906412	medium	548249	medium	20571746	medium
	2.1.2 State/Provincial											
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal											
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>21</sup>												
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>22</sup>												
Total:											20571746	low
Comments:												

<sup>19</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>20</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for “central” and for “local/municipal”. When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>21</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>22</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.

Year: 2010			Currency: USD									
Source			Activity categories <sup>23</sup>								Total	
			Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets <sup>24</sup>	2.1.1 Central		506577	medium	3239389	medium	10632796	medium	398365	medium	14777127	medium
	2.1.2 State/Provincial											
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal											
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>25</sup>												
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>26</sup>												
Total:											14777127	low
Comments:												

<sup>23</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>24</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for “central” and for “local/municipal”. When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>25</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>26</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.

Year: 2011			Currency: USD									
Source			Activity categories <sup>27</sup>								Total	
			Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets <sup>28</sup>	2.1.1 Central		606371	medium	3019612	medium	4852094	medium	460548	medium	8938625	medium
	2.1.2 State/Provincial											
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal											
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>29</sup>												
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>30</sup>												
Total:											8938625	low
Comments:												

<sup>27</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>28</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for “central” and for “local/municipal”. When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>29</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>30</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.

### **3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization**

This section of the Framework addresses initiatives which are important in enabling access to financial resources for biodiversity activities. The information sought in this section does not require response in monetary units.

**Please indicate whether your country has undertaken any of the following steps to enable implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization and provide additional information as appropriate.**

If your country has undertaken any of the activities below please indicate the results which have been achieved if possible. If you are representing a developing country (not a member of the OECD -DAC) please also indicate whether external funding and/or capacity building support was received by your country to undertake the initiatives (if applicable). Please also indicate the results and year initiated and completed (where applicable).

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity <sup>31</sup>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities <sup>32</sup>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity <sup>33</sup>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies <sup>34</sup>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets <sup>35</sup>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
Comments:				

### **4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability**

This section of the Framework contains questions related to several specific issues including: technical cooperation; South-South cooperation; innovative financial mechanisms; and access and benefit sharing.

---

<sup>31</sup> Assessments of the values of biodiversity and ecosystem services comprise assessments at the national, local and/or project levels, which may be undertaken by national or international experts, to estimate the value of biodiversity.

<sup>32</sup> Funding needs, gaps and priorities are identified and reported at the national level, on the basis of the Convention and is often part of a national biodiversity strategy and action plan process.

<sup>33</sup> National financial plans for biodiversity refer to financial plans developed as part of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

<sup>34</sup> Development plans and strategies may take various forms in different countries, such as national poverty reduction strategies or national sustainability strategies.

<sup>35</sup> A **national budget** which integrates biodiversity considerations would normally contain a section or paragraph dealing with biodiversity.

#### 4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation

For **developed countries** (members of OECD -DAC): Please indicate the number and value of technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives in support of biodiversity that are financed by your country as well as support to South-South cooperation through triangular cooperation. As far as is possible, please include the amount of resources provided through ODA, other public funds, private/market mechanisms and through non-for profit organizations.<sup>36</sup> You may also provide a description of the types of initiatives supported.

Year:

Currency:

Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided <sup>37</sup>				
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity-building through triangular cooperation <sup>38</sup>				
Comments:				

For **developing countries** (countries, not members of OECD -DAC): please indicate the number of technical cooperation and capacity building initiatives that support biodiversity from which you have received resources and the numbers of initiatives that have been financed by your country. Please indicate the number of initiatives and the amount of resources made available. Please also provide a description of the types of initiatives supported.

Year:

Currency:

Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.3 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building received <sup>15</sup>				
4.1.4 South-South technical cooperation & capacity building received from other developing countries <sup>39</sup>				
4.1.5 South-South technical cooperation and capacity building - Provided <sup>17</sup>				
Comments:				

#### 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies

---

<sup>36</sup> Note that your response to section 2 would already include such resources within the totals provided; this question is intended to elucidate specific information for indicators (8) and (9) of decision X/3.

<sup>37</sup> North-south technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives are those in which resources and/or expertise are provided by a developed country to a developing country.

<sup>38</sup> While South-South cooperation and capacity building is by definition between developing countries, in some instances developed countries may provide resources and expertise which play a catalytic role in such initiatives. This type of support is commonly referred to as "triangular cooperation" and should be noted.

<sup>39</sup> South-South Cooperation describes the exchange of resources, technology, and knowledge between developing countries. Developing countries participating in these types of initiatives can be recipients and/or providers of resources. In this field developing countries are asked to indicate separately the resources they have provided and received through such initiatives.

Please indicate the value of incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity<sup>40</sup> that have been removed, phased out or reformed and the value of positive incentives introduced.

Year:

Currency:

Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out		
4.2.2 Positive incentives <sup>41</sup> introduced		
Comments :		

### 4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism

Please identify the new and innovative financial mechanisms that have been implemented by your country or in which your country has participated.

Please indicate the type of initiative and the amount of financial resources generated (where known; order of magnitude estimates are better than none). Please also indicate whether and how the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity were considered and provide a brief description of the initiative, including the year of its establishment and operation.

Year:

Currency:

Type of Initiative <sup>42</sup>	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
Comments:			

### 4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention

Please indicate the number of access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms your country has undertaken that enhance resource mobilization:

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
Meetings and discussions between affected administrations regarding Nagoya Protocol.	Assignment of the problem and necessity of applying of new approaches for mobilization of resources for achieving Protocol goals.
<p>There is lack of understanding regarding financial aspects and resources mobilizations.</p> <p>In this relation national measures for capacity building are planned.</p> <p>We are on the position that this matter is high priority and it is necessary to be planned and implemented measures/programmes for capacity building, share of experience, applying of same approaches and equalization between member states in the frames of European Union. Together with this is important the stakeholders to be included in mobilization of resources processes.</p>	

## 5. Activity Classification

<sup>40</sup> **Incentives** harmful to biodiversity emanate from policies or programmes that induce unsustainable behaviour harmful to biodiversity, often as unanticipated and unintended side effects of policies or programmes designed to achieve other objectives. Types of possibly harmful incentives include production subsidies and consumer subsidies while policies and laws governing resource use, such as land tenure systems and environmental resource management, can also have harmful effects.

<sup>41</sup> **Positive incentive** measures are economic, legal or institutional measures designed to encourage beneficial activities.

<sup>42</sup> **Types of initiatives** might include: payment for ecosystem services; biodiversity offset mechanisms; environmental fiscal reforms; markets for green products; business-biodiversity partnerships; new forms of charity; integrating biodiversity and ecosystem services in the development of new and innovative sources of international development finance and funding mechanisms for climate change which consider biodiversity and ecosystem services.

**For the resource classification mentioned in sections 1 and 2 above please indicate which types of initiatives you have considered under each category.** A brief description of each of the categories as well as an indicative list of the actions that could be considered under each category is provided below. Please select all that apply. Please also list any additional activities considered under each category.

	Activity classification			
	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D
<b>Default Description</b>	<p>Activities where biodiversity protection is the main purpose, such as activities funded by environmental agencies that directly and intentionally impact biodiversity.</p> <p>Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan</p>	<p>Activities related to policy development and administration carried out in part or entirely by environmental agencies</p> <p>Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan</p>	<p>Activities related to sustainable use and sustainable management that have co-benefits for biodiversity. Activities under this category would generally be lead by agencies outside of the environmental sector</p> <p>Activities related to Articles 8, 10 and 11 of the Convention as well Targets 5-8, 10, 14 and 15 of the Strategic Plan</p>	<p>Activities related to sustainable production and consumption where the responsibility lies with multiple government entities, the private sector and the general public.</p> <p>Activities related to Articles 11 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 1-4 of the Strategic Plan</p>
<b>Activities considered</b> <i>(Please check those that apply)</i>	<p><b>Safeguarding biodiversity</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in situ/ex situ conservation</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protected areas</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maintaining genetic diversity</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats from invasive alien species</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats to specific ecosystems and/or species</p>	<p><b>Biodiversity Planning</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NBASP development</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CHM related activities</p> <p><b>Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ABS frameworks</p> <p><b>Biosafety</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biosafety frameworks</p>	<p><b>Sustainable management of ecosystems</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries, etc)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to conserve water and prevent pollution</p> <p><b>Land use and climate related activities</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Managing land use to protect biodiversity, mitigate climate change and increase resilience</p>	<p><b>Measures in the wider economy and society</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning, fiscal and regularity measures to promote sustainable consumption and production</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Broad scale public awareness and education measures.</p>
<b>Additional activities</b> <i>(Please add additional activities not already included in the row above)</i>				

*Appendix*

**HOW THE INDICATORS CONTAINED IN DECISION X/3 ARE COVERED BY THE DATA FIELDS IN THE PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK**

Indicators from decision X/3		Relevant data field in the reporting framework	Explanation and further notes
1. Aggregated financial flows, in the amount and where relevant percentage, of biodiversity-related funding, per annum, for achieving the Convention's three objectives, in a manner that avoids double counting, both in total and in, <i>inter alia</i> , the following categories:	(a) Official Development Assistance (ODA);	1.1	Includes bilateral (1.1.1) and multilateral (1.1.2)
	(b) Domestic budgets at all levels;	2.1	Includes government agencies and other publically funded entities at three levels of government: central/national/federal (2.1.1), state/provincial (2.1.2) and local/municipal (2.1.3).
	(c) Private sector;	2.2 and 1.3	2.2 indicates total available from private/market sources; 1.3 indicates international flows of private/market resources
	(d) Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia;	2.3 and 1.4	2.3 indicates total available from non profit organizations not already included above; 1.4 indicates international flows of such resources
	(e) International financial institutions;	1.1.1	Included within multilateral ODA. This date from countries will be supplemented by information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat from the organizations concerned and made available to Parties for their review
	(f) United Nations organizations, funds and programmes	1.1.1	
	(g) Non-ODA public funding;	1.2	
	(h) South-South cooperation initiatives;	4.1	
	(i) Technical cooperation;	4.1	
2. Number of countries that have:	(a) Assessed values of biodiversity, in accordance with the Convention;	3.1	
	(b) Identified and reported funding needs, gaps and priorities;	3.2	
	(c) Developed national financial plans for biodiversity;	3.3	
	(d) Been provided with the necessary funding and capacity building to undertake the above activities	3	
3. Amount of domestic financial support, per annum, in respect of those domestic activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of this Convention;		2 (less 1)	Includes all domestic sources (2.1 + 2.2 + 2.3) less, for developing countries, that received from other countries (1)



Indicators from decision X/3	Relevant data field in the reporting framework	Explanation and further notes
4. Amount of funding provided through the Global Environment Facility and allocated to biodiversity focal area;	None	Global indicator – Information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat from GEF Secretariat and made available to Parties for their review
5. Level of CBD and Parties' support to other financial institutions that promote replication and scaling-up of relevant successful financial mechanisms and instruments;	None	Global indicator – Information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat and made available to Parties for their review
6. Number of international financing institutions, United Nations organizations, funds and programmes, and the development agencies that report to the Development Assistance Committee of Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/DAC), with biodiversity and associated ecosystem services as a cross-cutting policy;	None	Global indicator – Information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat from the institutions concerned and made available to Parties for their review
7. Number of Parties that integrate considerations on biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services in development plans, strategies and budgets;	<b>3.4 and 3.5</b>	
8. Number of South-South cooperation initiatives conducted by developing country Parties and those that may be supported by other Parties and relevant partners, as a complement to necessary North-South cooperation;	<b>4.1</b>	Specifically <b>4.1.4, 4.1.5</b> and <b>4.1.2</b>
9. Amount and number of South-South and North-South technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives that support biodiversity;	<b>4.1</b>	
10. Number of global initiatives that heighten awareness on the need for resource mobilization for biodiversity;	None	Global indicator – Information to be gathered by the CBD Secretariat and made available to Parties for their review
11. Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries to contribute to achieving the Convention's objectives;	<b>1</b>	These two indicators are regarded as equivalent for the period of Strategic Plan 2011–2020.
12. Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020;	<b>1</b>	
13. Resources mobilized from the removal, reform or phase-out of incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity, which could be used for the promotion of positive incentives, including but not limited to innovative financial mechanisms, that are consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other international obligations, taking into account national social and economic conditions;	<b>4.2</b>	

14. Number of initiatives, and respective amounts, supplementary to the financial mechanism established under Article 21, that engage Parties and relevant organizations in new and innovative financial mechanisms, which consider intrinsic values and all other values of biodiversity, in accordance with the objectives of the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization;	<b>4.3</b>	
15. Number of access and benefit-sharing initiatives and mechanisms, consistent with the Convention and, when in effect, with the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of Their Utilization, including awareness-raising, that enhance resource mobilization;	<b>4.4</b>	

## DENMARK

### Submission to the CBD notification (2012-023) on Methodological and Implementation Guidance for the “Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Convention’s Strategy for Resources Mobilization”

Country: Denmark	Name of respondent: Jesper Tranberg
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<input type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input type="checkbox"/> Focal point for resource mobilization <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify: National CBD team
Title and Department of respondent:	Head of Section, Nature Planning and Biodiversity / Nature Agency
Organization of respondent:	Danish Ministry of the Environment
Email address:	<a href="mailto:npb@nst.dk">npb@nst.dk</a>
Telephone contact:	+45 7254 3000
Date of completion and submission of preliminary framework:	July 2012

## Introduction

In response to the call from the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and with offset in its Strategy for Resource Mobilization, this preliminary assessment focuses on Denmark’s financial contributions in support of the objectives of the CBD.

This submission is not meant to represent a final or comprehensive assessment of Denmark’s contributions towards the CBD’s three objectives. Instead Denmark has undertaken the data collection and preliminary assessment and reporting with the following three objectives;

- first of all it will contribute to building on the knowledge base needed for a robust baseline;
- secondly it is a step in the process to further develop and improve the reporting framework in order to move from the current preliminary framework to a effective one; and
- thirdly it will provide Denmark and other parties who engage in the reporting, with a better understanding of the challenges associated with collecting data and future needs for the reporting.

As this is a preliminary assessment the process has included limited involvement of NGO’s and private stakeholders in the compilation of data. Also, there has not been a comprehensive review process of the assessments within Denmark. The assessment should therefore be sited as preliminary and not be used for purposes which fall outside of its objective.

## Key findings

Based on the data sources used this assessment suggests that Denmark on average for the years 2006-2010 used 3.6 billion DKK annually on activities related to the CBD objectives.

The assessment indicates that Denmark, at national level uses between 1.1 and 1.5 billion DKK per year from 2006 to 2010.

On average Denmark provided an estimated 2.3 billion DKK annually in support of developing countries' efforts related directly to the objectives of the CBD. Multilateral aid was most significant in the five years except for 2010 where the bilateral aid exceeded the multilateral aid.

The approach to the national assessment focus on actual expenditure, directs effects on biodiversity and only to a certain extend includes indirect benefits and co-benefits. It must therefore be assumed that the result of the assessment is conservative and the estimates presented for the national flows should be seen as a low range estimate.

**Table 1. Summary of ODA and public resources from section 1 and 2**

Year: 2006-2010		Currency: million DKK					
		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Average
<b>1.1</b> Official Development Assistance	<b>1.1.1</b> Bilateral	812	560	856	621	1,796	929
	<b>1.1.2</b> Multilateral	1,153	1,286	1,532	1,253	1,490	1,343
<b>2.1:</b> Government budgets	<b>2.1.1</b> Central	863	965	1,315	1,179	841	1,033
	<b>2.1.2</b> State/Provincial	267*	-	-	-	-	261
	<b>2.1.3</b> Local/ Municipal	83	180	232	267	278	
<b>2.3:</b> Other (NGOs, foundation)		7	9	7	5	21	10
<b>Total:</b>		3,185	3,000	3,942	3,325	4,426	3,576

\* Provinces were abolished in 2006, resources spend on biodiversity were moved to the municipal or central level (the 267 million in 2006 has been included in the average of 2.1.3).

## General on Methodology

The assessment is based on publicly available and previously published sources data from 2006 to 2010. To ensure reliability, official reports such as government reports, annual reports and audited financial statements were used as a basis. The assessment of the international flows builds on the national reporting to OECD-DAC and Danida Annual Reports 2006 to 2010. For the national flows the reporting use actual spending for reporting on public resources. Due to the approach the level of confidence in the provided estimates are classified as "high".

Note that the activities included in the national assessment concentrate on the resources used directly for biodiversity. Resources used for activities that have indirect benefits or co-benefits for biodiversity is not included or only included to a very limited extend. Consideration regarding opportunity costs has not been part of the assessment as information in most cases are not readily available. The approach of focusing on actual expenditure, directs effects on biodiversity and to a great extend excluding indirect benefits and co-benefits, ensure a very conservative estimate.

Detailed information on expenditure from NGO's and private sector is not readily available and a comprehensive consultation procedure has not been made. However, an inquiry was made to the largest NGOs and private foundations in regards to their use of resources at national level. At international level the resources used by Danish NGO's has to a large extend been included under the assessment of bilateral aid. The reason being, that a large part of the funding to national NGOs comes from DANIDA and therefore is included in the DAC reporting.

Further detail regarding the methodological approach is provided under each table. All figures in this document are in Danish Crowns and displayed in millions.

# 1. International Flows of Financial Resources

Table 2:

Year: 2006 – 2010		Currency: million DKK					
Type of financial flows		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Confidence (all years)
1.1 Official Development Assistance <sup>43</sup>	1.1.1 Bilateral <sup>44</sup>	812	560	856	621	1,796	High
	1.1.2 Multilateral <sup>45</sup>	1,153	1,286	1,532	1,253	1,490	High
1.2 Other public funds <sup>46</sup>		-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3 Private/ Market <sup>47</sup>		-	-	-	-	-	-
1.4 Not for profit organizations		-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:		1,965	1,846	2,388	1,874	3,286	High
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p>1.1 Source of information are the MFA CRS-forms 2001-2010, the Danida Annual Reports 2001-2010, Danida's Programme and Project Database as well as information published in the Foreign Ministry's annual Programme and Project Orientation (PPO) and other official reports from the Foreign Ministry. The statistical summaries are compiled in report "The Danish assistance in relation to the Rio Conventions 2001 – 2010". The report is available at <a href="http://www.cbd.int/financial/doc/eu-resource-mobilization-strategy-dk-en.pdf">http://www.cbd.int/financial/doc/eu-resource-mobilization-strategy-dk-en.pdf</a>.</p> <p>Biodiversity related aid is defined as activities that promote at least one of the three objectives of the CBD: the conservation of biodiversity, the sustainable use of its components (ecosystems, species or genetic resources), or the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits of the utilisation of genetic resources.</p> <p>All funding of bilateral projects within the water, energy, agriculture, forestry and environment sectors has been examined. Both aid activities reported to OECD-DAC as targeting the Conventions as a "principal objective" and as "significant objective" have been fully included in the assessment.</p>							

<sup>43</sup> **Official Development Assistance (ODA)** refers to flows of official financing administered with the purpose of promoting economic development and welfare of developing countries as the main objective, and which are concessional in character with a grant element of at least 25 per cent (using a fixed 10 per cent rate of discount). ODA can be bilateral or multilateral. Where resources are provided or received for general budget support rather than for specific activities, an estimate of resources provided/received for biodiversity may be calculated from the proportion of the recipient country's budget devoted to such activities.

<sup>44</sup> **Bilateral ODA** refers to contributions of donor government agencies, at all levels, to developing countries

<sup>45</sup> **Multilateral ODA** refers to funds provided through international financial institutions such as the Global Environment Facility, the World Bank and United Nations funds and programmes.

<sup>46</sup> This category includes **non-ODA public funding**, also called "other official flows" (OOFs), which refers to transactions by the official sector with countries on the List of Aid Recipients which do not meet the conditions for eligibility as Official Development Assistance. The category also includes resources provided from other "non-donor" countries i.e. through "South-South Cooperation".

<sup>47</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transaction mediated through a market.

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

1.3 Denmark has the following instruments for providing aid to developing countries through the private sector: Mixed Credits and the Business-to-Business (B2B) Programme and Partnership Facility Programme. With the launch of Danida's new policy on "Growth and Employment", the B2B and IPD Programmes will be replaced by Danida Business Partnerships (mid-2011).

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

## 2. Availability of Financial Resources in each country

**Table 3:**

Year: 2006			Currency: million DKK								
Source			Activity categories <sup>48</sup>								Total
			Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption		
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts
2.1: Government budgets <sup>49</sup>	2.1.1 Central	503	High	104	High	256	High			863	
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	90	High	177	High					267	
	2.1.3 Local/ Municipal	83	High							83	
2.2 Private/ Market <sup>50</sup>											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia) <sup>51</sup>		7	Medium							7	
Total:		682		281		256				1,219	

<sup>48</sup> See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

<sup>49</sup> **Government budgets** include public money spent by government or government agencies to address domestic biodiversity issues. Resources from the different levels of government: central (national, federal); state/provincial (if applicable); and local/municipal should be included. All countries should include estimates for "central" and for "local/municipal". When providing information on government budgets Parties should ensure that funds transferred between the different levels of government are only counted once.

<sup>50</sup> The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

<sup>51</sup> **Other** represents funding that is neither public nor mediated through a market. **Non-governmental organizations** include non-profit organizations representing major groups and that are legally constituted organizations that operate independently from government. **Foundations** are non-profit organizations that typically either donate funds, provide support to other organizations, and/or directly provide funding for their own charitable purposes. **Academia** refers to all institutions aimed at advancing knowledge development, including educational and research institutions. The unifying factor between these three types of organizations is their not for profit status.

**Comments:**

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

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

2.1.2 Provinces were abolished in 2006, resources spend on biodiversity were moved to the municipal or central level.

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

2.3 Only a limited number of NGOs and foundations were requested to give input. Included in the assessment are; The Danish Society for Nature Conservation; 15. Juni Fonden. Please note that administration is included in section A.

**Table 4:**

Year: 2007			Currency: million DKK									
Source			Activity categories								Total	
			Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	452	High	113	High	401	High			965		
	2.1.2 State/Provincial											
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal	125	High	55	High					180		
2.2 Private/ Market												
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)			Medium							9		
Total:		585		167						1,153		
Comments: Please see comments to table 3.												

Table 5:

Year: 2008			Currency: million DKK								
Source			Activity categories								Total
			Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption		
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central		818	High	140	High	357	High			1,315
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal		159	High	73						232
2.2 Private/ Market											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)			7	Medium							7
Total:			984		212		357				1,554
Comments: Please see comments to table 3.											

Table 6:

Year: 2009		Currency: million DKK									
Source		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	702	High	129	High	347	High			1,179	
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal	170	High	97	High					267	
2.2 Private/ Market											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)		5	Medium								
Total:		878		226		347				1,451	
Comments: Please see comments to table 3.											



Table 7:

Table 1:

Year: 2010		Currency: million DKK									
Source		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	487	High	101	High	233	High			841	
	2.1.2 State/Provincial										
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal	165	High	113	High					278	
2.2 Private/ Market											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)		21	Medium							21	
Total:		673		214		233				1,120	
Comments: Please see comments to table 3.											

### 3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization

Table 8:

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities <sup>52</sup>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2009/2020		
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity <sup>53</sup>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/	However the plan for green growth 2010-2015 does include a financial plan	
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies <sup>54</sup>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1996/2020		
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets <sup>55</sup>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2009/2015		

<sup>52</sup> Funding needs, gaps and priorities are identified and reported at the national level, on the basis of the Convention and is often part of a national biodiversity strategy and action plan process.

<sup>53</sup> National financial plans for biodiversity refer to financial plans developed as part of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

<sup>54</sup> Development plans and strategies may take various forms in different countries, such as national poverty reduction strategies or national sustainability strategies.

<sup>55</sup> A **national budget** which integrates biodiversity considerations would normally contain a section or paragraph dealing with biodiversity.

**Comments:**

3.1 To date no national assessment has been made of the value of biodiversity. However, with a 2012 assessment of the funding needs the focus on a national assessment of the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) would be a logical next step.

3.2 Denmark has adopted the target decided in Nagoya, Japan, in 2010, of halting the loss of biodiversity before 2020. The cost of halting the loss of biodiversity in Denmark is assessed in the 2012 report Economics and Environment 2012 (<http://www.dors.dk/sw9038.asp>). The analysis indicates that management measures are required on 126,000 hectares of existing nature to secure the protection of all analysed species. Although many other species living in the same habitats will be covered by the management measures, not all 32,000 species will be covered. Thus the result of the analysis is a lower bound estimation of the extent of necessary management measures required to protect the habitats of all species. The analysis identifies a network of areas and finds that the social costs of protecting the habitats of all included species will be about DKK 0.8 billion per year. Some of the management measures are already carried out which indicates that the extra costs of the required management measures can be less than indicated in the report. On the other hand, far from all species are included in the analysis, and the costs of protecting all species are therefore likely to be higher. Altogether, it is assessed that the DKK 0.8 billion per year is a lower bound estimate of the socio-economic costs of protecting all Danish species. The funding priorities that includes biodiversity is set out in the former government plan for Green Growth (2010-2015).

3.4 The first Danish Biodiversity strategy "Biological Diversity in Denmark – status and strategy" was presented in 1996 and was followed up in 2004 with a new strategy for 2004-2009. In addition the Wilhjelm Committee in 2001 issued in unanimity the report "Danish nature- status trends and recommendations for future biodiversity policies" as a basis for a government action plan on biodiversity and nature conservation.

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

3.5 The funding priorities, including biodiversity funding is set out in the former government's plan for Green Growth (2010-2015).

## 4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability

### 4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation

Table 9:

Year: 2006 - 2010		Currency: DKK		
Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided <sup>56</sup>	More than 60 projects	-	-	See annex I.
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity-building through triangular cooperation <sup>57</sup>	-	-	-	-
<b>Comments:</b> 4.1.2 Please see annex I. 4.1.2 Projects exist but it has not been possible to assess number of projects and amount for this report.				

### 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies

Table 10:

Table 10:

Year: 2006 - 2010		Currency: million DKK
Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out	-	Negative incentives such as subsidies for drainage and watering have been removed. Grants and subsidies for thinning, drainage and road construction in the forest has ceased to exist. All management in state forests has been converted to close to nature management which provides far better conditions of forest biodiversity.
4.2.2 Positive incentives <sup>58</sup> introduced	1,178	Total amount from selected subsidies in 2006 – 2010 (see comments)
<b>Comments :</b> 4.2.2 Includes subsidies for nature and water efforts, subsidies for forestry, subsidies for organic farming and production and subsidies for hedgerows and planting for improvement of biotopes.		

<sup>56</sup> **North-south technical cooperation** and capacity-building initiatives are those in which resources and/or expertise are provided by a developed country to a developing country.

<sup>57</sup> While **South-South cooperation** and capacity building is by definition between developing countries, in some instances developed countries may provide resources and expertise which play a catalytic role in such initiatives. This type of support is commonly referred to as “triangular cooperation” and should be noted.

<sup>58</sup> **Positive incentive** measures are economic, legal or institutional measures designed to encourage beneficial activities.

### 4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism

**Table 11:**

Year: 2006 - 2010		Currency: million DKK	
Type of Initiative <sup>59</sup>	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
Fiscal policies	-	-	In recent years the Danish government has worked to integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into a number of major fiscal policy decisions, including most recently in the decisions on investment in infrastructure and tax reforms.
Afforestation initiatives	-	-	The Nature Agency together with local municipalities purchase farmland for afforestation purposes on a voluntary basis or the voluntary land consolidation programme, where support from the Rural Development Programme can be provided to establish wetlands, forests, or protect drinking water in Denmark
Agri-environmental measures	-	-	Creation of wetlands; maintenance of grass and nature areas; set-aside of riparian zones at open streams and lakes; ecological farming; plantations improving the countryside and biotopes. See annex II for further description
Subsidies/ Positive incentives introduced	1,178	-	Subset of above mentioned agri-environmental measures that includes subsidies for nature and water efforts, subsidies for forestry, subsidies for organic farming and production and subsidies for hedgerows and planting for improvement of biotopes.
Comments: Since 2010 innovative financing mechanisms have received more attention and currently Denmark is engaging in a number of initiatives at the international level to promote and use such mechanisms.			

### 4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention

**Table 12:**

Initiatives 2006-2010	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
African – European Environment Ministers Conference on ABS (Access and Benefit Sharing)	March 2010, Windhoek, Namibia. The international ministerial conference helped prepare for the negotiations later that year in Japan.
ABS Capacity Building Initiative:	DANIDA support this project which aim to support early entry into force and implementation of the new ABS Protocol ("Nagoya Protocol") and which has a particular focus on African countries
<b>Comments:</b>	

<sup>59</sup> **Types of initiatives** might include: payment for ecosystem services; biodiversity offset mechanisms; environmental fiscal reforms; markets for green products; business-biodiversity partnerships; new forms of charity; integrating biodiversity and ecosystem services in the development of new and innovative sources of international development finance and funding mechanisms for climate change which consider biodiversity and ecosystem services.

## 5. Activity Classification

Table 13:

	Activity classification			
	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D
<b>Default Description</b>	Activities where biodiversity protection is the main purpose, such as activities funded by environmental agencies that directly and intentionally impact biodiversity. Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to policy development and administration carried out in part or entirely by environmental agencies  Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to sustainable use and sustainable management that have co-benefits for biodiversity. Activities under this category would generally be lead by agencies outside of the environmental sector Activities related to Articles 8, 10 and 11 of the Convention as well Targets 5-8, 10, 14 and 15 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to sustainable production and consumption where the responsibility lies with multiple government entities, the private sector and the general public. Activities related to Articles 11 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 1-4 of the Strategic Plan
<b>Activities considered (Please check those that apply)</b>	<b>Safeguarding biodiversity</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in situ/ex situ conservation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protected areas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maintaining genetic diversity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats from invasive alien species <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats to specific ecosystems and/or species	<b>Biodiversity Planning</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NBASP development <input type="checkbox"/> CHM related activities <b>Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ABS frameworks <b>Biosafety</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety frameworks	<b>Sustainable management of ecosystems</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries, etc) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to conserve water and prevent pollution <b>Land use and climate related activities</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Managing land use to protect biodiversity, mitigate climate change and increase resilience	<b>Measures in the wider economy and society</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning, fiscal and regularity measures to promote sustainable consumption and production <input type="checkbox"/> Broad scale public awareness and education measures.
<b>Additional activities (Please add additional activities not already included in the row above)</b>		- only policy development and administration directly linked to biodiversity has been included	- mainly activities with a direct or very close influence on biodiversity has been included  - activities with the aim to mitigate or adapt to climate change has not been included	- research and education has not been included

## Annex I

Article 6-20 of the Convention outline key commitments. The table and below text links Danish development assistance to the articles of the Convention (source: Fourth Country Report to CBD, Denmark, January, 2010)

Key Commitments	CBD articles	Examples of Danish Environmental support
Developing national biodiversity strategies, plans or programmes. Establish policies which act as incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of Biodiversity.	6, 10 and 11	Bhutan, Bolivia, Cambodia, Indonesia, Kenya, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Malaysia and Laos (support to greening of PRSP and mainstreaming of biodiversity into national policies and plans).
Identifying and monitoring biodiversity in accordance with Annex 1 of the CBD including monitoring of: - Ecosystems and habitats, - Species and communities, - Described genomes and genes	7	- Malaysia (university collaboration, mapping of biodiversity) - Nicaragua (protected areas, research agreements, national environmental information system) - Vietnam (environmental information system, marine protected areas network)
Supporting <i>in situ</i> conservation measures encompassing the: - Establishment of protected areas, rehabilitation and restoration of degraded ecosystems and promoting the recovery of threatened species - Protection of indigenous peoples and their knowledge systems - Mitigation of potentially hazardous exotic species and biotechnology Products	8	- Bhutan, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Tanzania, Thailand and Vietnam (PA management) - Bolivia (PA establishment, national PA systems, natural resources management in indigenous peoples territories, support to demarcation and collective land rights) - Cambodia community based natural resources management, integrated coastal areas management) - Central America (local level natural resources management) - Mozambique (community based natural resources management)
Complementing the protection of natural habitats through ex-situ conservation measures	9	- Regional forest seed sector programmes (Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam) - Malaysia (captive breeding) - Nicaragua (tree seed centre)
In accordance with the special needs of developing countries, establish programmes for: - Scientific and technical education - Exchange of information, technical and scientific cooperation to support implementation of the CBD.	12,17 and 18	- Bolivia, Malaysia, South Africa, Tanzania and Thailand (University collaboration on forest management) - Central America (research collaboration) Indochina (University collaboration with Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam)
Promote and encourage understanding of the importance of, and the measures required for, the conservation of biological diversity, as well as its propagation through media and in educational programmes.	13	Bolivia, Cambodia, Nicaragua, South Africa, Thailand and Vietnam (environmental education in schools, public awareness)
Introduction of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	14	- Bolivia (EIA support as part of decentralised environmental management, SEA on mining sector) - Ghana (SEA on water and sanitation) - Indochina (EIA and SEA training and capacity development in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam) - Mozambique (SEA on coastal zone) - Nicaragua (EIA support to environment ministry, support to municipalities, transport sector support)

### *General measures for conservation and sustainable use (CBD article 6)*

The contracting parties are committed to developing national strategies, plans or programmes that reflect the CBD commitments. The conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity must therefore also be included as a cross-cutting issue within the planning process.

Denmark has contributed with analyses of the best ways to include and develop environmental considerations in the PRSP's (greening of PRSP), both as a cross-cutting issue and in the individual sectors. These analyses have also examined how this development can be supported through institutional and organizational capacity building of the authorities in the countries concerned. This process has been supported in Bhutan, Bolivia, Cambodia, Indonesia, Kenya, Mozambique and Nicaragua. Other countries have been supported in the process to develop and implement a national biodiversity strategy, i.e. the Lao PDR National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan.

There has also been given support to developing the national framework for biodiversity conservation. In Nicaragua, support included capacity building and a strengthening of the regulatory and policy framework by developing environmental standards and a national environment plan. Malaysia is supported in order to enhance opportunities for introducing biodiversity conservation and management safeguards into sectoral policy, programme and planning processes.

#### *Identifying and monitoring biodiversity (CBD article 7)*

Identification and monitoring of biodiversity is especially important in terms of supporting the establishment and appropriate management of protected areas. Danish support to the GEF is important in this regard since GEF finances the consolidation of many national protected area systems. Moreover, many GEF financed projects are site-based and include identification and assessment of biodiversity as well as the design and establishment of biodiversity monitoring schemes.

Some environment programmes, supported by Denmark, have also contributed have also contributed to identifying areas containing biodiversity of high conservation importance. This has often happened in collaboration with universities and NGOs, as in the Eastern Arc Mountains of Tanzania where support was provided to identify important areas for biodiversity. The identification of important marine areas has also been supported, as in the Marine Protected Areas Network component in Vietnam, which undertook an inventory and assessment of potential marine protected areas.

The development and establishment of different types of biodiversity monitoring schemes has been supported both inside and outside protected areas. These have ranged from a community based biodiversity and natural resource use monitoring system in Tanzania to forest cover monitoring using remote sensing and Geographical Information System (GIS) in Nicaragua.

#### *In-situ conservation (article 8)*

The CBD emphasizes the importance of supporting in-situ conservation. This line of support includes establishing protected areas and developing guidelines in this regard; biodiversity management inside and outside protected areas, including many types of sustainable Natural resource Management; the promotion of broader habitat and ecosystem protection and rehabilitation; sustainable development I buffer zones around protected areas; preventing the spread of genetically modified organisms (GMOs); resolving conflict over use and conservation; respect for indigenous peoples' territories, culture and intellectual property rights; and legislation on threatened species. The majority of Danish bilateral assistance of relevance to the CBD is, in some way, supporting in-situ conservation. The following is a selection of Danish supported activities in this area:

### *Protected areas establishment and management*

Danish support to activities that explicitly promote the objectives of the CBD are often related to the identification, establishment, monitoring and management of protected areas. Among the examples are Nicaragua, where continued support is being provided to the National Protected areas system and to the largest protected area in the country: the Bosawas Biosphere Reserve and the Indio-Maíz Biological Reserve. In Tanzania, support has been provided for the establishment and management of the 3.250,00 ha Malagarasi-Muyovozi wetland as a Ramsar site. In Vietnam, the focus has been on both terrestrial (Pu Houg PA and U Minh Thuong PA) and marine protected areas (Hon Mun Marine Protected Area, Con Dao and Cu Lao Cham). Together with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, World Wildlife Fund (WWF)-Denmark and WWF Indochina have developed a longterm management strategy for the terrestrial PA system.

Protected areas management has been supported in both peninsular Malaysia (Krau Wildlife Reserve, Endau Rompin National Park) and Sabah (conservation area along the Kinabatangan River). In Bhutan there was support to the management of the Bumdeling Wildlife Sanctuary. Comanagement of PAs is supported in several places.

### *Invasive species*

The introduction of non-native, harmful invasive species can cause severe damage to native biodiversity. Support has been provided – among other examples – to the International Water Hyacinth Programme and its work in Africa to develop an environmentally friendly fungal pesticide that will help bring the water hyacinth under control.

### *Indigenous peoples*

To conserve biodiversity it is vital to work with indigenous cultures and the traditional knowledge they possess. Many of the world's biodiversity hotspots and high biodiversity wilderness areas are inhabited by indigenous peoples, and their territories cover a large amount of biologically important land areas in many regions of the world. A long term support to indigenous peoples organizations and territories in Bolivia has succeeded in demarcation and titling of numerous territories. Technical assistance is provided to sustainable natural resources management including conservation of biodiversity. In Nicaragua, support has been provided for more than a decade to indigenous communities in the Bosawas Biosphere Reserve to protect their territory and promote a sustainable use of natural resources.

Denmark has furthermore supported two phases of the Consolidation of the Amazon Region (COAMA) programme in the Colombian Amazon. The programme supports the training and capacity building of indigenous organizations with the aim of ensuring their ability to develop their own policies and fulfil the legal and technical- administrative requirements for management of their territories. The International Work group for Indigenous affairs (IWGIA) is supported through a multi-annual framework agreement. The organization supports indigenous peoples in Latin America, Africa and Asia in their political struggle for recognition and their rights of self-determination. The work of IWGIA includes intellectual property rights, natural resources management, and the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.



#### Ex-situ conservation (CBD article 9)

Ex-situ conservation, whereby plants, animals or genetic material are removed from their original habitat and conserved in special facilities, is in most cases a last resort and the most resource intensive solution for the conservation of critically endangered biodiversity. Examples of ex-situ conservation activities supported by Denmark include support to forest tree seed banks (south 74 eastern Asia and Nicaragua) and to a gaur breeding facility in Malaysia (component of the Krau National Park Project).

#### *Sustainable use of natural resources (CBD Article 10)*

According to the CBD conservation and sustainable use of biological resources is to be integrated into national decision-making. Traditional cultural practices related to the use of biodiversity is encouraged and protected. Support should be given to local activities improving degraded areas. Governmental and private sectors are encouraged to collaborate on developing methods for sustainable use of biological resources. Sustainable use of natural resources is vital to long-term improvement of living conditions for disadvantaged population groups and to assure the basis of future production. Sustainable management of biological diversity is vital for securing food supplies as well as for preserving unspoiled habitats, health, the environment and a stable climate. Among the natural resources, the forests and the wetlands play a crucial role. While representing in themselves a multifunctional ecosystem characteristic of rural countryside, they not only make a vital contribution to the preservation of the climate, to the protection against natural hazards, to tourism etc, but also – in their function as elements of the rural production system – play a huge role in the reduction of poverty.

Sustainable natural resources management is a main priority in Denmark's development cooperation. Activities include the integrated water resources management, integrated coastal zone management, sustainable land management and protection and sustainable use of wetlands and forests. Sustainable water resources management is supported through global, regional and country programmes. Sustainable forestry is supported in several countries among those Cambodia, Honduras, Nepal, Nicaragua and Thailand. Support includes community forestry and certification. In Tanzania, Denmark has through more than 10 projects provides a substantial support to establishment and consolidation of participatory forest management.

#### *Research and training*

Scientific and technical education and training programmes for the identification, conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity are much needed in developing countries. Likewise with research that contributes to conservation and sustainable use. An example of Danish support in this area is the development of an environmental education and research programme at Can Tho University in Vietnam. The objective of this project is to assist the University to develop its capacity to provide environmentally oriented teaching and research to serve the special needs of the Mekong Delta Provinces for natural resources management. Activities like these will often also contribute to the obligations under CBD articles 16-18 "Access and transfer of technology", "Exchange of information" and "Technical and scientific cooperation".

The major modalities of research and training in relation to the CBD are ENRECA40, the Danish Council for Development Assistance, research centers and support to research through the

environment programmes. One example is an on-going long-term ENRECA programme between Danish Universities and Uganda and Tanzania, which seeks to strengthen local capacity in biodiversity research.

Another long-term collaboration on biodiversity research took place in the period 1999-2003 between the University of Sabah (UMS), Malaysia and Danish universities. Denmark has supported the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT) since 1994. This programme includes research and training in areas such as integrated watershed management and integrated pest management. University collaboration between South Africa and Denmark on sustainable NRM and PFM in Southern Africa took place over the period 2000-2005.

Denmark is host to the global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) and a major donor to the institution. The main task for this centre of knowledge is to register all available biodiversity information in the world. The knowledge is made available to all participating parties.

#### *Education and Awareness (Article 13)*

General environmental awareness and understanding of the importance of biodiversity for human well-being is important, as is a general understanding and appreciation of principles on sustainable use. The CBD recommends to the parties to support activities promoting environmental education in schools and general public awareness raising.

Denmark has supported many initiatives in the field of environmental education and awareness raising. Two examples can be highlighted: Support has been provided for a decade to the Danish NGO Nepenthes, who in partnership with the Nicaraguan Fundacion del Rio develops environmental education for children and young people in the buffer zone of the Indi-Maíz Biological Reserve. Activities include curriculum development, education materials, a nature centre, natural trails, a radio station, agroecological training and school gardens.

The Outdoor Council, a Danish Umbrella organisation for 93 associations related to outdoor life, nature and the environment, is involved in an environmental education programme in Kenya alongside Kenyan organisation for Environmental Education. The project aims to implement the green School concept in 300 schools and to strengthen environmental education in another 1200.

#### *Impact Assessment (CBD Article 14)*

Any proposed projects that are likely to have significant adverse effects on biological diversity should undergo an environmental impact assessment with a view to minimising or avoiding such effects. Denmark is supporting developing countries to ensure that Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) become a natural part of planning and that capacity is built in terms of implementing EIAs.

The environmental support provided by Denmark includes capacity building in EIA methodologies. One example of this practice is the long-term development of Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales Nicaragua (MARENA), Nicaragua. Another example is the regional collaboration on environmental planning and management, the USEPAM programme. This programme has organised a number of EIA courses for local university staff and government officials in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam.

Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) have been supported in Bolivia (mining sector), Ghana (SEA on Water sanitation), Mozambique (SEA on coastal zone), and Vietnam (SEA on Fisheries sector).

Denmark is also providing training and capacity building in EIA in other types of support such as the transportation sector programmes in Bangladesh, Benin, Ghana, Nicaragua, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia.

## Annex II

Agri-environmental measures in Denmark (based on M. Zandersen et al.2009, *Payment for and anagement of Ecosystem Services, Issues and Options in the Nordic Context*, Nordic Council, download [http://www.norden.org/is/utgafa/utgefid-efni/2009-571/at\\_download/publicationfile](http://www.norden.org/is/utgafa/utgefid-efni/2009-571/at_download/publicationfile))

Agri-environmental measures in Denmark are based on a number of independent projects that can receive full or part support from the state and the EU.

- Support to pilot projects and demonstration use of *technology* that reduces environmental impacts, improve working environment and reduce negative impacts on nature;
- Support to the *creation of wetlands* covers up to 100% of expenditure eligible for public funding and maximum 15,000dkr per ha with possibility of dispensation. All landowners can apply regardless of their status. Eligibility conditions include that the area must be within Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) and will contribute i.a. to a reduction of phosphor leakage and enhance fauna and flora. During 2009, three rounds of applications are open.
- *Maintenance of grass and nature areas* covers a per hectare support for grazing (1400dkr/ha) and grazing and/or hay cutting (800dkr/ha) in areas classified as ESAs. Agreements have a duration of five years;
- Support to *reduce the use of nitrogen and stop use of pesticides*, targeting all farmers in Denmark, including ecological farmers, regardless of location and type of farm. The application for this support was open during 3 months in 2009;
- Support to *set-aside of riparian zones at open streams and lakes* larger than 100m<sup>2</sup> targets all farmers and intends to function as an incentive for farmers to locate their obligatory set-aside area along lakes and streams. The objective is to reduce the leakage of nitrogen, phosphor and pesticides to the water environment;
- Support to *ecological farming* covers three sub-categories of support directly to farmers. These are i) per hectare support; ii) support for the conversion to ecological farming; and iii) support to reduce the use of nitrogen, and stop the use of pesticides.
- Support to *plantations improving the countryside and biotopes* (e.g. windbreaks), where the public support covers 40–60% of total costs. Projects can be applied by individual land owners or by a group of minimum seven land stewards. Objectives are to preserve and enhance biodiversity by creating good conditions for animals and plants; preserve and enhance environmental, nature and cultural as well as landscape values and recreative values; establish landscape corridors and increase the share of small biotopes and create natural limits around technical plants. Permanence should be assured a minimum of five years after the final payment.

## ESTONIA

SUBMISSION BY **ESTONIA** TO THE CBD NOTIFICATION **2012-23** ON THE  
METHODOLOGICAL AND IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE FOR THE “INDICATORS FOR  
MONITORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION’S STRATEGY FOR  
RESOURCE MOBILIZATION”

<b>Country: Estonia</b>	<b>Name of respondent: Lilika Käis</b>
<b>1.</b> Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<b>X</b> National Focal Point
<b>2.</b> Title and Department of respondent:	Senior officer in Nature Conservation Department
<b>3.</b> Organization of respondent:	Ministry of the Environment of Estonia
<b>4.</b> Email	<a href="mailto:lilika.kais@envir.ee">lilika.kais@envir.ee</a>
<b>5.</b> Telephone	+ 3 726 262 875
<b>6.</b> Date of completion and submission	4 July 2012

Report has been completed with the help of expert Mr Üllas Ehrlich, Chair of Environmental Economics, from Tallinn School of Economics and Business Administration, Tallinn University of Technology. Email: [yllas.ehrlich@tseba.ttu.ee](mailto:yllas.ehrlich@tseba.ttu.ee)

The report is based on financial data of 2010 and is given in Euros. Where exact numbers could not be attained, data is given based on approximations and expert opinions. As methodology could be widely interpreted, some data considered under one category (in Table 2) would be suitable also in another. Information on international financial flows and official development assistance were not gained by the time of completing the report or were available to very limited extent.

# 1. Information on International Flows of Financial Resources

<b>Year:</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>Currency:</b>	<b>EUR</b>								
		<b>Activity categories:</b>								<b>Total</b>	
<b>Type of financial flows</b>		<b>Category A</b> Biodiversity protection		<b>Category B</b> Policy development and administration		<b>Category C</b> Sustainable use and management		<b>Category D</b> Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
1.1 Official Development assistance	1.1.1 Bilateral					14000	L			14 000	L
	1.1.2 Multilateral										
1.2 Other public funds											
1.3 Private/market											
1.4 NGOs											
<b>Total:</b>										14 000	
<b>Comments: The sum consists of the Estonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs bilateral development aid (one project). Other aid was not detected. Estonian payments to the EU common budget that are meant for development aid directed to biodiversity conservation are not known.</b>											

## 2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country

Year:		2010		Currency:		EUR							
Source				Activity categories								Total	
				Category A Biodiversity protection		Category B Policy development and administration		Category C Sustainable use and management		Category D Sustainable production and consumption			
				Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1 Government budgets	2.1.1 Central		23 257 343	M	11 720 145	M	75 502 503	H	3 953 464	M	114 433 455		
	2.1.2 State/Provincial												
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal		1 676 537	H	2794733,1	M					4 471 270		
2.2 Private/ Market	2.2.1 Enterprises specialised in environmental protection										738 355		
	incl 2.2.1.1 Enterprises with the main activities of environmental protection		418 755	M			283500	M			702 255		
	2.2.1.2 Enterprises with secondary activities of environmental protection						36100	M			36 100		
	2.2.2 Enterprises not specialised in environmental protection						46 016 387	H			46 016 387		
2.3 Other (NGO, foundation, academia)			265 928	H	377 675	M					643 604		
Total:			25 618 564		14 892 553		121 838 490		3 953 464		166 303 071	M	

**Comments: Category A includes direct physical and non-physical nature conservation expenditures and investments. It includes the EU nature conservation related payments (EAFRD Natura payments; EU Life Nature projects; ERDF payments for nature conservation; CF payments for watercourse protection; INTERREG Nature Conservation Projects); non-EU foreign nature conservation programmes (Norway and EEA, Switzerland); Estonian Environmental Investment Centre's nature conservation programme; direct costs related to nature conservation of Estonian state institutions; direct cost related to nature conservation of Estonian NGO-s; private donations for nature conservation; nature schools and education centres; programme of preservation of agricultural genetic resources.**

**Category B includes the administrative cost and labour inputs related to nature conservation of Estonian state institutions; academic research cost related to nature conservation; administration of EU funds (ERDF and CF) for nature conservation.**

**Category C includes ERDF payments (sustainable use of infrastructure and support systems); CF environmental payments; EAGGF payments (Estonian Rural Development Plan II); EAFRD payments (Estonian Rural Development Plan II); costs and investments of enterprises with the main activities of environmental protection; costs and investments of enterprises with the secondary activities of environmental protection; Estonian Energy Company environmental investments.**

**Category D includes payments for wider environmental awareness (Estonian Environmental Investment Centre Environmental education programme); payments for environmental education.**

**Abbreviations: EAFRD: European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development; EAGGF: European Agricultural Guidance And Guarantee Fund; CF: Cohesion Fund; ERDF: European Regional Development Fund; INTERREG - EU Interregional Cooperation; EEA: European Economic Area.**



### 3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization

Steps	Yes /No	Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received (if applicable)	Results achieved
3.1. Assessment of values of biodiversity	Yes, partially	2011/ Ongoing	State resources, NGO resources, university research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* No nation wide activities have been initiated.</li> <li>* There are some projects based activities for some types of ecosystems or parts of them (see comments).</li> <li>* Some universities e.g. Tallinn Technical University and Estonian University of Life Sciences are dealing with the biodiversity and ecosystem services value assessments on scientific bases.</li> </ul>
3.2. Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities.	Yes, partially	Ongoing	State resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Strategic funding needs, gaps and priorities for biodiversity are defined in draft Nature Conservation Development Plan until 2020. Planned adoption of the plan is summer 2012. No biodiversity needs reported to the CBD.</li> </ul>
3.3. Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	Yes, included in different plans	Ongoing	State resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Strategic planning for biodiversity financing is covered in draft Nature Conservation Development Plan until 2020. Plan lists the necessary activities and the resources needed for biodiversity conservation. Nature conservation activities are included in the plans for the EU funds distribution and proposals are currently being made for the next financing period.</li> </ul>

3.4. Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	Yes, partially	Ongoing	State resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Biodiversity and ecosystem services topics are dealt in draft Nature Conservation Development Plan until 2020.</li> <li>* Biodiversity issues are also included in Environmental Strategy until 2030 and Action Plan until 2013.</li> <li>* Proposals are made to incorporate the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services into several other state strategies and development plans (e.g. agriculture).</li> </ul>
3.5. Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	Yes, partially	Ongoing		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* See above points. However, concept and methodology of how to incorporate values of ecosystem services into national budgets need further development.</li> </ul>
<b>Comments</b>	<p>p 3.1. No uniform ecosystem service mapping or value assessment, covering the whole Estonia, has taken place. The following project based activities have been undertaken:</p> <p>a) 'The demand for protected forest by working age population of Estonia' (2011) - economical value for the demand for protected forest was assessed (Ordered by Ministry of Environment);</p> <p>b) 'Public benefits from different agricultural production types' (2012) - environmental and social benefits from different production types were assessed (monetary values not included);</p> <p>c) 'Overview of ecosystem services and their economical value' (2012) - explanatory overview, literature review;</p> <p>d) 'Assessing the economical value of bogs, on the example of Kuresoo bog' (2012) - assessment of economical value of one bog;</p> <p>International project where Estonian NGO has participated: e) BalticSTERN-s report (with 9 Baltic Sea Countries) (2012) about the willingness to pay for a healthier Baltic Sea. See: <a href="http://www.mtt.fi/dp/DP2012_1.pdf">http://www.mtt.fi/dp/DP2012_1.pdf</a></p>			

#### 4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability

##### 4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation

Type of initiative		Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided					
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity building through triangular cooperation					
<b>Comments:</b> No direct initiatives. Through contributions to the common EU budget.					

##### 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies

Incentives	Value	Description	
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out			
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced			
<b>Comments:</b> No country specific activities. Implementing the EU policy, see the EU submission.			

##### 4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism

Type of initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of bio-diversity have been reflected	Description

1.			
<b>Comments:</b> Topic has not been dealt specifically in country level.			

#### 4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
1. Development plan for collection and conservation of genetic resources of agricultural plants for 2007-2013	Strategy is compiled by the Ministry of Agriculture. Includes priority activities with estimated budget lines. Does not include direct ABS activities, but has a supportive role.
2. Nagoya protocol	Preparations for ratification
<b>Comments:</b> No Nagoya protocol specific activities have been taken place.	

## FINLAND

### RESOURCES MOBILISED FOR BIODIVERSITY, Finland

The Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity with regard to the Strategy for Resource Mobilization invited Parties to the Convention to make use the preliminary reporting framework (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add. 1) as a flexible and tentative framework to monitor resources mobilised for biodiversity at national and global level.

-----

#### Identification of respondent

Country:	Name of respondent:
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<input type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focal point for resource mobilization <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify:
Title and Department of respondent:	Eija Lumme, Ministerial Adviser
Organization of respondent:	Ministry of the Environment, Finland
Email address:	<a href="mailto:eija.lumme@ymparisto.fi">eija.lumme@ymparisto.fi</a>
Telephone contact:	+358 50 364 7358
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	27 June 2012

Table 1. Information on International Flows of Financial Resources			
Years: 2006 - 2010; Finland			
Type of financial flows		Average 2006-2010 x 1000 €	Confidence
1.1 Official Development Assistance (ODA)	1.1.1 Bilateral	8 484	good
	1.1.2 Multilateral	3 171	good, only GEF biodiversity support
1.2 Other public funds			
1.3 Private/ Market			
1.4 Not for profit organizations			
<b>Total:</b>		<b>11 655</b>	

**Comments on Table 1:** It is not possible to analyze ODA funds accurately to categories A - D without consultation with the developing partners. For the definition of ODA, see the footnotes 3, 4 and 5 in the original reporting framework UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add.1

<b>Table 2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country</b>			
<b>Years: 2006 - 2010; Finland</b>			
<b>Source</b>		<b>Average 2006-2010 x 1000 €</b>	<b>Confidence</b>
<b>2.1 Government budgets</b>	<b>2.1.1 Central</b>	<b>130 868</b>	<b>high/medium</b>
	<b>2.1.2 State/ Provincial</b>		
	<b>2.1.3 Local/ Municipal</b>		
<b>2.2 Private/ Market</b>			
<b>2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)</b>			
<b>Total:</b>		<b>130 868</b>	

Comments on Table 2: In general, there is not available exact information about the use of financial resources for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Finnish enterprises. Finnish forest industries have used some resources for this purpose in their research and development activities. Forest industries follow the forest management practices which enhance biodiversity more than just the minimum required by legislation, e.g. by following the rules of forest certification. This can be seen as a factor which reduces maximum potential economic yield and could be calculated. However, it has to be done by enterprises themselves. Obviously this "investment" is noteworthy. Around 95% of the Finnish commercial forests have been certified under the national Finnish Forest Certification System (FFCS), endorsed by the international Programme for Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC). Some Finnish forests have also been certified under another international system, the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC).

Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity has a growing role as a part of social responsibility in other than forest enterprises too. Unfortunately, information about their financial contributions are not available.

In addition, Metsähallitus which provides natural resources sector services to a diverse customer base, from private individuals to major companies, uses annually for biodiversity related activities around 8 M€ which it receives as cash flow financing.

### **3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization**

Steps in Finland		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
Comments:				

#### **4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation**

For **developed country Finland** (members of OECD -DAC):

Year:

Currency:

Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided	Not possible to analyze accurately without consultation with developing partners, practically all ODA-funded projects have both technical assistance and capacity building component(s).			
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity-building through triangular cooperation	South-South cooperation is supported in several regional projects, but triangular projects where Finland has other role than donor (except Finnish experts or companies or NGOs as consultants) are virtually non-existing, although some regional forestry projects have biodiversity components.			
Comments:				

#### ***4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies in Finland***

Year:

Currency:

Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out	-	-
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced	-	-
Comments :		

#### ***4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism in Finland***

Year:

Currency:

Type of Initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-
Comments:			

#### ***4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention in Finland***

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
-	-
-	-
Comments:	



## 5. Activity Classification; Finland

For the resource classification mentioned in sections 1 and 2 above please indicate which types of initiatives you have considered under each category. A brief description of each of the categories as well as an indicative list of the actions that could be considered under each category is provided below. Please select all that apply. Please also list any additional activities considered under each category.

	Activity classification			
	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D
<b>Default Description</b>	Activities where biodiversity protection is the main purpose, such as activities funded by environmental agencies that directly and intentionally impact biodiversity.  Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to policy development and administration carried out in part or entirely by environmental agencies  Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to sustainable use and sustainable management that have co-benefits for biodiversity. Activities under this category would generally be lead by agencies outside of the environmental sector  Activities related to Articles 8, 10 and 11 of the Convention as well Targets 5-8, 10, 14 and 15 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to sustainable production and consumption where the responsibility lies with multiple government entities, the private sector and the general public.  Activities related to Articles 11 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 1-4 of the Strategic Plan
<b>Activities considered</b> <i>(Please check those that apply)</i>	<b>Safeguarding biodiversity</b> <input type="checkbox"/> in situ/ex situ conservation <input type="checkbox"/> Protected areas <input type="checkbox"/> Maintaining genetic diversity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats from invasive alien species <input type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats to specific ecosystems and/or species	<b>Biodiversity Planning</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NBASP development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CHM related activities  <b>Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ABS frameworks  <b>Biosafety</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biosafety frameworks	<b>Sustainable management of ecosystems</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries, etc) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to conserve water and prevent pollution  <b>Land use and climate related activities</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Managing land use to protect biodiversity, mitigate climate change and increase resilience	<b>Measures in the wider economy and society</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning, fiscal and regularity measures to promote sustainable consumption and production <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Broad scale public awareness and education measures.
<b>Additional activities</b> <i>(Please add additional activities not already included in the row above)</i>				

\*\*\*

**Soumission française relative à la notification n°2012-023**

**(Secrétariat de la Convention sur la diversité biologique)**

***Cadre préliminaire de rapportage***

***relatif à la stratégie de mobilisation des ressources en faveur de la biodiversité***

**Introduction**

Cette soumission, réalisée sur la base du cadre préliminaire de rapportage élaboré par le Secrétariat de la Convention sur la diversité biologique (UNEP/CBD/SRM/ Guidance/1 de janvier 2012), constitue un premier exercice de recensement des flux financiers français en faveur de la biodiversité. Cette soumission complète les éléments apportés par la France dans les réponses aux notifications 2011-071 (activités mises en œuvre par la France en matière de mobilisation des ressources) et 2011-014 (mesures incitatives) du secrétariat de la Convention sur la diversité biologique (CDB).

En raison du caractère préliminaire du cadre de rapportage et de la nouveauté de l'exercice, les éléments apportés par la France dans le cadre de cette soumission constituent un premier ensemble de données synthétiques, dont la qualité pourra être améliorée par la suite. Ils n'ont pas vocation à constituer une compilation chiffrée exhaustive de référenc.

**Stratégie de mobilisation des ressources en faveur de la biodiversité**

**Cadre préliminaire de rapportage**

**1. Informations sur les flux financiers internationaux**

Période de référence 2006-2010		Monnaie: voir rubriques ci-dessous
Type de flux financier		Estimation totale
1.1 Aide publique au développement	1.1.1 Bilatérale	<p>Concernant la période 2006-2010, les données agrégées publiées par l'OCDE permettent de chiffrer l'aide publique au développement française « biodiversité » à un montant total de 1622,6 millions de dollars américains (soit 324,5 millions de dollars rapportés en moyenne annuelle sur la période donnée).</p> <p>A noter que, conformément à la méthodologie de l'OCDE, les projets classés « marqueurs 1 et 2 » de Rio sont comptabilisés tous deux à 100% sur la période donnée, l'importance des engagements sous marqueur 1 de Rio conduisant à un fort degré d'incertitude sur la contribution directe à la préservation et l'utilisation durable de la biodiversité dans le montant total.</p> <p>L'OCDE insiste sur le fait qu'il ne s'agit pas d'estimation de l'effort financier en matière de biodiversité, mais d'une indication du volume global des projets bilatéraux dont une partie plus ou moins importante porte sur la protection de la biodiversité. (voir commentaire 1 infra)</p>

	<b>1.1.2</b> Multilatérale	<p>Globalement et sur la période 2006-2010, la France a contribué à hauteur de 77 millions de dollars à la fenêtre « biodiversité » du Fonds pour l'Environnement mondial (FEM) (soit 15,45 millions de dollars rapportés en moyenne annuelle sur les 5 années de la période de référence). Ce chiffre global a été calculé sur la base de la contribution totale de la France au FEM, pondérée par la part des financements engagés en faveur de la biodiversité par le FEM sur la période.</p> <p>S'agissant du Fonds européen de développement (FED), la part française affectée à la biodiversité / ressources naturelles sur la période 2008-2010 est estimée à 30 millions d'euros, soit 10 millions d'euros en moyenne annuelle sur les 3 années de référence.</p> <p>S'agissant des autres fonds multilatéraux qui financent des projets biodiversité, et qui ne font pas encore aujourd'hui l'objet d'une comptabilisation au titre des marqueurs de Rio par le Comité d'Aide au Développement (CAD) de l'OCDE, il n'a pas été possible d'évaluer la part française affectée à la biodiversité sur la période. (voir commentaire 2 infra)</p>
<b>1.2</b> Autres fonds publics		Données agrégées actuellement non disponibles
<b>1.3</b> Mécanismes du marché		Données agrégées actuellement non disponibles (voir commentaire 3 infra)
<b>1.4</b> Organisations à but non lucrative		Données agrégées actuellement non disponibles
<p><b>Observations: Parallèlement à l'Aide publique au développement, la France verse des contributions obligatoires aux principales organisations internationales et accords multilatéraux environnementaux en lien avec la biodiversité</b> (Parmi lesquels : Convention sur la diversité biologique, Convention OSPAR, Plan d'action du PNUE pour les Caraïbes, Convention Alpine, Protocole de Carthagène, Convention de Nairobi pour l'Océan Indien Occidental, Convention Ramsar, Programme régional océanien pour l'environnement, Convention sur la conservation des espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage (CMS), Convention internationale pour la protection des végétaux (CIPV), Accord sur la conservation des oiseaux d'eau migrateurs d'Afrique-Eurasie, Plan d'action pour la protection de la Méditerranée contre la pollution, Convention CITES, ACCOBAMS et ASCOBANS, Convention sur la conservation de la faune et la flore marines de l'Antarctique, Commission baleinière internationale, Traité international sur les ressources phytogénétiques pour l'agriculture et l'alimentation, Global Biodiversity Information Facility. Ce montant comprend également la contribution de la France au Programme des Nations Unies pour l'Environnement).</p> <p>Sur la période 2006 à 2010, ces contributions ont atteint un montant total de plus de 50 millions d'euros, soit une moyenne annuelle de 10 millions d'euros.</p>		

### **Commentaires :**

1 - Pour des raisons liées aux modalités de rapportage de l'aide publique au développement, en particulier l'application des marqueurs de Rio par le Comité d'Aide au Développement (CAD) de l'Organisation de coopération et de développement économique (OCDE), le chiffrage de

l'aide bilatérale « biodiversité » figurant dans le tableau récapitulatif de la rubrique n°1 ne constitue qu'une indication du volume global dont une partie plus ou moins importante porte sur la protection de la biodiversité. Ceci souligne la nécessité de parfaire l'élaboration d'un cadre d'analyse spécifique au marqueur 1 de Rio (contribution significative, mais secondaire à la biodiversité).

A titre d'illustration, l'Agence française de développement (AFD) a développé un système interne de pondération « marqueurs de Rio » de son portefeuille de projets selon les critères suivants :

Type d'activité	Contenu	Proportion du financement total retenue comme favorable à la biodiversité
Projets marqueur 2 (Rio –Biodiversité)	Aire protégée Appui aux ONG d'environnement Trust-fund Biodiversité Aide budgétaire Biodiversité	100%
Projets marqueur 1 (Rio –Biodiversité)	Gestion durable des forêts REDD	80%
Projets marqueur 1 (Rio –Biodiversité)	Agroécologie Pastoralisme-transhumance Apiculture Gestion durable des pêcheries Gestion locale des ressources biologiques Filières bio-équitable	30%
Projets marqueur 1 (Rio –Biodiversité)	Assainissement des eaux usées Carbone rural (hors plantations forestières) Développement urbain avec volet biodiversité urbaine Traitement durable des déchets – Réduction de l'impact déchet	5%
Projets marqueur 1	Irrigation raisonnée – Economie en eau	1%

(Rio-Biodiversité)	Ligne de crédit environnement (hors climat)	
Projets marqueur 0 (Rio –Biodiversité)	Infrastructure à compensation biodiversité explicite et exemplaire (Secteur minier, Barrages, etc.)	0 %
Personnel	Valeur des personnels dédiés à la Biodiversité	100%
Activité de communication et d'éducation	Activité présentant un volet biodiversité	50%
Activité de recherche Capitalisation Production de connaissances	Etude dédiée à la biodiversité	100%

2 - S'agissant de l'aide publique multilatérale au développement en faveur de la biodiversité, la France soutient l'extension aux marqueurs Rio « biodiversité » de la démarche entamée par le Comité d'Aide au Développement (CAD) de l'OCDE concernant les marqueurs « climat », dans la perspective d'une meilleure comptabilisation de cette aide.

3 - Concernant le chiffrage de la mobilisation financière internationale en faveur de la biodiversité des acteurs de la société civile (dont secteur privé), l'absence de cadre / mécanisme de rapportage international répondant à des indicateurs définis et harmonisés rend cet exercice particulièrement difficile. Une réflexion est entamée sur ce sujet au niveau français.

## 2. Informations sur la disponibilité des ressources financières dans chaque pays

Année : <b>moyenne [2006-2010]</b>		Devise : <b>millions € courants</b>									
Source :		Catégories d'activités :								<b>Total</b>	
		<b>A – Protection de la biodiversité</b>		<b>B – Politique, développement et administration</b>		<b>C – Utilisation et gestion durable</b>		<b>D – Production et consommation durables</b>			
		Montant	Confiance	Montant	Confiance	Montant	Confiance	Montant	Confiance	Montant	Confiance
2.1 Dépenses publiques	2.1.1 État									188,4	
	2.1.2 Régions									291,6	
	2.1.3 Communes									401,6	
2.2 Dépenses secteur privé										69	
2.3 Autres (ONG, fondations, académies)										113,4	
<b>Total :</b>										<b>1064</b>	
<b>Commentaires :</b> (1) Ce tableau a été renseigné à partir des comptes de l'environnement ( <i>source : Service de l'observation et des statistiques du Ministère de l'Ecologie français</i> ). Les données 2010 sont provisoires, les données 2009 sont semi-définitives, les données 2008 et précédentes sont définitives. Les données 2011 ne sont pas encore disponibles. Les valeurs indiquées sont des moyennes pour la période 2006-2010 soit 5 années. (2) Il n'a pas été possible de distinguer les différentes catégories d'activités (colonnes A à D). Toutes les dépenses prises en compte sont qualifiées de « protection de la biodiversité », mais comprennent également des dépenses de gestion. <b>Voir question 5 pour des commentaires détaillés.</b>											

- (3) Les dépenses publiques régionales regroupent les dépenses des régions, des départements et des agences de l'eau.
- (4) Les dépenses du secteur privé sont les dépenses des entreprises.
- (5) La rubrique « Autres » regroupe les dépenses des ménages (qui sont principalement des contributions aux associations) et d'autres dépenses.



### **3. Informations sur les mesures prises pour appliquer la stratégie de mobilisation des ressources**

Étapes		Année Début / Fin	Résultats obtenus (si approprié)
3.1 Évaluation des valeurs de la biodiversité	Non <input type="checkbox"/> Oui <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2007 / en cours	Cf (1) ci-dessous
3.2 : Identification et suivi des besoins de financements, des financements manquants et des financements prioritaires	Non <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	/	Cf (2) ci-dessous
3.3 : Développement d'un plan national de financement de la biodiversité	Non <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	/	Cf (3) ci-dessous
3.4 : Intégration et prise en compte de la biodiversité et des services écosystémiques dans les plans et stratégies	Non <input type="checkbox"/> Oui <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	/	Cf (4) ci-dessous
3.4 : Intégrations et prise en compte de la biodiversité et des services écosystémiques dans le budget de l'État.	Non <input type="checkbox"/> Oui <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	/	Cf (5) ci-dessous

Commentaires :

(1) La France a engagé une première réflexion sur l'évaluation des écosystèmes (MEA) dès 2007. Ce travail se poursuit par des travaux d'ordre conceptuel et méthodologique et des évaluations physiques et monétaires. Des valeurs de référence ont été calculées pour les services rendus par plusieurs écosystèmes :

- forêts tempérées (Centre d'Analyse Stratégique, 2009),
- prairies permanentes (Centre d'Analyse Stratégique, 2009),
- zones humides (Ministère de l'Ecologie- Commissariat général au développement durable, 2010)

et d'autres évaluations sont actuellement menées sur d'autres écosystèmes (haies, cultures de légumineuses, récifs coralliens) en en balayant tout le champ.

Un travail de synthèse nationale a été réalisé en 2009 (Centre d'Analyse Stratégique, 2009).

(voir également en annexe la liste des principaux travaux réalisés par la France)

(2) Des éléments ponctuels d'analyses des besoins de financement de la biodiversité, des financements manquant et des priorités existent mais ne permettent pas encore de répondre totalement à la question.

(3) La politique nationale de la biodiversité est portée par le ministère de l'écologie, du développement durable et de l'énergie. Elle est inscrite dans la stratégie nationale pour la biodiversité (SNB) adoptée en 2004 et renouvelée en 2011 pour la période 2011-2020. Le texte des engagements de l'État français pour la mise en œuvre de la SNB pour la période 2011-2013 est disponible à l'adresse suivante : [http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/SNB20112020engagement\\_etat.pdf](http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/SNB20112020engagement_etat.pdf)

Toutefois, cette stratégie ne comporte pas encore de plan national de financement de la biodiversité.

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

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

#### **4. Informations sur des initiatives spécifiques relatives à la disponibilité des ressources**

##### ***4.1 Coopération technique, renforcement des capacités et coopération Sud-Sud***

**Période 2006-2010 (monnaie : euros)**

<b>Type d'initiative</b>	<b>Description</b>
4.1.1 Coopération technique et renforcement des capacités Nord-Sud	Les montants relatifs à la coopération technique et au renforcement des capacités Nord-Sud en lien avec la biodiversité sont comptabilisés dans la rubrique 1 du cadre de reporting. A noter que le volet « recherche » des projets biodiversité à l'international est évalué à 30 millions par an sur la période. Le volet « assistance technique » (mise à disposition de personnels par les ministères français et l'Agence française de développement confondus) est évalué quant à lui à près de 22 millions d'euros sur la période.

##### ***4.2 Ressources mobilisées grâce à une réforme des mesures d'incitation et des subventions***

La loi de programmation 2009-967 relative à la mise en œuvre du Grenelle de l'environnement prévoit, dans ses articles 26 et 48, que l'État, sur la base d'un audit, déterminera les mesures fiscales défavorables à la biodiversité et proposera de nouveaux outils permettant un basculement progressif vers une fiscalité mieux adaptée aux nouveaux enjeux environnementaux.

La France a conduit en 2011 un important travail d'identification et d'analyse des aides publiques dommageables à l'environnement<sup>60</sup>. S'appuyant sur les travaux préliminaires d'analyse des dépenses fiscales dommageables à l'environnement pilotés par le Commissariat Général au Développement Durable (MEDDTL), le rapport du Comité d'évaluation des dépenses fiscales et des niches sociales a souligné les effets dommageables sur l'environnement des exonérations dont bénéficient certaines consommations d'énergies fossiles.

Sur cette base, le Centre d'analyse stratégique a mis en place, à la demande du gouvernement, un groupe d'experts de la biodiversité, d'économistes, de représentants de syndicats, d'entreprises, d'associations environnementales et de l'administration. Leurs travaux, et le rapport "Les aides publiques dommageables à la biodiversité" qui en est issu, ont eu pour but, tout d'abord, de lister les aides publiques nuisibles à la biodiversité, puis de proposer des pistes d'évolution et de réforme afin de réduire, voire d'annuler, l'impact préjudiciable de ces aides. Ce rapport publié en octobre 2011 est disponible à l'adresse suivante :

[http://www.strategie.gouv.fr/system/files/rapport\\_43\\_web.pdf](http://www.strategie.gouv.fr/system/files/rapport_43_web.pdf)

Ce rapport s'inscrit pleinement dans les objectifs du plan stratégique adopté à Nagoya en octobre 2010 par la Conférence des Parties en matière de réforme des subventions dommageables à la biodiversité et fournit des pistes de réformes des aides publiques et de la fiscalité, dont certaines ont inspiré les évolutions récemment adoptées à l'issue des débats des lois de finances. Quatre dispositifs ont ainsi été réformés dans les domaines suivants :

- reparamétrage des redevances des agences de l'eau,
- modification d'un instrument fiscal<sup>61</sup> dans le domaine de l'immobilier locatif,
- suppression du taux réduit de TVA sur des produits phytosanitaires,
- modification du droit annuel de francisation et de navigation (DAFN) acquitté par les bateaux de plaisance.

#### **4.3 Mécanismes de financement nouveaux et innovants**

---

<sup>60</sup> <http://www.economie.gouv.fr/files/rapport-comite-evaluation-depenses-fiscales-et-niches-sociales.pdf>

<sup>61</sup> Dispositif Scellier

**Les paiements pour services environnementaux** : les PSE sont déjà utilisés en France (notamment dans le cadre de la politique agricole commune, ou dans la production d'eau potable). Des réflexions ont été engagées au ministère de l'écologie, du développement durable et de l'énergie, afin de dégager des orientations pour la mise en œuvre de cet outil.

**Les réformes fiscales environnementales engagées depuis 2011** : cf. point 4.2 ci-dessus.

**Les mesures compensatoires** : La France a mis en œuvre une expérimentation d'offre de compensation destinée à répondre aux besoins de projets de faible ampleur. L'expérimentation de l'offre de compensation consiste, pour un opérateur, à anticiper la demande potentielle de compensation, en particulier dans des territoires où la pression attendue sur les milieux est forte. L'opérateur sécurise des terrains et les restaure par des actions de long terme, dans la perspective de les valoriser ultérieurement au titre de la compensation, via la vente d'unités auprès de plusieurs maîtres d'ouvrage ayant l'obligation de mettre en œuvre des mesures compensatoires.

L'expérimentation de l'offre de compensation s'inscrit dans le droit existant. Elle a été initiée en 2008 par une opération de CDC Biodiversité (filiale de la Caisse des Dépôts) sur le site Cossure, en région Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, à laquelle s'ajoutent aujourd'hui 4 nouvelles opérations. Ces opérations seront menées par les opérateurs retenus, sous le pilotage du Ministère en charge de l'écologie et en collaboration avec les parties prenantes de niveaux national et local.

L'évaluation de l'expérimentation, pilotée par le Comité national de l'expérimentation d'offre de compensation, se fera au regard de la plus-value générée en termes d'état de conservation des espèces et de leurs habitats, et de la fonctionnalité des écosystèmes.

Par ailleurs, la France a renforcé les obligations d'évitement et de réduction des impacts qui pèsent sur les mesures de compensation, et a porté, dans le cadre d'un processus de concertation impliquant les différentes composantes de la société civile française (services de l'Etat, collectivités locales, entreprises, ONG), l'élaboration d'une doctrine nationale et de lignes directrices pour piloter la séquence « éviter, réduire, et compenser ».

**Les marchés de produits verts** : la France étudie actuellement le dispositif qui viserait à allouer à la préservation de la biodiversité le produit de la vente aux enchères de permis d'émissions de CO<sub>2</sub>, mécanisme déjà utilisé par l'Allemagne.

**La biodiversité dans la finance internationale** : la France participe au financement de la biodiversité à l'international au travers de l'AFD et du Fonds français pour l'environnement mondial (FFEM), tant avec des prêts bonifiés qu'avec des dons. Elle met activement en œuvre les

instruments innovants de financement, et notamment les fonds fiduciaires de conservation, la certification de produits agricoles, halieutiques ou forestiers, les conversions de dette contre des programmes en faveur de la biodiversité (« C2D Nature »).

**La biodiversité dans les financements pour le climat** : la France participe activement à la préparation de la mise en œuvre du mécanisme REDD+.

**La France s'intéresse par ailleurs aux obligations vertes**, qui peuvent permettre de financer des investissements importants en vue d'une rentabilité à moyen terme, en particulier des projets visant la préservation de la biodiversité et des services écosystémiques. En mars 2012, la Région Ile-de-France a levé 350 millions d'euros grâce à des obligations vertes, et a pu financer des projets énergétiques, des logements sociaux sobres en énergie, et des actions consacrées à la biodiversité et à l'économie sociale et solidaire. La France pourrait étudier ce type de mécanisme à l'avenir.

#### ***4.4 Initiatives et mécanismes relatifs à l'accès aux ressources génétiques et au partage des avantages découlant de leur utilisation, compatibles avec les dispositions de la Convention***

Initiative	Description
Mise en œuvre d'une procédure d'accès et de partage des avantages (APA) transitoire non contraignante pour les bénéficiaires, pilotée par le point focal national pour l'APA dans l'attente de la mise en place d'une législation nationale sur l'APA.	Réception et analyse des requêtes formulées par les chercheurs et les entreprises souhaitant accéder à des ressources génétiques en France (y compris ses départements d'outre-mer).  Encouragement à proposer des dispositions d'échanges d'avantages, le plus souvent mais pas exclusivement sous des formes non monétaires (par exemple : collaboration avec des chercheurs français, dépôts de spécimens auprès de collections françaises, etc.)
Mise en œuvre de formations sur l'APA organisées par le Ministère en charge de l'écologie pour les chercheurs, les entreprises et les parties-prenantes.	

##### 5. Liste des activités considérées :

- conservation de la biodiversité *in situ* / *ex situ*
- aires protégées
- maintien de la diversité génétique
- lutte contre les espèces exotiques envahissantes
- lutte contre menaces spécifiques sur des espèces et sur des écosystèmes
- APA
- Mesures sectorielles de sensibilisation à la conservation et à un usage durable de la biodiversité
- Mesures sectorielles de préservation de la qualité de l'eau et de prévention contre les pollutions
- Actions de sensibilisation

##### 6. Identification de la personne qui complète le cadre :

Pays: France	Nom de la personne qui complète le cadre: Emmanuelle Swynghedauw
Veuillez indiquer au nom de qui vous complétez ce cadre:	<input type="checkbox"/> Correspondant national de la Convention <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Correspondant pour la mobilisation des ressources <input type="checkbox"/> Autre. Veuillez préciser :
Titre et Service dont relève cette personne:	Chargée de mission, Sous-direction de l'environnement et des ressources naturelles, Direction Générale de la Mondialisation, du Développement et des Partenariats
Organisation dont relève cette personne:	Ministère des Affaires étrangères
Adresse courriel:	<a href="mailto:emmanuelle.swynghedauw@diplomatie.gouv.fr">emmanuelle.swynghedauw@diplomatie.gouv.fr</a>
Numéro de téléphone:	+33 1 43 17 66 93
Date à laquelle le tableau a été complété et présenté:	Finalisation de l'exercice le : <b>19 juin 2012</b>

## **Annexe : Bibliographie des travaux réalisés par la France**

MNHN, 2007, Harold Levrel, « Étude de faisabilité pour la réalisation d'un Millenium Ecosystem Assessment en France »

[http://www2.mnhn.fr/cersp/IMG/pdf/Rapport\\_Faisabilite\\_MEA\\_France1.pdf](http://www2.mnhn.fr/cersp/IMG/pdf/Rapport_Faisabilite_MEA_France1.pdf)

Centre d'analyse stratégique(CAS), 2009, « Évaluation économique de la biodiversité et des services écosystémiques, rapport n°18.

[http://www.strategie.gouv.fr/article.php3?id\\_article=980](http://www.strategie.gouv.fr/article.php3?id_article=980). In English: *An economic approach of biodiversity and ecosystem services – Contribution to public decision-making* <http://www.cbd.int/doc/case-studies/inc/cs-inc-report-en.pdf>

Premier ministre, 2010, « Stratégie nationale pour la biodiversité » [http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/1\\_bis\\_-\\_French\\_National\\_Biodiversity\\_Strategy\\_-\\_May\\_2011.pdf](http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/1_bis_-_French_National_Biodiversity_Strategy_-_May_2011.pdf)

MEDDTL-DEB, 2010, *Millenium ecosystem Assessment en France, étude exploratoire*, » [http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/DGALN\\_Synthese\\_Rapport\\_Final\\_MA20100204.pdf](http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/DGALN_Synthese_Rapport_Final_MA20100204.pdf)

MEDDTL-CGDD, 2010, MNHN « Projet de caractérisation des fonctions écologiques des milieux en France » <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/ED20.pdf>

INSEE, MEDDTL, 2010, « Le rapport Stiglitz, un an après : de nombreuses recommandations mises en oeuvre, de nouveaux travaux à venir » [http://www.insee.fr/fr/ppp/comm\\_presse/comm/communiqu%C3%A9\\_20Stiglitz\\_2010\\_web.pdf](http://www.insee.fr/fr/ppp/comm_presse/comm/communiqu%C3%A9_20Stiglitz_2010_web.pdf)

MEDDTL-CGDD, 2010, « Donner une valeur à l'environnement : la monétarisation, un exercice délicat mais nécessaire », *Revue du CGDD*, décembre. <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/RevueM.pdf>

MEDDTL-CGDD, 2010, « Conservation et utilisation durable de la biodiversité et des services écosystémiques : une analyse des outils économiques. Rapport de la Commission des comptes et de l'économie de l'environnement » <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/Conservation-et-utilisation.html>

MEDDTL-CGDD, 2010 et 2011, « Évaluation économique des services rendus par les zones humides :

- Un préalable à leur préservation » <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/L-evaluation-economique-des.html>

- Enseignements méthodologiques de monétarisation, 2011 : <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/Evaluation-economique-des-services.24313.html>; - Complémentarité des méthodes de monétarisation, 2011 : <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/Evaluation-economique-des-services.24314.html>



- Les Aides Publiques dommageables à la Biodiversité, 2011, rapport CAS / G. SAINTENY : <http://www.strategie.gouv.fr/content/les-aides-publiques-dommageables-la-biodiversite-note-de-synthese-246-octobre-2011>

MEDDTL-CGDD, 2011, « Monétarisation des biens, services et impacts environnementaux. Actes du séminaire du 15 décembre 2010 » <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/ED53-2.pdf>

ONEMA, 2012, J.P. Amigues, B. Chevassus-au-Louis, « Evaluer les services écologiques des milieux aquatiques enjeux scientifiques, politiques et opérationnels », [http://www.onema.fr/IMG/pdf/servicesecologiques\\_BD.pdf](http://www.onema.fr/IMG/pdf/servicesecologiques_BD.pdf)

MEDDTL, 2012, CSPNB « La biodiversité à travers des exemples : services compris » <http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/La-biodiversite-a-travers-des,27213.html>

# GERMANY

## PRELIMINARY REPORT

### ON BIODIVERSITY RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

Submission to the CBD notification (2012-023)

#### Identification of Respondent

Country: <b>Germany</b>	Name of respondent: <b>Axel Benemann</b>
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<b>National Focal Point</b>
Titel and Department of respondent	<b>International Cooperation on Biological Diversity"</b>
Email address:	<b>Axel.Benemann@bmu.bund.de</b>
Telephone contact:	<b>+49 228 99305 2615</b>
Organization of Respondent	<b>Federal Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety</b>

#### Introduction

This submission is preliminary and does not represent at all a comprehensive assessment of Germanys financial contribution in support of the three objectives of the CBD. Germany has carried out the data collection and reporting with the objective to support further development and refinement of this preliminary reporting framework. The attached information has to be considered as a first draft and the data reported are to be regarded as incomplete. In particular on national level a majority of data is missing (e.g. Federal State level/local level). **The included information is only of an exemplary nature. The numbers are far below the overall biodiversity financing and should therefore not be aggregated !!!**

At this point in time data is not available for all levels of the government and not for private sector or other non-profit organizations. Germany also did not use the categorization of biodiversity activities.

#### 1. International Flows of Financial Resources

The German Government is strongly committed to conserve and sustainably manage biodiversity, forests and ecosystem services in particular not only nationally but also through its international cooperation. In

recognition of the importance of Biodiversity for achieving sustainable development, poverty eradication, mitigating greenhouse gas emissions and for the adaptation to climate change, German international cooperation has significantly increased its engagement in this area.

Guiding instrument for German international cooperation with regard to Biodiversity is the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its Strategic Plan 2011-2020: Through supporting the protection and sustainable use of natural resources and incorporating biodiversity into other sectors as e.g. agriculture and good governance, German Development Cooperation safeguards ecosystem services that are inevitable for human development. Further methods of valorising biodiversity and to integrate these values into development policies and economic decision making are supported. An important instrument for valuating Biodiversity is Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) with regard to genetic resources and the German cooperation increasingly supports countries to implement the Nagoya Protocol on ABS. Furthermore German development cooperation supports the implementation of REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) and supports ecosystem based adaptation to climate change. As it is the explicit objective of biodiversity programs implemented through BMZ and BMU to integrate aspects of protection and sustainable use of biodiversity and as these programs often contain support in policy development or administration and also often include measures to support sustainable production and consumption patterns it is not possible to report in categories A to D.

In the following we show the yearly bilateral commitments and multilateral disbursements of the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and the Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) with regard to biodiversity and forest related projects with the main focus and principle objective to support at least one of the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (protection and sustainable use of biodiversity and the fair sharing of benefits)

#### **Biodiversity related ODA, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany (BMZ)**

The following list shows yearly bilateral pledges and multilateral disbursement with regard to biodiversity and forest related projects (bi- and multilateral) in Million Euro:

Source	2008	2009	2010	2011
BMZ bilateral*	159	183	225	350
BMZ multilateral**	10	13	37	22
<b>BMZ total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>372</b>

\* containing technical cooperation that is implemented through Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH and financial cooperation implemented through KfW Entwicklungsbank. Further they contain a specific amount of money provided each year to support the cooperation with civil society and non governmental organization.

Additionally, in the period of 2008 to 2011 15 Mio. Euros in market funds have been raised.

\*\* includes contributions to the Global Environmental Facilities Focal Area "Biodiversity" and to the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility.

The bilateral figures reported above are commitments whereas OECD-DAC reporting is based on actual disbursement records (since 2010 based on biodiversity Rio Marker BTR 2).

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

#### **Biodiversity related ODA, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Germany (BMU)**

In 2008 the BMU launched the International Climate Initiative (ICI) to support projects designed to mitigate climate change (including conservation and restoration of natural carbon sinks and REDD+), adapt to climate change impacts (with a particular focus on ecosystem based adaptation) and to conserve biodiversity. A dedicated support area for biological diversity was established within the Initiative in 2011. The resources for these activities are generated by auctioning emission certificates in the European emission trading system. ICI financing in the area of biological diversity targets projects promoting implementation of the Strategic Plan of the CBD. Projects are carried out by the implementing organisations of the German federal government (GIZ and KfW), other state organisations, non-governmental organisations, scientific institutions and international and multilateral organisations and bodies such as the organisations and programmes of the United Nations. The following table lists the projects pledged every year which have a main focus on biodiversity (in Million Euro):

Source	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>BMU bilateral</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>38*</b>	<b>130</b>

\* includes a one time contribution of 10 Mio. Euro to the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

#### **Aggregation of BMZ and BMU funding (in Million Euro):**

Source	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>BMZ/BMU funding combined</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>502</b>

<b>NGOs, Foundations</b>	
--------------------------	--

Several German NGOs, foundations and church foundations are using resources at international level. It was not possible to make a reliable assessment of the resources involved. In the following only some selected examples of the many internationally active NGOs is given. This list is far from being comprehensive. It has to be considered that part of the funding of the NGOs comes from the governmental budget.

<b>The Society for Nature Conservation Germany</b> <b>NABU</b> (Der Naturschutzbund Deutschland e.V) Expenditure in 2010	1.48 mln € for international projects to support nature conservation and environmental protection.  Source: NABU Annual Report 2010
<b>WWF Germany</b>	39,1 mln € for nature conservation and environmental protection, campaigns and education and awareness building (of this total amount about 15% is used in Germany)  Source: Annual Report 2010/2011
<b>ZGF: Frankfurt Zoological Society</b>  The Society supports some 70 conservation projects in 30 countries (5 projects in Germany)  Expenditure in 2010	8,28 mln € (7,32 mio project costs and 0,96 administration and coordination costs)  Source: Frankfurt Zoological Society Annual Report 2012

## 2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country

The Convention on Biological Diversity is implemented on the federal, state, regional and local level. Within the federal system of Germany the competency for nature conservation is at the States level (Länder) and the vast majority of financing for biodiversity is realized on this level. Nevertheless at this point in time data is only available from the federal governmental level. The figures presented in the following thus do not represent the overall spending but solely showcase some of the spending on national level.

Due to the large number of actors in the private market and non-profit sector it was not possible to make a reliable assessment of the resources involved.

The following data on federal level present a first indication of the different areas of financing they are not meant to be exhaustive.

<b>Government Budgets - Central level</b>	
<b>Federal Ministry of Environment (BMU)</b>  Departments for Conservation and Sustainable Use of National Resources	24.315.000 € in 2010  40.795.000 € in 2011  49.307.000 € in 2012  Amount includes: important domestic nature conservation projects, research for the BMU, National Programme for Biodiversity since 2011, administration costs, maintenance and salary
<b>The Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)</b> is the scientific authority of the federal government for national and international nature conservation. It is one of the research facilities of the government and reports to the Federal Environmental Ministry	22.435.000 € in 2010  24.435.000 € in 2011  26.605.000 € in 2012  Annual budget of the agency
<b>Federal Ministry for Agricultural Development</b>	Data collection ongoing.
<b>Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development</b> in corporation with the Federal Ministry of Environment  - Federal Programme for Reconnecting Biotopes Interrupted by Highways	<b>78.000.000 € for the</b> installation of wildlife crossings over highways (in the last years)  Planned investment <b>180 million</b> euros
<b>Federal Ministry for Education and Research</b>	Data ollection ongoing.

<b>Government Budgets - State and local levels</b>	
State level: Data is not available.	<p>In the following a figure of a single State is presented to give a general idea of the amount of financing at this level. The state of North Rhine Westphalia (one out of 16 States; 21,8% of the total population; 9,5% of the total area) in 2011 spent 20,2 mln Euro for biodiversity protection.</p> <p>Local level:</p> <p>Data not available</p>
<b>Private Market, NGO, Foundation and Academia</b>	
<p>Comprehensive data not available. As example some data from the Annual Reports of some of the largest NGOs and foundations is given (not always specified for biodiversity). This is only a very short list of the many organizations which are active in Germany and is far from being comprehensive. The purpose for the integration in this report is to showcase in an exemplary manner the strong engagement of the civil society in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.</p>	
<p><b>NABU The Society for Nature Conservation Germany NABU e.V.</b> – (Der Naturschutzbund Deutschland e.V)</p> <p>The objective of NABU is to contribute to the preservation of nature and safeguard the future</p> <p>The work of NABU includes: Nature conservation in practice , scientific research, political articulation, environmental education and public relations.</p>	<p>Total budget 2010, 23.8 mln €</p> <p>4.56 mln € for national projects on nature conservation and environmental protection</p> <p>1.48 mln € for international projects on nature conservation and environmental protection</p> <p>Source: NABU Annual Report 2010</p>
<b>BUND - Friends of the earth Germany</b>	<p>Total budget in 2010, 14 mln €</p> <p>9 mln € for conservation measures, actions, public relations, and lobbying in favor of nature and the</p>

<p>The main objective of the BUND is to contribute to a sustainable development in Germany.</p>	<p>environment a national and state level. Source: BUND annual report</p>
<p><b>WWF Germany</b></p>	<p>About 6 mln € for nature conservation and environmental protection, campaigns aducation and awareness building in Germany Source: Annual Report 2010/2011</p>
<p>The <b>“Deutsche Bundestiftung Umwelt - DBU” (German Federal Environmental Foundation)</b> is one of the largest foundations in Europe. It promotes innovative and exemplary projects for environmental protection</p>	<p>13,7 mln € funding of projets in the area of conservation (approx 6 mln), environmental education, sustainable land use in 2010</p>



### 3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the Stepp (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicabel )
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	Yes	2010 / 2015		
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	No	/		
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	No	/		
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	Yes x	Ongoing		
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets <sup>62</sup>	Yes	Ongoing		
<b>Comments:</b> In September 2012, the Federal Ministry of the Environment officially launches the study, natural capital, Germany/TEEB. The aim is to apply this TEEB approach to Germany, generating economic arguments for nature protection policy				

### 4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability

#### 4.1 Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation

The support to technical cooperation and capacity building is included in the response to chapter 1 (International Flows of Financial Resources).

As regards South-South cooperation Germany is engaged in triangular cooperation with different partner countries. With regard to biodiversity German development cooperation is for example promoting the exchange of experiences between representatives of regional organizations that are engaged in cross-border efforts to conserve tropical forests.

## 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies

Year	Currency:EURO	
Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out		Data not available (regarding agro-environmental measures see EU submission)
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced	15 mln € per year (since 2011)  35 mln € per year (start 2013)	Federal Programme for Biodiversity: The governmental programme supports the implementation of the national strategic for biodiversity (to avoid double counting please note that this governmental programme is included in government budget at central level. )  National forest climate fund: The funds are to be used amongst others to develop schemes to restore balanced landscape water resources, to improve adaptation to climate change, to maintain and secure forest mires, to establish new carbon-rich riparian and moist forests, as well as to set up reference areas
<b>Comments</b> One key element of the national strategy is the dialogue with social actors. Currently, the Department for Conservation of the Federal Ministry of the Environment worked together with high level business associations to establish the project "Biodiversity companies 2020", which is a platform for the dialogue and action of the Ministry with the private sector.		

## 4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism

Year:	Currency:		
Type of Initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been	Description

		reflected	
Comments:			

#### ***4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention***

As ABS is an important tool to valorize genetic resources and thus to preserve biodiversity and to reduce poverty in our partner countries, bilateral support of German Development Cooperation for partner countries to implement the Nagoya Protocol on ABS has been considerably increased. In addition the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) hosts the ABS-Capacity Development Initiative. Due to its various measures, studies and communication activities the Initiative received broad international recognition for its capacity development approach and significant impacts on the strong and constructive engagement of the African Group in the international ABS negotiations, which lead to the conclusion of the Nagoya Protocol. Today this multi donor initiative is supported by Germany, Denmark, Norway, the EU and the Institut de l'Énergie et de l'Environnement de la Francophonie. The initiative supported the African Group in the negotiation process leading to the Nagoya Protocol and is now supporting countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific region in implementing ABS regimes.

## ITALY

### Italian contribution for the CBD Notification 2012-023

#### Preliminary methodological issues

As already reported in answer to CBD Notification 2011-071, in line with the commitments taken in the frame of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) concerning a Strategy for Resource Mobilization (Decision VIII/13, para. 4) adopted by COP 9 (decision IX/11) and in line with Decision X/3 adopted by COP 10 in Nagoya, Italy has set up a Permanent Board for CBD Resource Mobilization Strategy.

This Board has been promoted by the Ministry of Environment, Land and Sea – CBD Focal Point – jointly with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Economy and Finance. The Board has been furtherly joined by the Ministry of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Policies, the Ministry of Economic Development and Piedmont Region, on behalf of the Italia Regions.

In the last meeting (April 2012), also the National Italian Institute of Statistics (ISTAT) and the National High Institute for Environmental Protection and Research took part to the Board as observers.

The activities started in July 2011 and were characterized by a significant commitment of the Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea Protection that worked to involve other central administrations dealing with the management and funding of biodiversity. The exchange among the central administrations was primarily aimed at identifying the amount of the expenditure for biodiversity (baseline) as recommended by the CBD Secretariat through: "Methodological and Implementation Guidance for the" Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Convention's Strategy for Resource Mobilization "for the compilation of "reporting framework".

This work stressed the difficulty to provide a high confidence level data for the indirect financial flows that are not directly aimed at protecting biodiversity but do not exclude it.

So, in this first step, only direct financial flows were taken into account.

Critical issues concern both central and local government expenditure, as well as international one (ODA flows), especially when there are financial transfers between two or more administrations because it is difficult to avoid double counting.

Moreover, at present, we didn't take into account private financial flows nor those coming from IFMs.

We also discussed about the need to provide comparable data at national level (data of different years) and at international level.

#### The Reporting Framework

In the view to give mainly a contribution to finalize the methodology on indicators and reporting framework, the current attached Reporting Framework filled by Italy has to be considered as a draft and the data reported, even though taken from official sources and therefore reliable, are to be considered as tentative, because their appropriateness depend on the methodologies under which they are accounted.

All methodological notes have been included among the comments in the proper sheet of the Reporting Framework.

Anyway, as regards the data concerning the financial flows – as already declared by Italian representatives in coordination meeting, and even in the informal meeting among Ministers on Resource Mobilisation for global biodiversity of the 14th May – Italy has the opinion that only data collected under international validated methodologies have to be considered. In this view, Italy has taken in consideration the classifications CEPA2000 and CRUMA (currently adopted by Eurostat) and believes that a similar common choice could be done by all EU Member States.

It was decided to adopt a standard methodology to increase the level of reliability as well as the level of data comparability and to work by using the following reporting systems of public expenditure that are already recognized at international level:

- CEPA2000 (Classification of Environmental Protection Activities and expenditure)
- CRUMA (Classification of Resource Use and Management Activities and Expenditure).

CEPA and CRUMA are two classification developed in the context the European System for the Collection of Economic Data on the Environment (SERIEE), the framework intended to supply the Member States with a common basis for the collection and presentation of economic data on the environment.

SERIEE comprises two satellite accounts:

- the Environmental Protection Expenditure Account (EPEA), aiming at the description of measures and related expenditures carried out to protect the environment against pollution and degradation phenomena (qualitative perspective);
- the Natural Resource Use and Management Expenditure Account (RUMEA), devoted to the description of measures and related expenditures carried out to manage and save the stock of natural resources against depletion phenomena (quantitative perspective).

For the EPEA, a classification (namely the CEPA2000) is defined and adopted at the international level, while a similar classification has not been developed yet for the RUMEA. The Eurostat Working Group “Environmental Expenditure Statistics” has assigned a high priority to the development of the RUMEA in the next future. CRUMA is a classification built by ISTAT and currently under discussion at Eurostat level.

For financial flows included in Italian Reporting Frameworks, two classes have been considered:

- CEPA 6, that includes all activities and actions to protect and rehabilitate any species of animal or plant and any type of ecosystem or habitat (including the fight against forest fires), to develop and manage protected areas and parks and urban gardens provided having a clear goal as the protection of biodiversity, to protect and restore the natural and semi-damaged (including quarries and abandoned mines). It also includes – when conducted only for the purpose of environmental protection within or in relation to protected natural areas – activities and actions to protect soil degradation process related to erosion and deterioration of the hydrogeological and vegetation cover of soil. It includes, finally, activities and actions aimed to monitoring, control, regulation and administration, designed exclusively for activity sectors included in this class.
- CRUMA 12, that includes all activities and actions aimed to reduce the taking of the resources belonging to wild fauna and flora and to increase the stock of these resources, including activities and management actions, monitoring and control and the regulation and administration solely concerned with flora and fauna. The activities and actions that

increase the stock of wildlife for the purpose of protection of biodiversity (already included in class 6 of CEPA) are excluded from CRUMA 12.

22 June 2012

### 1.1 Information on International Flows of Financial Resources

Year: 2010				Currency:		Euros							
Type of financial flows				Activity categories								Total	
				Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
				Biodiversity protection		Policy development and administration		Sustainable use and management		Sustainable production and consumption			
				Amount	Confidance	Amount	Confidance	Amount	Confidance	Amount	Confidance	Amount	Confidance
1.1 Official Development Assistance		1.1.1 Bilateral	4	100%								4	100%
		1.1.2 Multilateral											
1.2 Other public funds													
1.3 Private/Market													
1.4 Not for profit organizations													
Total:													
Comments:													
1) All figures are in millions of euros.													
2) Data are provided by Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Directorate General for Cooperation and Development.													
3) Only Biodiversity-related-aid activities targeting the CBD Convention as a 'principal objective' (Rio Markers) are considered. However, the total amount of the activities targeting Biodiversity as a "Significant" objective is € 11.349.532,00.													
4) Lines 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 are accounted as a whole.													
5) For other lines data are not available.													

### 2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country

Year: <b>2009-2010</b>				Currency:		Euros								
Source: <b>Ministry of Economy and Finance (line 2.1.1, year 2010) and ISTAT - Italian National Institute of Statistics (line 2.1.2, year 2009). Classification used: CEPA2000 and CRUMA</b>				Activity categories								Total		
				Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:				
				Biodiversity protection		Policy development and administration		Sustainable use and management		Sustainable production and consumption				
				Amount	Confidance	Amount	Confidance	Amount	Confidance	Amount	Confidance	Amount	Confidance	Amount
2.1 Government budgets		2.1.1 Central		455				63					518	
		2.1.2 State/Provincial		1002				158					1160	
		2.1.3. Local/Municipal												
2.2 Private/Market														

2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation and academia)											
2.4 Not for profit organizations											
Total:											
<p>Comments:</p> <p>1) All figures are in millions of euros.</p> <p>2) For line 2.1.1 data are referred to year 2010 and are taken from Ecorendiconto issued by Italian Ministry of Economy and Finance, 2011. They refer to expenditure made by Central Administration (Ministries).</p> <p>3) For line 2.1.1 data are referred to year 2009 and are provided by ISTAT - Italian National Institute of Statistics. They refer to expenditure made by Regional Administration (Regions and Autonomous Provinces, that in Italian legal framework are autonomous legislative and administrative bodies).</p> <p>4) For category A data are related to class CEPA 6 "Protection of biodiversity and landscape" of the CEPA2000 Classification (Classification of Environmental Protection Activities and expenditure). In this class are included payments for activities related both to biodiversity and to landscape protection. At this moment they can be considered only as a whole. (see Explanatory Note attached)</p> <p>5) For category C data are related to class CRUMA 12 "Use and management of wild flora and fauna" of the CRUMA Classification (Classification of Resource Use and Management Activities and expenditure). (see Explanatory Note attached)</p> <p>6) Lines 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 are both referred to amounts of final expenditure made in the year but they can't be compared because they make use of different methods of accounting: for line 2.1.1 they are defined as "financial flows"; for line 2.1.2 they are defined as "economic flows".</p> <p>7) For other lines data are not available.</p>											

### 3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization

Steps			Year initiated/completed			Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1	Assesment of values of biodiversity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes		/			
3.2	Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes		/			
3.3	Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes		/			
3.4	Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes		/			
3.5	Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes		/			
Comments:							

#### 4. Information on specific Issues Related to Resource Availability

Year:

Currency:

Type of initiative		Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1	North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided				
4.1.2	Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity building through triangular cooperation				
4.1.3	North-South technical cooperation and capacity building received				
4.1.4	South-South technical cooperation & capacity building received from other developing countries				
4.1.5	South-South technical cooperation and capacity building - Provided				
Comments:					

#### 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies

Year:

Currency:

Incentives		Value	Description
4.2.1	Removed, reformed or phases-out		
4.2.2	Positive incentives introduced		
Comments:			

#### 4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism

Year:

Currency:

Type of Initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
Comments:			

#### 4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
Comments:	



## 5. Activity classification

Activity classification					
Default description	Category A	Category B		Category C	Category D
	Activities where biodiversity protection is the main purpose, such as activities funded by environmental agencies that directly and intentionally impact biodiversity.	Activities related to policy development and administration carried out in part or entirely by environmental agencies	Activities related to sustainable use and sustainable management that have co-benefits for biodiversity. Activities under this category would generally be lead by agencies outside of the environmental sector		Activities related to sustainable production and consumption where the responsibility lies with multiple government entities, the private sector and the general public.
	Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to Articles 6-9 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 9, 11-13 and 16-20 of the Strategic Plan	Activities related to Articles 8, 10 and 11 of the Convention as well Targets 5-8, 10, 14 and 15 of the Strategic Plan		Activities related to Articles 11 and 12-21 of the Convention as well Targets 1-4 of the Strategic Plan
Activities considered (Please check those that apply)	<b>Safeguarding biodiversity</b>	<b>Biodiversity Planning</b>		<b>Sustainable management of ecosystems</b>	<b>Measures in the wider economy and society</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in situ/ex situ conservation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NBASP development		<input type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries, etc)	<input type="checkbox"/> Planning, fiscal and regulatory measures to promote sustainable consumption and production
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protected areas	<input type="checkbox"/> CHM related activities		<input type="checkbox"/> Sectoral measures to conserve water and prevent pollution	<input type="checkbox"/> Broad scale public awareness and education measures.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maintaining genetic diversity	<b>Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources</b>		<b>Land use and climate related activities</b>	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats from invasive alien species	<input type="checkbox"/> ABS frameworks			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addressing threats to specific ecosystems and/or species	<b>Biosafety</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Managing land use to protect biodiversity, mitigate climate change and increase resilience			
		<input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety frameworks			

<b>Additional activities</b> <b>(Please add additional activities not already included in the row above)</b>	
---	--

Identification of respondent

Country: <b>Italy</b>	Name of respondent: <b>Dott. Renato Grimaldi</b>
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>National Focal Point</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Focal point for resource mobilization</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other. Please specify:</b>
Title and Department of respondent:	<b>General Directorate for nature and sea protection</b>
Organization of respondent:	<b>Italian Ministry of the Environment, Land and Sea</b>
Email address:	<a href="mailto:pnm-udg@minambiente.it">pnm-udg@minambiente.it</a>
Telephone contact:	0039 06/5722 3433 - 3428
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	22/06/2012

## NETHERLANDS

### **Resource Mobilisation, based on the reporting framework ([UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add.1, 11 april 2012](#))**

#### Introductory remarks

The resources reported by the Netherlands in this report are under the reservation that they are a result of an interpretation and a first application of the CBD reporting framework, based on a limited national and international experience with the framework. The data provided by the Netherlands in this report are related to the year 2010 (Table 1 and Table 2).

The report contains national expenditure and national budgets directly related to Biodiversity. Where possible a differentiation between categories A to D was made in table 1 and 2. This was not always possible because classifications and definitions we use nationally cannot easily be applied to the categories A to D. Budget used for water quality and soil quality have been included in the report as well, because of the relationship with the quality of ecosystems and biodiversity. This is also the case for the budget for Ecosystems and natural resources.

Resources that could only be attributed to biodiversity in a very limited or indirect way have been left out, in order to improve the robustness of the report. This affects to total reported numbers only in a very limited way.

Some difficulty we encountered is that OECD-DAC classifications not fully resemble the categorization and classification indicators we use nationally. This leads to a difference in the figures in our national reporting systems compared to those in the in OECD DAC. The data we use in the Reporting Framework are based on our national methodology.

No complete picture can be given of financial resources of the private market and the not for profit organizations. The large number of actors prohibit us to make a responsible judgment of the resources involved. Data on a more generic level is not easily available.

Based on the tables 1 and 2 the total resources for biodiversity of the Netherlands in 2010 sum up to a amount of 1.047 mln € (2010). This includes financial flows from Not For Profit Organisations (1.4) but excludes the Private Market.

## Identification of Respondent

Country: <b>Netherlands</b>	Name of Respondent: <b>Wieger Dijkstra</b>
Please Indicate on whose behalf this is being completed	<input type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input type="checkbox"/> Focal Point for Resource Mobilisation <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify: <b>Senior Policy Advisor</b>
Title and Department of respondent:	<b>Policy advisor at Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment</b>
Organization of Respondent:	<b>Unit Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment</b>
Email address:	<b><a href="mailto:wieger.dijkstra@minienm.nl">wieger.dijkstra@minienm.nl</a></b>
Telephone Contact:	<b>0031 6 52740243</b>
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	<b>22 june 2012</b>

## 1 Information on International flows of Financial Resources

Year: 2010		Currency: 1.000 k€									
Type of financial flows		Activity Categories								Total	
		A		B		C		D			
		amount	Confidence	amount	confidence	amount	confidence	amount	confidence	amount	confidence
1.1 ODA	1.1.1 Bilateral	38				24				62	
	1.1.2 Multilateral									32	
1.2 Other Public Funds											
1.3 Private Market											
1.4 Not for profit Organizations										60 (b)	Low
Total:										154 (a)	
Comments:											
1.1. Source: Ministerie Buitenlandse Zaken / Ministry of Foreign Affairs											
(a) This includes 11,3 mln € for Initiatief Duurzame Handel (IDH / sustainable trade initiative) and 33% (6 mln €) of our total national GEF-contribution (20 mln €)											
(b) Estimate											

## 2 Information on the availability of financial Resources in each country

Year: 2010		Currency: 1.000 k€									
Type of financial flows		Activity Categories								Total	
		A		B		C		D		amount	Confidence
		amount	Confidence	amount	confidence	amount	confidence	amount	confidence		
2.1 Government Budgets	2.1.1 Central	14 (a) 443 (g)	Med.			8,9 (b) 13,3 c) 22.2 (d) 11.4 (e) 22,9 (f)				535,7	
	2.1.2 Provincial	330 (h)								330	
	2.1.3 Local	21 (i)								21	
	2.2 Private / Market										
2.3 Other											
Total:		808				78,7				886,7	
Comments and References:											
2.1											
a) Budget for Connectivity (preventing ecological and nature fragmentation) in the national Infrastructure Fund: The <a href="#">Meerjaren Programma Ontsnippering</a> (MJPO). In total 250 mln EUR for 2005 – 2018. Estimate for 2010.											
b) Sustainable Production: Improvement of environmental quality of Soil en Water: Artikel 4 (Duurzaam Produceren), <a href="#">VROM-jaarverslag 2010</a> : 8.937 k€											
c) Sustainable Production: Sustainable use of ecosystems and natural resources: Artikel 4 (Duurzaam Produceren), VROM jaarverslag 2010: 13.345 k€											
d) Sustainable use of soil, sub-surface and groundwater, Artikel 10 (Leefomgevingskwaliteit), <a href="#">VROM-jaarverslag 2010</a> : 22.262 k€											
e) Waddenfonds: Expenditure and Programme: resp. 6.256 k€ en 5.216 k€ (total: 11.472 k€) (reference: <a href="#">VROM-jaarverslag 2010</a> )											
f) <a href="#">VenW, Annual Report 2010</a> , Water Quality (Art. 31.04): 22.965 k€ (including Water Framework Directive and Marine Strategy)											
g) Acquisition of protected Areas 41.682 k€, Development of protected Areas 136.619 k€, Management of Protected Areas 264.446 k€											
h) Budget for Provinces for nature											
i) Municipality Fund for nature											

### 3 Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	Yes	2010		TEEB NL is in progress. This <a href="#">first publication</a> in a series of six TEEB studies explores costs and benefits of nature for health and health care. Estimated benefits are 400 mln €/year.
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	No			
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	No			
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	Yes	2011 (ongoing)		Duurzaamheidsagenda (Sustainability Agenda, 2011, <a href="#">Link to website</a> ). The agenda is a Green Growth Strategy and contains 5 focal areas under which: Resources and Product chains, Sustainable water and land use, food and climate and energy. Within these areas several initiatives in different economic sectors have been agreed to target green growth. Biodiversity is part of the overall framework.
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	No			
Comments:				

#### 4.1 Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation

Year: 2010    Currency: 1.000 k€

Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Despcription
4.1.1 North South Technical Cooperation and capacity building provided		62		Through ODA (a)
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity building through triangular cooperation				
Comments:	(a) To avoid double counting please note that this 62 mln € has already been reported in table 1			

#### 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies.

Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed, phased out		
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced	14% of Dutch tax revenues (2010) can be considered as green taxation	Revenues of Green taxation in 2010, not defined to which extend these may be attributed to biodiversity

### 4.3 New and innovative Financial Mechanisms

Type of initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
Environmental Fiscal reforms: <i>Green taxation</i>	14% of Dutch tax revenue (2010)	It has not been estimated to what extent these revenues can be attributed to biodiversity benefits	
Business Biodiversity Partnerships: <i>Green Deals</i>	No direct government funding but contributions on the level of legal framework, including the removing of legal obstacles to make green initiatives possible.	A number of 11 <a href="#">green deals</a> has a special focus on biodiversity and ecosystems e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity and Economy: formation of a Public Private Partnership (Platform Biodiversiteit en Bedrijfsleven)</li> <li>• Biodiversity+ label</li> <li>• Productive landscape:</li> <li>• And others</li> </ul>	Several Green deals have been agreed between private sector and government. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove (legal) barriers (central government), support sustainable use (private sector, citizens, municipalities) of resources, water, including biodiversity.</li> <li>• Leading to new economic initiatives and activities and cost reductions.</li> </ul>
Markets for Green Products:  <i>Duurzaam Inkopen/ Green Procurement</i>	Government procurement (central, provincial, municipal, education etc.) of products and services accounts for about 50 bln €/year.	Procurement needs to fulfill environmental and social criteria.	Monitoring and evaluation of procurement and criteria every 2 years. In developing criteria there is a close collaboration between governmental organisations en private sector.
Payment for Ecosystem services:  <i>GDI, Green Development Initiative</i>	VROM: 430.000 (2005 – 2012), exclusief tweede fase (vanuit IPB)	Methodology development Raising awareness and sharing knowlegde Conferences Workshops Reporting	Green Development Initiative: Mobilizing Private Sector Finance for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use. The Netherlands has been one of the initiators and co funders of de development of the GDI. Goal is to create a voluntary, transparent international market for private sector funding of GDI-certified areas.



Type of initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
Biodiversity offset mechanisms: <i>BBOP, Business Biodiversity Offsetting Program</i>	450.000 € (2005 – 2012), waarvan ca 400.000 uit IPB en ca 50.000 VROM	Methodology development Raising awareness and sharing knowlegde Conferences Workshops Reporting	BBOP is an international collaboration between companies, financial institutions, government agencies and civil society organizations. The members are developing best practice in following the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, minimize, restore, offset) to achieve no net loss or a net gain of biodiversity.
<i>NVI, Natural Value Initiative</i>	VROM: 250.000 (2005 – 2012), exclusief de subsidie vanuit IPB	Methodology development Raising awareness and sharing knowlegde Conferences Workshops Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build awareness of corporate dependence on ecosystem services and impact on biodiversity and the links to corporate risk;</li> <li>• Build expertise both in companies and investors on evaluating and managing biodiversity and ecosystem services (BES) risks and opportunities;</li> <li>• Stimulate improved performance within the private sector and encourage greater reward of responsible behavior;</li> <li>• Mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services (BES) into investment analysis</li> </ul>

Type of initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
Forest Carbon Partnership Facility/ FCPF	Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken : 15 mln EUR 2008- 2012	Methodology development Raising awareness and sharing knowlegde Conferences Workshops Reporting	The FCPF intends to assist developing countries in their efforts to <i>reduce emissions from deforestation and degradation/REDD</i> . The FCPF will be comprised of two separate mechanisms. 1) <u>Readiness Mechanism</u> : the Facility intends to assist developing tropical and sub-tropical countries prepare themselves to participate in a large scale system of positive incentives for REDD 2) Carbon Finance Mechanism: The Facility will support a few countries that will have successfully participated in the Readiness Mechanism to join a second mechanism through which the Facility will test and evaluate incentive payments for REDD programs in five developing countries.
Global Crop Diversity Trust. Innovatieve funding mechanism. Set up in 2004. Funded by governments, foundations (e.g. Gates), companies, NGO's, individual donors. Resource mobility is enhanced and translated by using the endowment fund's interest to finance programmes.	NL has contributed \$ 1,8 mio (of \$ 2,5 mio pledged)  Total mounts up to \$ 172 mio.	Food is one of the main ecosystem services biodiversity lends us. Working on genetic resources for food and agriculture, works to guarantee the effective conservation - and crucially, the ready availability to those who wish to use it - of the biological basis of all agriculture.	The interest from the endowment fund will ensure that the conservation of this most vital and natural resource is placed forever on a firm foundation. The Trust does so by funding, developing and executing demand-driven projects with regards to sustainable use and conservation of genetic resources for food and agriculture, in particular ex-situ, in order to preserve their diversity.
Offset mechanisms and integration with climate policy: Trees for Travel		Planting of trees contributes to sustainable land use and local sustainable development	Government travel CO2 offsetting and tree planting scheme (2010)

4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms (please indicate the number of initiatives and mechanisms your country has undertaken that enhance resource mobilization)

Initiative	Description
ABS Capacity Development Initiative for Africa. Multi-donor Initiative. Co-founded in 2006 by Germany and the Netherlands. NL contributed € 2,5 mio being a partner 2006-2010.	Enabling African states and stakeholders to use benefits generated by the use of genetic resources for biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation.
Comments: Resource mobility is enhanced by exchanging knowledge, raising awareness, and building capacities in the African region about the possibilities of access & benefit-sharing for sustainable development. E.g. best practices, joint programming, studies.	

# POLAND

## PRELIMINARY REPORT

### ON BIODIVERSITY RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

#### Identification of respondent

Please complete the following table:

Country: Poland	Name of respondent: Bozena Haczek
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	CBD National Focal Point
Title and Department of respondent:	Minister's Counsellor/ Department of Forestry and Nature Protection
Organization of respondent:	Ministry of the Environment
Email address:	bozena.haczek@mos.gov.pl
Telephone contact:	+48 22 57 92 423
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	20.06.2012

#### 1. Information on International Flows of Financial Resources

Year: 2011		Currency: USD									
Type of financial flows		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management.		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
1.1ODA	1.1.1 Bilateral			203 169	high	1 483 700	high			1 686 869	high
	1.1.2 Multilateral										
1.2 Other public funds											
1.3 Private/ Market											
1.4 Not for profit organizations											
Total:				203 169	high	1 483 700	high			1 686 869	high
Comments: amount of resources provided in support of biodiversity in developing countries, including energy saving projects											

## **2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in each country**

Year: 2009		Currency: PLN									
Source		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	202 102 000	high					34 010 000	high	236 112 000	high
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	26 476 000	high							26 476 000	high
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal										
2.2 Private/ Market											
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)											
Total:		228 578 000	high					34 010 000	high	262 588 000	high
Comments: data for local budgets, private/market and other not available; data for category A include data for category B and C											

Year: 2010			Currency: PLN										
Source			Activity categories								Total		
			Category A: Biodiversity protection		Category B: Policy development and administration		Category C: Sustainable use and management		Category D: Sustainable production and consumption				
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amounts		Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	229 052 000	high					30 446 000	high	259 498 000		high	
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	28 594 000	high							28 594 000		high	
	2.1.3Local/Municipal												
2.2 Private/ Market													
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)													
Total:			257 646 000	high					30 446 000	high	288 092 000		high
Comments: data for local budgets, private/market and other not available; data for category A include data for category B and C													

### **3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization**

<b>Steps</b>		<b>Year initiated/ completed</b>	<b>Description of support received for the step (if applicable)</b>	<b>Results achieved (if applicable)</b>
<b>3.1</b> Assessment of values of biodiversity	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
<b>3.2</b> Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	Yes	2005/2007	Not applicable	As a part of NBSAP; for a period 2007-2013 funding needs: 281,1 mln PLN
<b>3.3</b> Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
<b>3.4</b> Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	Yes	2008/-	Not applicable	Nature protection included into national priorities in the State Ecological Policy for 2009-2012, and beyond by 2016. Biodiversity included into national priorities in the draft National Development Strategy by 2020
<b>3.5</b> Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	Yes	2008/2011	Not applicable	Biodiversity distinguished in government and self-government budgets

### **4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability**

#### ***4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South Cooperation***

**Year:**

**Currency:**

<b>Type of initiative</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Confidence</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>4.1.1</b> North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided				
<b>4.1.2</b> Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity-building through triangular cooperation				
<b>Comments:</b> no data available				

#### 4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies

Year:

Currency:

Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out		
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced		
<b>Comments :</b> no initiatives undertaken		

#### 4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism

Year: 2010

Currency: PLN

Type of Initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management	99 466 000	Projects and other activities on biodiversity and sustainable forestry	below
<p><b>Comments:</b> The National Fund of Environmental Protection and Water Management (NFEP&amp;WM) which was established in 1989 as a result of the regime transformation in Poland, in cooperation with voivodeship funds for environmental protection and water management is the pillar of the Polish system of financing environmental protection, including biodiversity. The basis of the National Fund's operation as a State legal person is the Act on Environmental Protection Law. The mission of the National Fund, according to the NFEP&amp;WM Strategy for 2009-2012, is to financially support undertakings intended for environmental protection and respecting its value, on the basis of the principle of sustainable development included in the constitution. It participates in implementation of the environmental policy of Poland as a source of financing and cooperate, along with the Ministry of the Environment, with commissions of environmental protection at the Sejm and Senate. The National Fund and voivodeship funds provide financial support for projects which contribute to enforcement of Polish environmental obligations, including implementation of the Convention on biological diversity. The amount of money, mentioned above is included in the central government budget in the second table under para 2</p>			

#### 4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
<b>Comments:</b> no initiatives undertaken	



## SPAIN

### **Contribución Española en respuesta a la Notificación 2012-023 de la Secretaría del Convenio de Naciones Unidas sobre Diversidad Biológica**

En contestación a la **Notificación 2012-023** de la Secretaría del CDB, en la que se anima a las Partes del Convenio a hacer uso de la estructura de información, se adjunta a continuación la información relativa a la aplicación en España del marco de información preliminar sobre la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos.

De conformidad con las directrices para el uso del marco de información preliminar, se aporta la información disponible para el periodo comprendido entre los años **2006 y 2010**. Todas las cantidades se indican en **euros (€)** para el periodo correspondiente.

Para la aplicación de este marco preliminar de información ha sido necesario consultar y contar con la colaboración de numerosas instituciones y organismos que disponen de la información relevante en la materia. En particular, se han realizado consultas a los organismos de la Administración Estatal responsable en materia de cooperación internacional al desarrollo y, en varios campos relacionados con la conservación del medio natural, así como a los responsables en materia de biodiversidad y naturaleza en las Comunidades Autónomas, y a la Federación Española de Municipios y Provincias. Asimismo, se han realizado consultas a instituciones representativas del sector privado y a organizaciones no gubernamentales y fundaciones relevantes.

Pese a los esfuerzos realizados por recopilar la máxima información disponible, no ha resultado posible responder a todos los campos requeridos. Si bien la información aportada como respuesta a este marco de información corresponde a la mejor información disponible, se trata de datos parciales e incompletos, por lo que no debe interpretarse como una cuantificación completa ni exhaustiva de todos los recursos de financiación movilizados en España para la conservación y el uso sostenible de la biodiversidad. No obstante, esta Subdirección General prevé continuar con este ejercicio de recopilación y consolidación de información, a fin de seguir completando y mejorando la información sobre los flujos nacionales e internacionales de financiación para la biodiversidad.

A continuación se señala la metodología que se ha utilizado para la toma de datos, así como las principales dificultades y carencias que se han encontrado durante la aplicación del marco de información preliminar.

### 1.1. Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo

Los datos de Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo (AOD) aportados para la Categoría A corresponden a la AOD identificada con el código CRS41030 (biodiversidad) del CAD/OCDE. El nivel de fiabilidad de estos datos se considera alto, por tratarse de información oficial que se recoge sistemáticamente.

No es posible aportar datos para las categorías B, C y D puesto que no existen metodologías para contabilizar cuantitativamente la cantidad de financiación que contribuye a la biodiversidad a través de otras actividades sectoriales. No obstante, existe constancia de que, además de las actividades identificadas con el marcador CRS41030, muchas actividades identificadas con otros códigos CRS contribuyen también a los objetivos del Convenio de Diversidad Biológica. Por ejemplo, los marcadores CRS 41010 (política medioambiental y gestión administrativa), CRS 41081 (educación ambiental) y CRS 41082 (investigación medioambiental) pueden resultar relevantes en el contexto de este marco de información. Sin embargo, se ha optado por no incluir la información de estos marcadores por no poder cuantificarse la contribución concreta que, a través de esas actividades, se realiza a los objetivos de biodiversidad. Los datos correspondientes a dichos CRS, no obstante, se encuentran disponibles en los informes oficiales enviados por España al OCDE/CAD y pueden ser utilizados, en caso de considerarse oportuno.

Por otro lado, el marcador de Río sobre diversidad biológica puede aportar información cualitativa relevante, puesto que permite identificar las actividades que contribuyen a la conservación de la biodiversidad, si bien no proporciona información cuantitativa. En este sentido, el desarrollo de directrices metodológicas para el posible uso o revisión de los marcadores de Río, en línea con la invitación del párrafo 12 de la Decisión X/3, podría contribuir a la obtención de una información más sólida sobre la financiación para biodiversidad a través de la Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo.

En todo caso, se considera que la metodología para obtener la información relativa a la financiación para biodiversidad a través de la Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo debe poder obtenerse de forma directa y sencilla, a partir de la información oficial que se remite al Comité de Ayuda al Desarrollo de la OCDE (OCDE/CAD).

### 1.2. Otros fondos públicos:

Aunque existe información relativa a otros fondos públicos diferentes de la ODA en los datos relativos a “otros flujos financieros” (OFF), no existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la

biodiversidad a través de estos otros flujos financieros. Por tanto, no ha sido posible aportar los datos relativos a la financiación para la biodiversidad a través de otros fondos públicos. Para ello, sería necesario el desarrollo y aplicación de metodologías que permitieran la identificación y cuantificación de la parte de OFF que contribuye a la protección de la biodiversidad.

### 1.3. Sector privado / mercados:

No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través del sector privado.

### 1.4. Organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro:

No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro. Este Ministerio ha realizado una consulta a algunas de las principales ONG de medio ambiente en España, a fin de realizar una estimación orientativa de los fondos destinados a biodiversidad a nivel internacional por estas instituciones. No obstante, la falta de información disponible no ha permitido realizar este tipo de estimaciones.

### 2.1. Presupuestos gubernamentales:

Para la estimación de los presupuestos gubernamentales destinados a la protección de la biodiversidad, se han realizado consultas a diferentes Direcciones Generales de la Administración General del Estado con competencias directas o indirectas en esta materia, y a los órganos competentes de las Comunidades Autónomas, así como a la Federación Española de Municipios y Provincias.

Los datos de los presupuestos de la **Administración Central** (punto 2.1.1.) se han calculado a partir de los presupuestos ejecutados destinados a la protección de biodiversidad, incluyendo los presupuestos de los siguientes organismos:

- presupuesto de la entonces Dirección General de Medio Natural y Política Forestal, destinado a las siguientes líneas de actuación: conservación de la biodiversidad; inventario y seguimiento de la biodiversidad; difusión y comunicación ambiental; lucha contra incendios forestales; hidrología; ordenación forestal; material genético forestal; lucha contra agentes nocivos; inventario forestal; vías pecuarias; banco de datos de biodiversidad; y análisis territorial.

- Presupuesto de la Fundación Biodiversidad, destinado íntegramente a la protección de la biodiversidad y el medio natural.
- Presupuesto ejecutado por el Organismo Autónomo de Parques Nacionales destinado directamente a protección de la biodiversidad.
- Presupuesto ejecutado por la Dirección General de Sostenibilidad de la Costa y el Mar a favor de la protección de la biodiversidad marina y costera, que incluye actividades de protección, rehabilitación y gestión de sistemas litorales naturales y actuaciones desarrolladas por la División de la Protección del Mar.
- Presupuesto ejecutado por la Dirección General de Recursos Pesqueros y Acuicultura que contribuyen a la protección de la biodiversidad: presupuestos relacionados con acuerdos y organizaciones regionales de pesca; presupuesto ejecutado en reservas marinas pesqueras, arrecifes artificiales y medidas de mitigación de capturas accidentales; y presupuesto para el cartografiado y caracterización de los fondos marinos.
- Presupuesto de la Dirección General del Agua que contribuye a la protección de la biodiversidad, entre los que se incluyen actuaciones destinadas principalmente a la conservación y mejora de cauces y riberas.

En el cálculo de estos presupuestos se ha descontado la parte de estos presupuestos correspondientes a cofinanciación de la Unión Europea, a fin de evitar duplicidades con los datos aportados por los presupuestos comunitarios. Para este cálculo, se ha descontado entre el 70% y el 80% de los presupuestos de las líneas de actuación que cuentan con co-financiación comunitaria. Esta metodología constituye una aproximación ya que no siempre se conoce con precisión si esos presupuestos cuentan con cofinanciación comunitaria y, en ese caso, el porcentaje concreto de cofinanciación. El grado de fiabilidad debe considerarse por tanto relativamente bajo.

En cuanto a los datos correspondientes a la **Administración Autonómica (2.1.2) y local (2.1.3)**, la recopilación de toda la información relevante ha resultado de gran complejidad, debido al alto número de organismos involucrados. Por este motivo, y pese a la colaboración prestada por varias Comunidades Autónomas, dada las dificultades que entraña identificar y recopilar una información exhaustiva de todos los organismos relevantes en esta materia, se ha optado por utilizar como fuente de información los datos existentes de acuerdo con la Clasificación de las Funciones de las Administraciones Públicas. Los datos aportados en este caso se han extraído de la clasificación funcional de los empleos de las Administraciones Públicas, que ofrece información sobre el gasto realizado por las Administraciones Públicas atendiendo a su finalidad. Esta información, que se publica anualmente en los informes de Cuentas de las Administraciones Públicas, se obtiene aplicando la metodología de la Clasificación de las Funciones de las Administraciones Públicas (CFAP) de las Naciones Unidas, recogida en el Reglamento (CE) nº 113/2002 de la Comisión Europea, de 23 de enero de 2002.

En concreto, se han utilizado para este apartado los datos correspondientes a la subfunción 05.4, relativa a al gasto público en protección de la diversidad biológica y del paisaje. En esta categoría se incluyen los gastos relativos a actividades como:

protección y recuperación de especies y hábitats; protección de paisajes naturales y seminaturales; y actividades de medición, control y laboratorios y similares.

No ha sido posible, en este caso, establecer una distinción entre las cuatro categorías, por lo que la información obtenida se ha incluido como total, incluyendo a todas las categorías.

## 2.2. Sector privado/mercados

La información que se aporta sobre la financiación del sector privado ha sido tomada de la Encuesta del gasto de las empresas en protección ambiental, elaborada por el Instituto Nacional de Estadística ([www.ine.es](http://www.ine.es)). Esta información incluye los resultados de una encuesta realizada al sector industrial español. Los datos que se han considerado para esta contestación se refieren únicamente al gasto realizado por el sector empresarial industrial español en equipos, instalaciones y actividades para la protección de la naturaleza, que incluyen: compra de terrenos por razones de protección de la naturaleza; repoblación; recuperación del paisaje después de excavaciones; zonas verdes alrededor de actividades industriales; adaptación de estructuras para prevenir colisiones de animales.

No se han tenido en cuenta los co-beneficios para la biodiversidad derivados de otro tipo de actuaciones (como descontaminación de aguas, reducción de la contaminación, etc.) por la dificultad que entraña identificar con fiabilidad la proporción de esas actividades que efectivamente contribuye a la conservación de la diversidad biológica.

Puesto que la información aportada se refiere exclusivamente al sector industrial, se considera que el grado de fiabilidad es medio, puesto que a esta cantidad debería añadirse la contribución de otros sectores empresariales, como el sector de servicios. No existen datos disponibles, ni se han podido obtener datos fiables sobre otros sectores empresariales, que pueden tener una contribución significativa para la protección de la biodiversidad.

## 2.3. Otros: ONG, fundaciones y academia.

No ha sido posible recabar información fiable y completa sobre los recursos movilizados para la biodiversidad por otros agentes como las organizaciones no

gubernamentales o las fundaciones y academias. Esta información se encuentra muy disgregada y no existen fuentes de información oficiales en esta materia.

**Identification of respondent**

Country: <b>Spain</b>	Name of respondent: <b>Miguel Aymerich</b>
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input type="checkbox"/> Focal point for resource mobilization <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify
Title and Department of respondent:	Head of Unit of Nature.
Organization of respondent:	Ministry on Agriculture, Food and Environment.
Email address:	MAymerich@magrama.es
Telephone contact:	91.7493614
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	1 <sup>st</sup> July 2012

**1. Information on International Flows of Financial Resources.**

Year: 2006		Currency: €									
Type of financial flows:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1. Bilateral	5.116.690	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1.1.2. Multilateral	1.160.871	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2. Other public funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3. Private/Market		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.4. Not profit organizations		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:		6.277.561	Low								
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p><b>1.1.</b> Los datos de Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo (AOD) aportados para la Categoría A corresponden a la AOD identificada con el código CRS41030 (biodiversidad) del CAD/OCDE. (Fuente: datos de la AOD de España). El nivel de fiabilidad de estos datos se considera medio por tratarse de información oficial que se recoge sistemáticamente, pero que no incluye necesariamente la totalidad de la ODA que contribuye a la biodiversidad, sino únicamente aquellas actuaciones identificadas con el CRS 41030.</p> <p><b>1.2., 1.3, 1.4:</b> No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través de otros fondos públicos, el sector privado o las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro. No ha sido posible obtener estimaciones de estos flujos.</p>											

Year: 2007		Currency: €									
Type of financial flows:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1. Bilateral	5.477.733	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1.1.2. Multilateral	4.193.144	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2. Other public funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3. Private/Market		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.4. Not profit organizations		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:		9.670.877	Low								
Comments:											
<p>1.1. Los datos de Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo (AOD) aportados para la Categoría A corresponden a la AOD identificada con el código CRS41030 (biodiversidad) del CAD/OCDE. (Fuente: datos de la AOD de España). El nivel de fiabilidad de estos datos se considera medio por tratarse de información oficial que se recoge sistemáticamente, pero que no incluye necesariamente la totalidad de la ODA que contribuye a la biodiversidad, sino únicamente aquéllas actuaciones identificadas con el CRS 41030.</p> <p>1.2., 1.3, 1.4: No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través de otros fondos públicos, el sector privado o las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro. No ha sido posible obtener estimaciones de estos flujos.</p>											



Year: 2008		Currency: €									
Type of financial flows:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1. Bilateral	15.571.808	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1.1.2. Multilateral	3.359.193	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2. Other public funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3. Private/Market		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.4. Not profit organizations		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:		18.931.000	Low								
Comments:											
<p>1.1. Los datos de Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo (AOD) aportados para la Categoría A corresponden a la AOD identificada con el código CRS41030 (biodiversidad) del CAD/OCDE. (Fuente: datos de la AOD de España). El nivel de fiabilidad de estos datos se considera medio por tratarse de información oficial que se recoge sistemáticamente, pero que no incluye necesariamente la totalidad de la ODA que contribuye a la biodiversidad, sino únicamente aquellas actuaciones identificadas con el CRS 41030.</p> <p>1.2., 1.3, 1.4: No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través de otros fondos públicos, el sector privado o las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro. No ha sido posible obtener estimaciones de estos flujos.</p>											

Year: 2009		Currency: €									
Type of financial flows:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1. Bilateral	8.488.664	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1.1.2. Multilateral	6.972.175	Medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2. Other public funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3. Private/Market		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.4. Not profit organizations		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:		15.460.839	Low								
Comments:											
<p><b>1.1.</b> Los datos de Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo (AOD) aportados para la Categoría A corresponden a la AOD identificada con el código CRS41030 (biodiversidad) del CAD/OCDE. (Fuente: datos de la AOD de España). El nivel de fiabilidad de estos datos se considera medio por tratarse de información oficial que se recoge sistemáticamente, pero que no incluye necesariamente la totalidad de la ODA que contribuye a la biodiversidad, sino únicamente aquéllas actuaciones identificadas con el CRS 41030.</p> <p>En el año 2009, el 4,20% de las actuaciones de la Cooperación Española tienen incorporada la biodiversidad en mayor o menor grado, es decir, un total de 718 actuaciones. Dentro de las actuaciones marcadas, hay un mayor número de significativas (508) que de principales (210), sumando un total de 181 millones de euros. Por tanto, puede concluirse que un 5,2% de la AOD bilateral en 2009 contempla la diversidad biológica. (Fuente: informe de Seguimiento PACI 2009).</p>											
<p><b>1.2., 1.3, 1.4:</b> No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través de otros fondos públicos, el sector privado o las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro. No ha sido posible obtener estimaciones de estos flujos.</p>											

Year: 2010		Currency: €									
Type of financial flows:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
1.1. Official Development Assistance	1.1.1. Bilateral	7.015.707	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1.1.2. Multilateral	4.272.743	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2. Other public funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.3. Private/Market		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.4. Not profit organizations		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:		11.288.450	Low								
Comments:											
<p>1.1. Los datos de Ayuda Oficial al Desarrollo (AOD) aportados para la Categoría A corresponden a la AOD identificada con el código CRS41030 (biodiversidad) del CAD/OCDE. (Fuente: datos de la AOD de España). El nivel de fiabilidad de estos datos se considera medio por tratarse de información oficial que se recoge sistemáticamente, pero que no incluye necesariamente la totalidad de la ODA que contribuye a la biodiversidad, sino únicamente aquéllas actuaciones identificadas con el CRS 41030.</p> <p>De acuerdo con los datos aportados por los marcadores de Rio, en el año 2010, del total de la AOD bilateral española, 192 millones de euros (578 contribuciones), que representan el 6,7% del total, incluían aspectos vinculados a la biodiversidad.</p> <p>1.2., 1.3, 1.4: No existe información detallada sobre los flujos de financiación internacional movilizados específicamente para la biodiversidad a través de otros fondos públicos, el sector privado o las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro. No ha sido posible obtener estimaciones de estos flujos.</p>											

## **2. Information on the Availability of Financial Resources in Spain.**

Year: 2006		Currency: €									
Source:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende
2.1. Government budgets	2.1.1. Central	158.093.638	medium	-	-	20.381.851	medium	-	-	178.475.489	low
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	1.098.000.000	low
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	195.000.000	low
2.2. Private/Market		46.589.236	medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	46.589.236	low
2.3. Other (NGOs, foundation, academia)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total:		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.518.064.725	low
Comments:											
<p>2.1.1. Los datos aportados en la categoría A se han calculado a partir de los presupuestos ejecutados destinados a la protección de biodiversidad de los siguientes organismos: la entonces Dirección General de Medio Natural y Política Forestal (111.182.166€) + Fundación Biodiversidad (10.072.480 €) + Organismo Autónomo de Parques Nacionales ( 34.713.891 €) + Dirección General de Sostenibilidad de la Costa y el Mar (2.125.101 €)</p> <p>Los datos aportados en la categoría C se han calculado a partir del presupuesto que contribuye a la conservación y protección de la biodiversidad ejecutado por la Dirección General de Recursos Pesqueros y Acuicultura (5.432.604 €) + la Dirección General del Agua (14.949.247€)</p>											
<p>2.1.2. y 2.1.3. Se incluyen en estos apartados los datos de gasto público en protección de la diversidad biológica y del paisaje de las Comunidades Autónomas y las Entidades Locales, de acuerdo con la clasificación funcional de los empleos de las Administraciones Públicas, aplicando la metodología de la Clasificación de las Funciones de las Administraciones Públicas (CFAP) de las Naciones Unidas. (Fuente: Cuentas de las Administraciones Públicas 2007).</p>											

**2.2:** La información que se aporta sobre la financiación del sector privado ha sido tomada de la Encuesta del gasto de las empresas en protección ambiental, elaborada por el Instituto Nacional de Estadística ([www.ine.es](http://www.ine.es)), que se refiere únicamente al sector industrial, por lo que el grado de fiabilidad se considera medio. No existen datos disponibles ni se han podido obtener datos fiables sobre otros sectores empresariales que pueden tener una contribución significativa para la protección de la biodiversidad.

**2.3:** No ha sido posible recabar información fiable y completa sobre los recursos movilizados para la biodiversidad por otros agentes como las organizaciones no gubernamentales o las fundaciones y academias. Esta información se encuentra muy disgregada y no existen fuentes de información oficiales en esta materia.

Year: 2007		Currency: €									
Source:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1. Government budgets	2.1.1. Central	170.560.402	medium	-	-	42.365.677	medium	-	-	212.926.079	low
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.003.000.000	low
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	266.000.000	low
2.2. Private/Market		64.857.736	medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	64.857.736	low
2.3. Other (NGOs, foundation, academia)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Total:		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.546.783.815	low
Comments:											
2.1.1. Los datos aportados en la categoría A se han calculado a partir de los presupuestos ejecutados destinados a la protección de biodiversidad de los siguientes organismos: la entonces Dirección General de Medio Natural y Política Forestal (116.857.669€) + Fundación Biodiversidad (13.293.907 €) + Organismo Autónomo de Parques Nacionales ( 37.790.383 €) + Dirección General de Sostenibilidad de la Costa y el Mar ( 2.569.443 €) + División de Protección del Medio marino ( 49.000 €)											
Los datos aportados en la categoría C se han calculado a partir del presupuesto que contribuye a la conservación y protección de la biodiversidad ejecutado por la Dirección											

General de Recursos Pesqueros y Acuicultura (7.230.360 € ) + la Dirección General del Agua (35.135.317€)

**2.1.2. y 2.1.3.** Se incluyen en estos apartados los datos de gasto público en protección de la diversidad biológica y del paisaje de las Comunidades Autónomas y las Entidades Locales, de acuerdo con la clasificación funcional de los empleos de las Administraciones Públicas, aplicando la metodología de la Clasificación de las Funciones de las Administraciones Públicas (CFAP) de las Naciones Unidas. (Fuente: Cuentas de las Administraciones Públicas 2007).

**2.2:** La información que se aporta sobre la financiación del sector privado ha sido tomada de la Encuesta del gasto de las empresas en protección ambiental, elaborada por el Instituto Nacional de Estadística ([www.ine.es](http://www.ine.es)), que se refiere únicamente al sector industrial, por lo que el grado de fiabilidad se considera medio. No existen datos disponibles ni se han podido obtener datos fiables sobre otros sectores empresariales que pueden tener una contribución significativa para la protección de la biodiversidad.

**2.3:** No ha sido posible recabar información fiable y completa sobre los recursos movilizados para la biodiversidad por otros agentes como las organizaciones no gubernamentales o las fundaciones y academias. Esta información se encuentra muy disgregada y no existen fuentes de información oficiales en esta materia.

Year: 2008		Currency: €									
Source:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende
2.1. Government budgets	2.1.1. Central	161.251.604	medium	-	-	-	50.202.623	medium	-	211.454.228	low
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.032.000.000	low
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	273.000.000	low
2.2. Private/Market		75.395.062	medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	75.395.062	low
2.3. Other (NGOs, foundation, academia)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.591.849.290	low

**Comments:**

**2.1.1.** Los datos aportados en la categoría A se han calculado a partir de los presupuestos ejecutados destinados a la protección de biodiversidad de los siguientes organismos: la entonces Dirección General de Medio Natural y Política Forestal (107.378.544€) + Fundación Biodiversidad (9.340.478 €)) + Organismo Autónomo de Parques Nacionales ( 41.789.911 €)) + Dirección General de Sostenibilidad de la Costa y el Mar ( 1.937.856 €)) + División de Protección del Medio marino ( 804.815 €))

Los datos aportados en la categoría C se han calculado a partir del presupuesto que contribuye a la conservación y protección de la biodiversidad ejecutado por la Dirección General de Recursos Pesqueros y Acuicultura ( 7.076.041 €) + la Dirección General del Agua (43.126.582€)

**2.1.2. y 2.1.3.** Se incluyen en estos apartados los datos de gasto público en protección de la diversidad biológica y del paisaje de las Comunidades Autónomas y las Entidades Locales, de acuerdo con la clasificación funcional de los empleos de las Administraciones Públicas, aplicando la metodología de la Clasificación de las Funciones de las Administraciones Públicas (CFAP) de las Naciones Unidas. (Fuente: Cuentas de las Administraciones Públicas 2007).

**2.2:** La información que se aporta sobre la financiación del sector privado ha sido tomada de la Encuesta del gasto de las empresas en protección ambiental, elaborada por el Instituto Nacional de Estadística ([www.ine.es](http://www.ine.es)), que se refiere únicamente al sector industrial, por lo que el grado de fiabilidad se considera medio. No existen datos disponibles ni se han podido obtener datos fiables sobre otros sectores empresariales que pueden tener una contribución significativa para la protección de la biodiversidad.

**2.3:** No ha sido posible recabar información fiable y completa sobre los recursos movilizados para la biodiversidad por otros agentes como las organizaciones no gubernamentales o las fundaciones y academias. Esta información se encuentra muy disgregada y no existen fuentes de información oficiales en esta materia.

Year: 2009		Currency: €									
Source:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende
2.1. Government budgets	2.1.1. Central	213.524.303	medium	-	-	96.034.816	medium	-	-	309.559.119	low
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.046.000.000	low
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	442.000.000	low
2.2. Private/Market		39.937.424	medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	39.937.424	low
2.3. Other (NGOs, foundation, academia)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Total:		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.837.496.543	low
Comments:											
2.1.1. Los datos aportados en la categoría A se han calculado a partir de los presupuestos ejecutados destinados a la protección de biodiversidad de los siguientes organismos: la entonces Dirección General de Medio Natural y Política Forestal (146.005.455€) + Fundación Biodiversidad (22.636.686 €)) + Organismo Autónomo de Parques Nacionales ( 41.575.041€) + Dirección General de Sostenibilidad de la Costa y el Mar (3.269.943 €)) + División de Protección del Medio marino (37.178 €))											
Los datos aportados en la categoría C se han calculado a partir del presupuesto que contribuye a la conservación y protección de la biodiversidad ejecutado por la Dirección General de Recursos Pesqueros y Acuicultura (7.731.293 €) + la Dirección General del Agua (88.303.523€)											
2.1.2. y 2.1.3. Se incluyen en estos apartados los datos de gasto público en protección de la diversidad biológica y del paisaje de las Comunidades Autónomas y las Entidades Locales, de acuerdo con la clasificación funcional de los empleos de las Administraciones Públicas, aplicando la metodología de la Clasificación de las Funciones de las Administraciones Públicas (CFAP) de las Naciones Unidas. (Fuente: Cuentas de las Administraciones Públicas 2007).											



**2.2:** La información que se aporta sobre la financiación del sector privado ha sido tomada de la Encuesta del gasto de las empresas en protección ambiental, elaborada por el Instituto Nacional de Estadística ([www.ine.es](http://www.ine.es)), que se refiere únicamente al sector industrial, por lo que el grado de fiabilidad se considera medio. No existen datos disponibles ni se han podido obtener datos fiables sobre otros sectores empresariales que pueden tener una contribución significativa para la protección de la biodiversidad.

**2.3:** No ha sido posible recabar información fiable y completa sobre los recursos movilizados para la biodiversidad por otros agentes como las organizaciones no gubernamentales o las fundaciones y academias. Esta información se encuentra muy disgregada y no existen fuentes de información oficiales en esta materia.

Year: 2010		Currency: €									
Source:		Activity categories								Total	
		Category A:		Category B:		Category C:		Category D:			
		Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende	Amount	Confidende
2.1. Government budgets	2.1.1. Central	152.835.288	medium	-	-	104.345.417	medium	-	-	257.180.705	low
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2.1.3 Local/Municipal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.2. Private/Market		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.3. Other (NGOs, foundation, academia)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Comments:											
2.1.1. Los datos aportados en la categoría A se han calculado a partir de los presupuestos ejecutados destinados a la protección de biodiversidad de los siguientes organismos: la entonces Dirección General de Medio Natural y Política Forestal (110.974.305€) + Fundación Biodiversidad (7.908.740 €) + Organismo Autónomo de Parques Nacionales (30.534.807 €) + Dirección General de Sostenibilidad de la Costa y el Mar ( 2.464.657 €) + División de la Protección del Medio marino ( 952.779 €)											

Los datos aportados en la categoría C se han calculado a partir del presupuesto que contribuye a la conservación y protección de la biodiversidad ejecutado por la Dirección General de Recursos Pesqueros y Acuicultura (8.496.200 €) + la Dirección General del Agua (95.849.217€)

**2.1.2. y 2.1.3.** No se aportan datos para este año por no estar aún disponibles los datos de gasto público en protección de la diversidad biológica y del paisaje de las Comunidades Autónomas y las Entidades Locales para el año 2010.

**2.2:** No se aporta información relativa al sector privado por no estar aún disponibles los datos de la Encuesta del gasto de las empresas en protección ambiental para el año 2010.

**2.3:** No ha sido posible recabar información fiable y completa sobre los recursos movilizados para la biodiversidad por otros agentes como las organizaciones no gubernamentales o las fundaciones y academias. Esta información se encuentra muy disgregada y no existen fuentes de información oficiales en esta materia.

### **3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization**

<b>Steps</b>		<b>Year initiated/completed</b>	<b>Description of support received for the step (if applicable)</b>	<b>Results achieved (if applicable)</b>
<b>3.1</b> Assessment of values of biodiversity	<b>Yes</b>	Primer informe de resultados publicado en 2011. Actualmente, está en marcha la segunda fase del proyecto.	Proyecto coordinado por la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, con el apoyo de la Fundación Biodiversidad.	Proyecto de Evaluación de Ecosistemas del Milenio en España, elaborado por la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid con el apoyo de la Fundación Biodiversidad. <a href="http://www.ecomilenio.es">www.ecomilenio.es</a>
<b>3.2</b> Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	<b>Yes</b>	El Plan Estratégico del Patrimonio Natural y la Biodiversidad, que incluye una identificación de las necesidades de financiación y de las prioridades de actuación, fue aprobado en septiembre de 2011.		El Plan Estratégico del Patrimonio Natural y la Biodiversidad incluye una estimación del presupuesto que se consideraría necesario para un desarrollo adecuado de las acciones establecidas. <a href="http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/legislacion/rd_plan_estrategico_patrimonio_natural_biodiversidad.aspx">http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/legislacion/rd_plan_estrategico_patrimonio_natural_biodiversidad.aspx</a>
				El Plan Estratégico del Patrimonio Natural y la Biodiversidad incluye

3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	Yes	El Plan Estratégico del Patrimonio Natural y la Biodiversidad fue aprobado por Consejo de Ministros en septiembre de 2011.		<p>una serie de acciones destinadas al objetivo de movilizar los recursos financieros de todas las fuentes para asegurar la adecuada financiación de la política de conservación de biodiversidad. Se considera, por tanto, que este Plan Estratégico incluye, así, el plan de financiación para biodiversidad.</p> <p><a href="http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/legislacion/rd_plan_estrategico_patrimonio_natural_biodiversidad.aspx">http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/legislacion/rd_plan_estrategico_patrimonio_natural_biodiversidad.aspx</a></p>
Steps		Year initiated/completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	Yes	El III Plan Director de la Cooperación española fue aprobado por Consejo de Ministros para el periodo 2009-2011.		<p>El III Plan Director de la Cooperación española reconoce el medio ambiente como base del desarrollo, considerándolo una prioridad horizontal y sectorial.</p> <p>Se apuesta por un nuevo paradigma de desarrollo, caracterizado por economías sostenibles que respeten los límites de la naturaleza, con altos índices de biodiversidad, justicia social y equidad y bajas emisiones de dióxido de carbono y por la transversalización del medio ambiente en todas sus acciones.</p>

				<p>De este modo, la consideración de la biodiversidad y de los servicios de los ecosistemas han sido integrados en el Plan Director de la Cooperación española.</p> <p><a href="http://www.aecid.es/galerias/publicaciones/descargas/libro1_PlanDirector_LR.pdf">http://www.aecid.es/galerias/publicaciones/descargas/libro1_PlanDirector_LR.pdf</a></p>
<p><b>3.5</b> Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p>En todos los años comprendidos en el periodo 2006-2010, los Presupuestos Generales del Estado incluyen un programa presupuestario (456C) destinado a la protección y mejora del medio natural.</p>		<p>Los presupuestos generales del Estado incluyen un programa presupuestario (456C) destinado específicamente a la protección y mejora del medio natural.</p> <p><a href="http://www.minhap.gob.es/es-ES/Areas%20Tematicas/Presupuestos%20Generales%20del%20Estado/Paginas/Presupuestos.aspx">http://www.minhap.gob.es/es-ES/Areas%20Tematicas/Presupuestos%20Generales%20del%20Estado/Paginas/Presupuestos.aspx</a></p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>				

#### **4. Information on Specific Issues Related to Resource Availability**

##### **4.1. Technical cooperation, capacity building and South-South cooperation**

Type of initiative	Number	Amount	Confidence	Description
4.1.1 North-South technical cooperation and capacity-building provided	-	-	-	-
4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity building through triangular cooperation	-	-	-	-
<b>Comments:</b>				

##### **4.2. Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies**

Incentives	Value	Description
4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out	-	-
4.2.2 Positive incentives introduced	-	-
<b>Comments</b>		

--

#### **4.3. New and innovative financial mechanisms**

Type of initiative	Amount	How the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected	Description
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Comments:			

#### **4.4. Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention**

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
-	-
-	-
Comments:	

# SWEDEN



REGERINGSKANSLIET

6 July 2012

Ministry of the Environment Sweden

**Submission of information from Sweden, in response to CBD Notification  
2012-023 on Methodological and Implementation Guidance for the  
“Indicators for Monitoring the Implementation of the Convention’s Strategy  
for Resources Mobilization”**

In response to the CBD Notification 2012-023 and the invitation of the Conference of the Parties and the Working Group on the Review of Implementation to use the preliminary reporting framework (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add.1) as a flexible and tentative framework to monitor resources mobilised for biodiversity at national and global level, Sweden would like to submit the following information.

The latest figures on disbursed biodiversity financing in Sweden’s Official Development Assistance have been reported to the OECD Development Assistance Committee. According to this report, in the year 2010 about 2045 million SEK (approximately USD 284 million) was provided for biodiversity activities in developing countries<sup>1</sup>. These figures were calculated by applying the so called Rio markers.

The most comprehensive information available on domestic spending and other issues of relevance for the implementation of the reporting framework were submitted in Sweden’s fourth national report to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

  
Stefan Berggren  
Director

<sup>1</sup> A majority of the activities had biodiversity as a significant objective.