

## PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Preliminary Reporting Framework is intended for use by Parties for providing data on resource mobilization according to the indicators adopted in decision X/3. Data provided for the 2006-2010 will be used for the calculation of a baseline while data provided after 2010 will be used to monitor progress. The relationship between each of the indicators agreed in decision X/3 and the data fields contained in the Framework is provided in Appendix 1.

## II. OVERVIEW OF THE PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK

The indicators in decision X/3, as well as the strategy for resource mobilization and Aichi Target 20 require certain types of information:

- (a) Data, in monetary units, on flows of financial resources for biodiversity from developed to developing countries;
- (b) Data, in monetary units, on financial resources available for biodiversity;
- (c) Information on the steps countries are taking to implement the strategy for resource mobilization; and
- (d) Information (both qualitative and quantitative, including in monetary terms) on the role of specific initiatives including those relating to technical cooperation, and innovative financial mechanisms.[1]

The Preliminary Reporting Framework has been structured to correspond with these categories. Further the framework contains a fifth section which addresses the scope of biodiversity funding. Funding for biodiversity includes not only funding for direct actions to protect biodiversity but also funding related to actions across different sectors (e.g. agriculture, forestry, tourism) to promote biodiversity-friendly initiatives that have other primary purposes (e.g. ecosystem-based approaches to climate-change mitigation and adaptation) where a wider range of funding sources is typical. In addition, economy-wide and society-wide measures that address the underlying causes of biodiversity-loss are relevant, even if they are not traditionally regarded as biodiversity finance. With this in mind, the reporting framework has been developed to distinguish two general types of biodiversity funding. Funding related to activities which are intended to directly affect biodiversity and activities which focus on other issues but which have an indirect positive effect on biodiversity. In order to facilitate comparison, ideally Parties would provide funding information according to these two categories.

*Note:*

[1] The indicators requiring this type of information should be completed at the discretion of Parties. Some of the data used to calculate the information required for (1) and (2) may be used to provide information for this type of indicators as well.

## III. GUIDANCE FOR THE USE OF THE PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK

For those sections which ask for monetary figures (1, 2, and 4):

- (a) For the calculation of the baseline, please provide data for 2010 or the most recent year prior to that. If data is available for more than one year please reproduce the table and provide the information for each year. If possible, provide data for the period 2006 to 2010 and other years that may be available. If specific annual data is not available you may provide the best estimate of an average figure for a range of years (e.g. 2006-2010). For the purposes of monitoring progress please provide data for years after 2010;
- (b) If your financial year does not correspond to the calendar year, please indicate the calendar year in which the financial year begins; (For example if the financial year is 1 April 2010 until 30 March 2011, please record the year as "2010".);
- (c) In order to facilitate compilation of data, please provide either: the figures in 2010 US dollars (preferred), or ensure that the currency and the relevant year are indicated;
- (d) Please provide the best estimate of the data and also indicate the confidence level of your estimate ("high": data mostly derived from published sources; "medium": data represents expert judgment based on good information; or "low": data is a best but risky estimate with very incomplete data). As an alternative to indicating the confidence level, you may provide a range of estimates.

In completing the reporting framework Parties are encouraged to interact with their respective statistical offices or other relevant departments when gathering information. Some of the information needed for this process is likely already available and it should be used where possible in order to reduce the reporting burden and the duplication of efforts. At the end of each question a comments field is provided where respondents can provide additional information to further substantiate responses, highlight any assumptions or qualifications linked to the data, or to raise any other related issues.

When completing the preliminary reporting framework respondents are encouraged to provide information for as many of the data fields as possible. However, recognizing that it may be difficult for Parties to provide some of the information, there is no need to complete all of the data fields before submitting information to the Secretariat. Further, where precise information is not available, respondents are encouraged to use their best estimates.

**NOTE: Information may be added only into grey areas.**

**Identification of respondent**

Country:

Please indicate on whose behalf this information is being completed:

Contact details of the respondent :

Mr. Hem Pande
Additional Secretary
Ministry of Environment and Forest
Government of India
<a href="mailto:hempande@nic.in">hempande@nic.in</a>
011-24362551

Date of completion and submission of completed framework (dd/mm/yyyy) :

4/7/2014

# 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 two categories (directly or indirectly related), or provide an estimate of the total in the case where the details are not available. A list of indicative activities for each of the categories is provided in section 5. Please provide data for multiple years if possible (duplicate the table as necessary).

Currency:

Year	Type of financial flows [2]	Category [3]	Amount	Confidence
2006	1.1.1 ODA - Bilateral	Total (Directly + Indirectly related)	444.73	Medium
2006	1.1.2 ODA - Multilateral	Total (Directly + Indirectly related)	174.415	Medium
2007	1.1.1 ODA - Bilateral	Total (Directly + Indirectly related)	539.47	Medium
2007	1.1.2 ODA - Multilateral	Total (Directly + Indirectly related)	183.895	Medium
2008	1.1.1 ODA - Bilateral	Total (Directly + Indirectly related)	639.47	Medium
2008	1.1.2 ODA - Multilateral	Total (Directly + Indirectly related)	201.075	Medium
2009	1.1.1 ODA - Bilateral	Total (Directly + Indirectly related)	639.47	Medium
2009	1.1.2 ODA - Multilateral	Total (Directly + Indirectly related)	215.595	Medium

2010	1.1.1 ODA - Bilateral	Total (Directly + Indirectly related)	528.67	Medium
2010	1.1.2 ODA - Multilateral	Total (Directly + Indirectly related)	313.945	Medium
Total Directly related			0.00	Overall average confidence:  Medium
Total Indirectly related			0.00	
Total (Directly + Indirectly related)			3,880.74	
Overall Total			2,822.53	

Since values are not available for each year, we have used pro rata method to calculate the ODA fundings for each year. Total amount of funding has been divided into the number of years for which the funding was given, and an average amount has been used. Multilateral ODA has been taken to be the sum of allowance by the World Bank and the EAP. JICA and World bank figures have been taken from MoEF Annual Report of 2008-09.

Notes:

[2] **Type of financial flows:**

- **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.

- **Bilateral ODA** refers to contributions of donor government agencies, at all levels, to developing countries

- **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.

- **Other public funds** 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**".

- The **private sector** comprises private corporations or transaction mediated through a market.

[3] **Category:** See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

**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 two categories (directly or indirectly related), or provide an estimate of the total in the case where the details are not available.** A list of indicative activities for each of the 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**.

Currency: INR (Crores)/ \$ (crores)

Year	Source [4]	Category [5]	Amount(INR crores)	Amount (\$ million)	Confidence
2006	2.1.1 Gov. budgets - Central	Directly related	804.546	134.207313	Medium
2006	2.1.1 Gov. budgets - Central	Indirectly related	435.2	72.59625008	Medium
2006	2.1.2 Gov. budgets - State/Provincial	Directly related	4480.98	747.4778141	Medium

2006	2.1.2 Gov. budgets - State/Provincial	Indirectly related	608.1	101.4379129	Low
2006	2.2 Private/ Market	Select >>	0	0	Select >>
2007	2.1.1 Gov. budgets - Central	Directly related	913.23	152.3370254	High
2007	2.1.1 Gov. budgets - Central	Indirectly related	484.34	80.79335424	Medium
2007	2.1.2 Gov. budgets - State/Provincial	Directly related	4919.32	820.5978515	Medium
2007	2.1.2 Gov. budgets - State/Provincial	Indirectly related	669.28	111.6434243	Low
2007	2.2 Private/ Market	Select >>	0	0	Select >>
2008	2.1.1 Gov. budgets - Central	Directly related	1119.047	186.6696137	High
2008	2.1.1 Gov. budgets - Central	Indirectly related	1337	223.0266231	Medium
2008	2.1.2 Gov. budgets - State/Provincial	Directly related	5916.331	986.9104891	Medium
2008	2.1.2 Gov. budgets - State/Provincial	Indirectly related	924.2	154.1669447	Low
2008	2.2 Private/ Market	Select >>	0	0	Select >>
2009	2.1.1 Gov. budgets - Central	Directly related	1098.069	183.1702475	High
2009	2.1.1 Gov. budgets - Central	Indirectly related	1234.2	205.878428	Medium
2009	2.1.2 Gov. budgets - State/Provincial	Directly related	6774.926	1130.133783	Medium
2009	2.1.2 Gov. budgets - State/Provincial	Indirectly related	1112.17	185.5224528	Low
2009	2.2 Private/ Market	Select >>	0	0	Select >>
2010	2.1.1 Gov. budgets - Central	Directly related	1335.007	222.6941683	High
2010	2.1.1 Gov. budgets - Central	Indirectly related	1322.9	220.6745846	Medium
2010	2.1.2 Gov. budgets - State/Provincial	Directly related	7492.894	1249.898912	Medium
2010	2.1.2 Gov. budgets - State/Provincial	Indirectly related	1149.41	191.7345032	Low
2010	2.2 Private/ Market	Select >>	0	0	Select >>

Total Directly related	34,854.35
Total Indirectly related	9,276.80
Total (Directly + Indirectly related)	0.00
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>44,131.15</b>

**Overall average confidence:**  
  
Medium

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

Notes:

[4] Sources:

• **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.

• **The private sector** comprises private corporations or transactions mediated through a market.

• **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.

[5] **Category:** See section 5 of the reporting framework for a description of the categories.

### **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 and description of the initiative (including support received, results achieved, year initiated/ completed)	
---	--

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity [6]  <i>Green Accounting for Indian States and Union Territories (GAISP) 2004 -Technical Support</i></p>
-------------------------------------	--

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities [7] <i>Annual and five yearly plans with details on funds published by Ministry of Environment and Forests and Planning Commission of India - Research and data analysis.</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity [8] <i>National Biodiversity Authority 2003 Ministry of Environment and Forests- Organizational building support.</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies [9] <i>Possibility of integrating Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 for biodiversity conservation activities (ongoing) - Rs. 17621.35 crores (2010-2011).</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets [10] <i>Environmental Impact Assessment Notifications 1994 - Environment and development projects.</i>
<You may add here your comments>	

**Notes:**

[6] 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.

[7] 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.

[8] National financial plans for biodiversity refer to financial plans developed as part of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

[9] Development plans and strategies may take various forms in different countries, such as national poverty reduction strategies or national sustainability strategies.

[10] A national budget which integrates biodiversity considerations would normally contain a section or paragraph dealing with biodiversity.

**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.

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

For **developed countries** (members of OECD -DAC): Please indicate if your country is participating in technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives in support of biodiversity that are financed by your country or providing support to South-South cooperation through triangular cooperation. You may also provide a description of the types of initiatives supported. [11]

Type and description of the initiative (including support received, results achieved, year initiated/ completed)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	4.1.1 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building provided [12]  
<input type="checkbox"/>	4.1.2 Support to South-South technical cooperation & capacity building through triangular cooperation [13]  

<You may add here your comments>

For **developing countries** (countries, not members of OECD -DAC): please indicate if your country is participating in technical

**Type and description of the initiative (including support received, results achieved, year initiated/ completed)**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.1.3 North-South technical cooperation and capacity building received <i>Rs. 296 (1992-2005) from Indo-Canadian Environment Facility for capacity building to deliver sustainable development programs.</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.1.4 South-South technical cooperation & capacity building received from other developing countries [14] <i>Capacity building to deliver sustainable development programs.</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.1.5 South-South technical cooperation and capacity building - Provided [16] <i>Capacity building to deliver sustainable development programs.</i>

<You may add here your comments>

**Notes:**

[12] 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.

[13] **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.

[14] 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.

[15] **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.

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

Please indicate if your country has removed, phased out or reformed incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity [16] and if

**Incentives and description of the initiative (including how the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected)**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.2.1 Removed, reformed or phased-out <i>Organic farming assistance to the tune of Rs. 1360/-crores per annum- ' Under the National Programme for Organic Production(NPOP).launched in 2004, Grants –in –Aids were released by the Government of India to State Governments to the tune of (Rs.) 6802 crores during 2004-2009 or approx Rs 1360 crores per annum. In India, as against 42,000 hectares under certified organic farming during 2003-04, initial estimates for 2009-10 indicate that organic agriculture under certification has grown to 10.5 lakh hectares. Out of this, nearly 7.5 lakh hectares is fully certified while the remaining three lakh hectares are under various stages of conversion,' A variety of subsidies are disbursed to farmers to promote organic farming under the scheme. This includes subsidies of 33.3 % to 50% for meeting the certification costs, costs on preparation of bio-fertilizers and meeting of input requirements</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.2.2 Positive incentives [17] introduced <i>Green India Mission (GIM) aims to increase forest/ tree cover on 5 mha of forest/non-forest land and improved quality of forest cover on another 5 mha of forest/ non-forest lands. The GIM will help to additionally enhance carbon dioxide sequestration by 50-60 million tonnes annually by the year 2022. The total expenditure proposed for GIM will be INR 13,000 crores during the XII Plan and a one year spill-over into XIII Plan. The GIM is likely to generate INR 1352 crores worth of skilled employment for about 28,000 community youths.</i>

<You may add here your comments>

Notes:

[16] **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.

[17] **Positive incentive** measures are economic, legal or institutional measures designed to encourage beneficial activities.

#### 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.

Type of Initiative [18]	Resources generated (If known)	Description (including how the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected)
Green India Mission	Rs. 1352 crores	This would be inform of skill employment for about 28,000 community youths.
Biodiversity Management Committees	<Resources generated>	Documenting biodiversity (maintain People's Biodiversity Register), their sustainable use and deal with access and
<Type of Initiative>	<Resources generated>	<Description>
<Type of Initiative>	<Resources generated>	<Description>
<You may add here your comments>		

Notes:

[18] **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.

#### 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)
National Biodiversity Authority of India	Has prescribed detailed application form for access and benefit sharing requests. It charges application fee of Rs.5000 to Rs.10000. The authority is presently working on detailed guidelines on ABS. From 2006-
<Initiative>	<Description>
<Initiative>	<Description>



<You may add here your comments>

### 5. Activity classification

For the resource classification mentioned in sections 1 and 2 above 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 list any additional activities considered under each category.**

	Activity classification	
	Directly related to biodiversity [19]	Indirectly related to biodiversity [20]
<b>Default Description</b>	<p>Funding for activities directly related to biodiversity such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· In situ/ex situ conservation</li> <li>· Protected areas</li> <li>· Maintaining genetic diversity</li> <li>· Addressing threats from invasive alien species (in situations where the primary purpose is to protect biodiversity)</li> <li>· Addressing threats to specific ecosystems and/or species</li> </ul> <p>Also included within this category would be funding related to human resources, policy development and administration for these activities including the development of NBSAPs, frameworks, and CHM.</p> <p>Generally funding considered under this category would be provided by environmental agencies that directly and purposely consider biodiversity within their mandates.</p>	<p>Funding for activities which have benefits for biodiversity but for which biodiversity conservation and sustainable use is not the main focus.</p> <p>Activities under this category would generally be led by agencies outside of the environmental sector or where responsibility lies with multiple sectors.</p> <p>Activities under this category would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Sectoral measures which benefit biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries, etc)</li> <li>· Sectoral measures to conserve water and prevent pollution</li> <li>· Managing land use to mitigate climate change and increase resilience</li> <li>· Planning, fiscal and regularity measures to promote sustainable consumption and production</li> <li>· Broad scale public awareness and education measures</li> </ul>
<b>Additional activities</b>  <i>(To ensure information comparability please add any additional activities not already included in the row above. Please also indicate if any of the above activities are included in different a category)</i>	<Additional activities>	<Additional activities>

Notes:

[19] Activities directly related to biodiversity broadly correspond to the activity categories A and B used in UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add.1.

[20] Actions which indirectly relate to biodiversity broadly correspond to the activity categories C and D used in UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add.1.

## **India's submission on funding for biodiversity through revised preliminary reporting framework using average annual biodiversity funding for the years 2006-2010 as a preliminary baseline**

Public financing forms the dominant source of resource flows for biodiversity conservation in India, coming mainly from the Centre and State (provincial) Governments.

In preparation for discussions on resource mobilisation at CoP-11, India was one of the few countries to have made submission to the CBD Secretariat in September 2012, providing information on existing resources mobilized for biodiversity for the year 2010-2011, as per the preliminary reporting framework. Towards this, the Ministry of Environment & Forests (MoEF) had commissioned a study for assessing funding support for biodiversity conservation in India. This was the first such attempt in the country, and was primarily based on the data collected from government documents.

As per that study, for the year 2010-2011, the core funding for biodiversity (on MoEF's biodiversity related programmes) was Rs. 10782.7 million (Rs. 1078.27 crores); the net leveragable non-core funding (on MoEF's other schemes with 30% of this allocation) was Rs. 3365.1 million (Rs. 336.51 crores); the core funding by State Governments (after deducting centrally sponsored schemes to avoid double counting) was Rs. 85936.4 million (Rs. 8593.64 crores); and the peripheral funding on biodiversity (on 29 schemes of seven other Ministries/Departments relevant to biodiversity by working out percentage of leveragable peripheral fund flows (as 5-10%) that may be attributed to biodiversity) was Rs. 10687.1 million (Rs. 1068.71 crores); thereby taking the core+non-core+net peripheral funding on biodiversity during 2010-11 to Rs. 110771.3 million (Rs. 11077.13 crores). Thus, India had spent an estimated amount of approximately 2 billion USD (using conversion rate in September 2012) on biodiversity in the year 2010-11.

Thereafter, as a part of preparation of India's Fifth National Report (NR5) and updating India's NBAP, an exercise was undertaken to assess biodiversity funding in India for the year 2013-2014, using similar approach and methodology, but by considerably expanding the dataset to 77 schemes of 23 Ministries/Departments of the Central Government. While the details of this assessment are given in India's NR5 submitted to the CBD Secretariat, the overall funding for biodiversity for 2013-2014 worked out to Rs. 92044.5 million (Rs. 9204.45 crores or USD 1482.68 million). When comparing to the previous study undertaken for 2010-2011, this amount for 2013-2014 is lower. This is

attributed to efforts made to reduce subjectivity in using the multiplicative factor by directly consulting the concerned Ministries/Departments for confirming contribution of schemes implemented by them towards biodiversity conservation.

Using similar approach and methodology, a study on assessment of funding for biodiversity was undertaken, using the average biodiversity funding for the period 2006-07 to 2010-11 as a preliminary baseline. This study was undertaken pursuant to CoP-11 decision XI/4, and in response to CBD Notification inviting Parties to submit information on funding for biodiversity through revised preliminary reporting framework using average annual biodiversity funding for the years 2006-2010 as a preliminary baseline.

As mentioned above, the approach and methodology used in the present report is similar to the one used in the previous study and in NR5 study. To recapitulate, budgetary flows have been considered as 'core', 'non-core' and 'peripheral'. Core funding for biodiversity is the funding for those schemes of MoEF which are directly relevant to biodiversity conservation. After excluding from the MoEF's total budget, the funds for schemes directly relevant to biodiversity, the remaining amount is for programmes such as pollution control, impact assessment, hazardous substance management etc. As these programmes contribute to biodiversity conservation only indirectly, a multiplier approach has been applied, wherein 30% of the allocation under these schemes is considered to be attributable to biodiversity at this stage, and is term non-core funding. In addition, several Ministries/Departments of the Central Government, other than MoEF fund and implement biodiversity related programmes. As in the case of non-core funding for biodiversity under MoEF's schemes, a multiplier approach has been applied to assess the biodiversity component of leveragable peripheral funding of these schemes implemented by other Ministries, depending on the potential ability of a scheme to contribute to biodiversity. On similar pattern, core and non-core funding for biodiversity was calculated from the budgetary allocations made by the State (provincial) Government. In the present study, peripheral funding by State Governments was also worked out by using multiplier factor (10%) for the programmes executed by their allied Departments such as, Department of Animal Husbandry, Fisheries, Agriculture etc.

As per the present study, using the annual average funding for the period 2006-07 to 2010-11, the core funding for biodiversity (on MoEF's biodiversity related programmes) is Rs. 9496.4 million (Rs. 949.64 crores); the net leveragable non-core funding (on MoEF's

other schemes with 30% of their allocation) is Rs. 1043.4 million (Rs. 104.34 crores); and peripheral funding on biodiversity (on relevant schemes of nine Ministries/Departments by working out 1% of the leveragable peripheral fund flows that may be attributed to biodiversity) is Rs. 9627.3 million (Rs. 962.73 crores); and the core, non-core and peripheral funding by State Governments is Rs. 68095.2 million (Rs. 6809.52 crores); thereby taking funding for biodiversity to Rs. 88262.3 million (Rs. 8826.23 crores). Thus, as per this assessment using annual average figures for funding for the period 2006-07 to 2010-11, India has spent on estimated amount of approx. 1472.31 million USD on biodiversity. Table 1 gives the details of year-wise flow of core, non-core and peripheral funding for biodiversity in India for the period 2006-07 to 2010-11, as per the assessment undertaken in the project study. Table 2 gives corresponding figures for the year 2013-14, as per the assessment undertaken as a part of NR5 preparation.

**Table 1: Year-wise flow of core, net non-core and net peripheral funding for biodiversity conservation in India: 2006-07 to 2010-11 (INR in crores and USD in million)**

Years	Central Government Outlays				State Government Outlays				Aggregate	Aggregate (in USD million)
1	2	3	4	5(2+3+4)	6	7	8	9(6+7+8)	10(5+9)	10(5+9)
	Core	Non-Core	Peripheral	Total	Core	Non-Core	Peripheral	Total	Grand Total	Grand Total
2006-07	739.86	64.69	435.20	1239.75	4472.04	8.94	608.10	5089.08	6328.83	1055.72
2007-08	833.00	80.23	484.34	1397.57	4909.50	9.82	669.28	5588.60	6986.17	1165.37
2008-09	1036.46	82.59	1337.00	2456.05	5904.52	11.81	924.20	6840.53	9296.58	1550.77
2009-10	1005.58	92.49	1234.20	2332.27	6761.40	13.52	1112.17	7887.09	10219.36	1704.70
2010-11	1133.29	201.72	1322.90	2657.91	7477.94	14.95	1149.41	8642.30	11300.21	1885.00
<b>Average</b>	<b>949.64</b>	<b>104.34</b>	<b>962.73</b>	<b>2016.71</b>	<b>5905.08</b>	<b>11.81</b>	<b>892.63</b>	<b>6809.52</b>	<b>8826.23</b>	<b>1472.31</b>

**Table 2: Flow of core, net non-core and net peripheral funding for biodiversity conservation in India in 2013-14 (INR in crores and USD in million)**

Years	Central Government Outlays				State Government Outlays				Aggregate	Aggregate (in USD million)
1	2	3	4	5(2+3+4)	6	7	8	9(6+7+8)	10(5+9)	10(5+9)
	Core	Non-Core	Peripheral	Total	Core	Non-Core	Peripheral	Total	Grand Total	Grand Total
2013-14*	1564.34	259.80	2354.74	4178.88	5025.57**		Not available	5025.57	9204.45	1535.41

*\*\* As part of India's Fifth National Report (NR5) submitted to the CBD in 2014, a detailed assessment of funding for biodiversity conservation was carried out for 2013-14 based on the estimation approach and methodology used in the assessments during 2006-07 and 2010-11 and covering 77 schemes of 23 Ministries/Departments of GoI in addition to MoEF. In the assessment for 2013-14, due to non-availability of data on peripheral funding by State Governments, the overall funding for biodiversity conservation is lower compared to that for 2010-11.*

*\*\* Government outlays (core and non-core) for three States and three Union Territories have not been included due to non-availability of data.*

## **Conclusion**

As detailed in this report, three assessments for biodiversity funding in India have been taken up using similar approach and methodology of working out core, non-core and peripheral funding for biodiversity, for the year 2010-2011 (India's pre-CoP-11 submission to CBD), for the year 2013-14 (for NR5), and using annual average for the period 2006-07 and 2010-11 (the present study). While the datasets in these three studies were somewhat different, an important difference is in using a lower multiplicative factor in the two later studies (on the advice of concerned Ministries/Departments), thereby explaining lower figures than the 2010-11 study. The biodiversity funding per annum as per these three assessments ranges from Rs. 88262.3 million (Rs. 8826.23 crores) to Rs. 110771.3 million (Rs. 11077.13 crores).

It is emphasized that these figures may be considered only as work-in-progress, giving only the best estimates, rather than any conclusive or definitive figures.

It is also relevant to state that in our attempt to further mainstream biodiversity, the leveragable non-core funding for biodiversity is expected to gradually increase.

\*\*\*\*\*