

---

**EU submission to the CBD notification 2011-071**  
**on views, information and experience on the implementation**  
**of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, pursuant to decision X/3, B, paragraph 4**

The submission for this Notification has a mixed format. The common EU chapeau contains the EU views and general statements, while individual inputs from Member States provide detailed information and experience on the implementation of the Resource Mobilization Strategy (RMS).

## **1. The EU views and general statements**

### **Improved information base and strengthening financial institutions (Goals 1 and 3)**

Biodiversity-related development cooperation activities have been monitored in the EU by reporting on the Biodiversity Action Plan up until 2010. Ahead of the Nagoya meeting the Council asked the European Commission to continue reporting on the amount of funds related to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.

The EU Accountability Report 2011 on Financing for Development describes the current situation in terms of EU biodiversity financing. From 2007 to 2009, the EU committed, on average, EUR 1.3 billion per year to biodiversity-related aid. The EU contribution corresponds to around half of all biodiversity-related ODA over the period 2007 to 2009. The EU's biodiversity-related aid as a share of total EU ODA increased from 2.1% in 2006 to 3.2% in 2009. Among the largest donors in EU Member States were Germany, France and Spain, and several other countries also donated substantial amounts during this period. Member States that are not the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) members, such as the Czech Republic, Slovenia and Romania also contributed to the effort.

Nearly a third of the EU's biodiversity-related aid goes to Africa and around one fifth each to America and Asia. In terms of sectors, the EU's biodiversity-related aid falls primarily within environmental protection, followed by water and sanitation, agriculture and forestry.

The EU and its Member States provide contributions to a number of biodiversity-related conventions. In addition, the EU Member States are important contributors to the Global Environment Fund (GEF) and the UNEP Environment Fund. The GEF serves as the financial mechanism for the Convention on Biological Diversity. It has been replenished five times. EU Member States provided EUR 1.096 billion to explain GEF-4, which represented 52% of total contributions. Compared to the previous replenishment, EU Member States increased their contributions considerably - by 24% - to EUR 1.357 billion, or 54% of total contributions.

### **Strengthening national capacity for resource mobilization (Goal 2)**

In the Environment Council of 13 December 2010, the EU committed to the implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization and to substantially increasing resources (financial, human and technical) from all possible sources balanced with the effective implementation of the CBD and its Strategic Plan against an established baseline to be presented for agreement by the Parties at CBD COP 11 in 2012, and highlighted the need for strong EU leadership both from the Member States and the Commission on follow-up efforts at global level in order to assess the existing resource inputs and needs for the achievement of goals and objectives under the Strategy for Resource Mobilization and the targets under the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

On 3 May 2011 the European Commission adopted the Communication to the European Parliament, the Council, the Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions 'Our life

insurance, our natural capital: an EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020', which recognises that meeting the EU global biodiversity commitments will depend on the availability and efficient use of financial resources. This will require that the Commission and Member States work to:

- ensure a better uptake and distribution of existing fund for biodiversity;
- rationalize available resources and maximize co-benefits of various funding sources;
- diversify and scale up various sources of funding, including through the promotion of the development and use of innovative financing mechanisms.

The Environment Council of 21 June 2011 endorsed the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 and stressed the need to mobilise additional resources from all possible sources and ensure adequate funding through, *inter alia*, the future EU financial framework, national sources and innovative financial mechanisms, for the effective implementation of the Strategy, including predictable, adequate and regular financing for the Natura 2000 network.

Further on, in order to significantly increase resources from all possible sources for global biodiversity, the Environment Council on 19 December 2011 called on the Commission and Member States to deliver on the commitments made at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD COP 10) in Nagoya as a part of the Strategy for Resource Mobilisation 1 in support of the achievement of the CBD objectives.

The Commission also adopted on 20 September 2011 a Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe recognizing that the EU economic prosperity and wellbeing depend on its natural capital, and reiterating that the Commission will promote the use of innovative financial and market-based instruments and explore their wider potential, including a possible establishment of a biodiversity financing facility and payments for ecosystem services, to address challenges to ecosystems and biodiversity at national, EU and international level. The roadmap also indicates that the Commission will put forward proposals to foster investments in natural capital to seize the full growth and innovation potential of Green Infrastructure and the 'restoration economy'. The Environment Council of 19 December 2011 welcomed the Communication on the Roadmap to a Resource-Efficient Europe and reaffirmed the need of valuing natural capital to create, among others, possibilities to integrate the economic value of biodiversity and ecosystem services in public and private sector decision-making and national accounting systems and invited the Commission to work further towards this end.

#### **Exploring new and innovative financial mechanisms (Goal 4)**

The EU and its Member States have increasing experience in implementing innovative financing mechanisms as described in the EU June 2011 submission on this topic.

#### **Mainstreaming biodiversity in development cooperation and capacity building (Goals 5 and 6)**

The Commission's Communication on Policy Coherence for Development states that the EU should 'enhance funding earmarked for biodiversity and strengthen measures to mainstream biodiversity in development assistance'. Biodiversity is indeed an integral part of EU's development cooperation policy and activities. The Commission Communication of 29 June 2011 on 'A Budget for Europe 2020' recognizes that concerns about biodiversity and ecosystem services should be mainstreamed in all development projects and programmes, focusing on sectors such as agriculture, water and sanitation, and that synergies between biodiversity and climate financing should be increased through ecosystem-based approaches to climate mitigation and adaptation. The Commission and Member States are currently discussing the next EU Multiannual Financial Framework for 2014-2020, with the aim of mainstreaming biodiversity objectives in the relevant financial instruments, including for agriculture, fisheries, regional, and external policy.

#### **Enhancing implementation of access and benefit-sharing initiatives in support of resource mobilization (Goal 7)**

---

1 Decision UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/IX/11 of 30 May 2008 adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its ninth meeting and Decision UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/X/3 of 29 October 2010 adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its tenth meeting.

The EU is engaged in funding various projects with a view to enhance regional and national capacity in the selection, development and use of biodiversity and related indicators to ensure progress towards the CBD 2020 targets as well as facilitating the Nagoya Protocol implementation by helping the establishment of the Nagoya Protocol clearing house as well as capacity building initiatives in strengthening national capacities in developing countries.

### **Enhance the Global engagement for resource mobilization (Goal 8)**

The EU Biodiversity public awareness raising Campaign was launched in March 2010, built around the slogan 'Biodiversity – we are all in this together', aiming at persuading people of all ages and backgrounds to become personally involved in biodiversity protection. A Campaign website and advertising in media were followed by launch events in several countries. In 2010 around 3.5 million web page views were recorded, and more than 190,000 persons from 130 countries had declared themselves 'biodiversity supporters' on the Facebook Campaign application. The Wake up call video had been viewed by more 1.5 million persons.

The campaign continued during 2011, and focused on on-line presence (website<sup>2</sup>, social media) and activities organised by partners such as the EU representations. In 2011 the campaign activities were aimed at engaging people to do something in real life. Through a new application, people were invited to commit to do something to help preserve biodiversity. A number of publications and videos were also launched<sup>3</sup>.

For 2012, a number of activities are planned to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the Habitats Directive/Natura 2000 and the LIFE Regulation. High level events in a few Natura 2000 sites, LIFE project events in ca. 100 sites and celebratory brochures, including on Natura 2000, are among those.

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/biodiversity/campaign/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/biodiversity/campaign/index_en.htm)

<sup>3</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/info/pubs/pubs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/info/pubs/pubs_en.htm)

## **2. National contributions of the Member States providing detailed information on experiences and examples on the implementation of the Strategy.**

### **The Netherlands submission on Notification 2011-071: Views, information and experience on the implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, pursuant to decision X/3, B, paragraph 4**

The Netherlands welcomes this opportunity to share experiences on mobilizing resources for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. We would like to emphasize that the Netherlands considers the Strategy for Resource Mobilization a solid basis for increasing funding for the three themes of the convention, from both public and private sources.

An important precondition for increasing biodiversity funding is an improved understanding of the social and economic values of biodiversity and ecosystem services. The Netherlands has commissioned a national ecosystem assessment study, which will be published end 2011. Also, a national TEEB study is being carried out, focusing on specific areas and projects, international supply chains and business and municipalities. The results of this study will be published in 2012.

In the opinion of the Netherlands it is important to generate new and additional funding from the private sector for the objectives of the CBD. This should be done at local, national and international levels. Exploration of new and innovative financing mechanisms needs to be stimulated to achieve this.

For example in the Netherlands, twenty regional funds have been set up. The goals of these funds are to finance projects, like landscape management and nature restoration. The funds are filled through sponsorships, donations and other gifts.

Fiscal transfers can also stimulate green investments. The Green Funds Scheme in the Netherlands is an example of fiscal transfer, in which green projects are stimulated by tax exemption for investors (private and institutional). Green projects with lower interest rates can thus be funded; investor's returns are normal through the fiscal compensation. Green projects need recognition from the government that can thus assess the environmental gains. Banks are the executing body and lenders. The scheme in its existence has raised more than 7 billion euro for 5000 green projects (1995-2007). There are other different financial arrangements, like payment for ecosystem services that the Dutch government and other stakeholders would like to explore.

The Netherlands is actively supporting, in its international cooperation, projects in developing countries that involve financial arrangements like PES-schemes, whereby local communities are paid for the conservation and sustainable use of ecosystem services.

Besides assisting in the establishment of local financial arrangements, international private funding schemes are necessary. The Netherlands is one of the initiators of the Green Development Initiative (GDI). This initiative aims to significantly increase financial resources for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use by stimulation of voluntary private funding of sustainable land management practices. The GDI proposes to set up a certification scheme to certify land management plans and practices that deliver measurable, tangible biodiversity and social development outcomes above a business as usual scenario. The revenues will compensate or reward users for their activities leading to sustainable use or conservation of biodiversity. Currently, GDI-pilots are being designed. By identifying and implementing pilot projects the GDI process creates an effective 'learning by doing' environment. On November 16th 2011, a status report on the GDI, including a report on its third expert meeting has been sent to parties to the convention through CBD-notification 2011-219.

**German Submission on Notification 2011-071: Views, information and experience on the implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, pursuant to decision X/3, B, paragraph 4**

The following table is meant to highlight some of the recent activities of the German government regarding the implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization in a condensed manner. It is not meant to be an exhaustive report on all measures taken in the context of resource mobilization.

<b>Goals of the Resource Mobilization Strategy</b>	<b>Selected examples of implementation (not conclusive)</b>
<p>Goal 1: Improve information base on funding needs, gaps and priorities</p>	<p>⇒ On Goal 1.1) During CBD COP 9 in Bonn Germany inspired and since then strongly supports the establishment and functioning of the SCBD LifeWeb Initiative. LifeWeb is supporting parties to highlight their funding needs for the implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas and encourages donors to strengthen their cooperation in this regard. Currently the LifeWeb contains funding needs of approx. 600 Mio. Euro. Since its beginning funding matches of approx. 150 Mio. Euro could be realized. Germany supports the functioning of the LifeWeb Platform (staff and logistics) and already supported funding needs with more than 100 Mio. Euro. <a href="http://www.cbd.int/lifeweb">www.cbd.int/lifeweb</a></p> <p>⇒ On Goal 1.1) With its brochure “Biodiversity in German Development Cooperation”, published every two years, the German Government delivers a transparent and accurate report on its biodiversity related cooperation. It presents a detailed overview of supported projects and the respective funding figures and trends. (<a href="http://www.conservation-development.net/Projekte/Nachhaltigkeit/CD2/Klima/Links/PDF/german_dc_biodiversity_2010.pdf">http://www.conservation-development.net/Projekte/Nachhaltigkeit/CD2/Klima/Links/PDF/german_dc_biodiversity_2010.pdf</a>)</p> <p>⇒ On Goal 1.2) Germany together with the European Commission initiated and strongly supported the global study on “The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity” TEEB. The study was crucial in raising understanding and awareness on the economic costs of the loss of biodiversity and its associated ecosystem services. In a follow up Germany is now supporting the implementation of the findings of the TEEB study on national level. (<a href="http://www.teebweb.org/">http://www.teebweb.org/</a>)</p>
<p>Goal 2: Strengthen national capacity for resource utilization and mobilize domestic financial resources for the Convention’s three objectives</p>	<p>⇒ On Goal 2.4) National level: In 2010 the German Ministry for Environment established a national fund to support the implementation of the National Strategy on Biodiversity (“Bundesprogramm Biologische Vielfalt”) with an annual disbursement of 15 Mio. Euro. (<a href="http://www.bfn.de/bundesprogramm.html">http://www.bfn.de/bundesprogramm.html</a> - in German only)</p> <p>⇒ On Goal 2.1) National level: The Federal Agency on Nature Conservation (BfN) published several guidelines for financing of biological diversity on the national level:  <a href="http://www.bfn.de/fileadmin/MDB/documents/foerderung/broschuere_fina_nzierungshdb-oV.pdf">http://www.bfn.de/fileadmin/MDB/documents/foerderung/broschuere_fina_nzierungshdb-oV.pdf</a>  <a href="http://www.bfn.de/fileadmin/MDB/documents/themen/natura2000/Wege_zur_Finanzierung_von_Natura_2000.pdf">http://www.bfn.de/fileadmin/MDB/documents/themen/natura2000/Wege_zur_Finanzierung_von_Natura_2000.pdf</a> (in German only)</p>
<p>Goal 3: Strengthen existing financial institutions and,</p>	<p>⇒ On Goal 3.2) International financing: During CBD COP 9 in Bonn Chancellor Merkel committed an additional 500 Mio. Euro from 2009-2012 and from 2013 onwards an amount of annually 500 Mio. Euro for the</p>

<p>promote replication and scaling-up of successful financial mechanisms and instruments</p>	<p>conservation of forests and other ecosystems. In fulfilment of this commitment the German Government already significantly increased its biodiversity related international funding from 170 Mio. Euro in 2008 to over 260 Mio. Euro in 2010 and further increases are planned in the coming years. The funds are mainly disbursed by the Ministry for Economic Cooperation (BMZ) supplemented with funding from the Ministry for Environment (BMU).</p> <p>⇒ On Goal 3.4) In the context of the above mentioned strengthening of international financing the BMU established a new funding programme which amongst others supports projects at the interface of climate and biodiversity and with the clear intention to strengthen the synergies between climate protection, adaptation to climate change and biodiversity: The International Climate Initiative (ICI): <a href="http://www.bmu-klimaschutzinitiative.de/en/news">http://www.bmu-klimaschutzinitiative.de/en/news</a> ; <a href="http://www.bmu-klimaschutzinitiative.de/en/projects">http://www.bmu-klimaschutzinitiative.de/en/projects</a></p> <p>⇒ On 3.6) Various endowment funds for the purpose of protected area management have received direct funding from German financial cooperation. Examples are: Caucasus Protected Areas Fund (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia). Fundo Brasileiro para Biodiversidad (FUNBIO) (Brazil); Fonds Tri-National du Sangha (Cameroon). In order to quantify the impact on nature conservation a number of comparative analysis have been conducted jointly by Agence Française de Développement (AfD), Conservation International (CI), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and KfW.( <a href="http://www.fmcn.org/documentos/RapidReviewCTFsMay08Final.pdf">http://www.fmcn.org/documentos/RapidReviewCTFsMay08Final.pdf</a>)</p> <p>⇒ On 3.7) With the purpose mentioned under 3.6) also Debt-for-nature Swaps have been implemented e.g. in Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru.</p>
<p>Goal 4: Explore new and innovative financial mechanisms at all levels with a view to increasing funding to support the three objectives of the Convention</p>	<p>⇒ On Goal 4) International level: The Federal Ministry for Environment (BMU) is supporting the exploration and discussions on innovative financial mechanisms in the CBD through different means. In the context of financing of protected areas BMU funded a study on innovative mechanisms by WWF which was added as Inf-Documents to the WGPA meeting (<a href="http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/pa/wgpa-02/information/wgpa-02-inf-08-en.doc">http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/pa/wgpa-02/information/wgpa-02-inf-08-en.doc</a>). BMU also supported the Secretariat for the realisation of an international workshop on innovative financing in collaboration with UNEP-TEEB in January 2010 in Bonn (<a href="http://www.cbd.int/financial/replication.shtml">http://www.cbd.int/financial/replication.shtml</a>).</p> <p>⇒ On Goal 4) German development cooperation plays a significant role in supporting payments for ecosystem services (PES) initiatives, mainly in Latin America. Further several public private partnership (PPP) projects have been implemented, such as promoting sustainable production methods in international value chains and afforestation measures.</p> <p>⇒ On Goal 4.4) The German Government is supporting the active engagement of the business community in the financing of biodiversity. During CBD COP 9 in Bonn Germany launched the “Business and Biodiversity Initiative” which has been joined by more the 30 companies (<a href="http://www.business-and-biodiversity.de/en/homepage.html?PHPSESSID=e2af0ff311129604734c173359ca1e29">http://www.business-and-biodiversity.de/en/homepage.html?PHPSESSID=e2af0ff311129604734c173359ca1e29</a>). The BMU hosted the international conference on the “Bonn Challenge” in September 2010 (Call to restore 150 Mio. ha of forests). During this conference the German business organisation ‘Senat der Wirtschaft’ launched the “Welt Wald Klima Initiative” (World Forest</p>

	<p>Foundation), enabling German companies to invest in forest restoration. (<a href="http://www.bmu.de/english/current_press_releases/pm/47728.php">http://www.bmu.de/english/current_press_releases/pm/47728.php</a> / <a href="http://www.senat-der-wirtschaft.de/home/news-and-presse/news/senat-startet-welt-wald-klima-initiative-auf-ministerkonferenz/">http://www.senat-der-wirtschaft.de/home/news-and-presse/news/senat-startet-welt-wald-klima-initiative-auf-ministerkonferenz/</a>)</p> <p>⇒ On Goal 4.4) International Level: With the organization of the first Global Private Donor Forum on Biodiversity in June 2009 in Berlin the further involvement of the private sector was encouraged. <a href="http://www.cbd.int/doc/press/2009/pr-2009-06-03-berlin-en.pdf">http://www.cbd.int/doc/press/2009/pr-2009-06-03-berlin-en.pdf</a></p> <p>⇒ On 4.6) International level: Germany is encouraging the widest possible synergies between climate protection, adaptation to climate change (including ecosystem based adaptation) and conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. There is an enormous and inseparable overlap between these areas and there should be coordinated and synergetic policy approach. This is also relevant for synergies as regards financing instruments. With the International Climate Initiative (<a href="http://www.bmu-klimaschutzinitiative.de/en/news">http://www.bmu-klimaschutzinitiative.de/en/news</a>) the BMU established an innovative funding mechanism which supports these synergies strongly. The innovation of the ICI is that it generates its funding through the auctioning of emission certificates in the European Emission Trading System. These revenues are partly used for supporting projects on climate mitigation and climate adaptation explicitly including climate related biodiversity projects. Trough the ICI so far it was possible to mobilize more then 170 Mio. Euro for biodiversity related projects (date March 2011).</p>
<p>Goal 5: Mainstream biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services in development cooperation plans and priorities including the linkage between Convention's work programmes and Millennium Development Goals</p>	<p>⇒ On Goal 5) Conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and ecosystem services are an important pillar of German development cooperation. Since the mid-1980s, Germany has supported over 500 programs and projects worldwide that have contributed to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. BMZ is continuously working on the further mainstreaming of biodiversity in its various cooperation programmes. Further BMZ supports its partners in mainstreaming biodiversity in other policy areas with a special focus on the linkages of biodiversity and the MDGs e.g. through preserving agrobiodiversity, generating income by marketing sustainable products of biological diversity and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources, sustainable management of protected areas, and the valuation of ecosystem services: <a href="http://www.bmz.de/en/what_we_do/issues/Environment/biodiversitaet/index.html">http://www.bmz.de/en/what_we_do/issues/Environment/biodiversitaet/index.html</a> <a href="http://www.bmz.de/de/publikationen/reihen/strategiepapiere/konzept164.pdf">http://www.bmz.de/de/publikationen/reihen/strategiepapiere/konzept164.pdf</a> (German only) <a href="http://www.gtz.de/en/themen/18459.htm">http://www.gtz.de/en/themen/18459.htm</a> / <a href="http://mdg.onlinegeneration.com/en/home/">http://mdg.onlinegeneration.com/en/home/</a></p> <p>⇒ On Goal 5) BMZ has provided funds and temporarily had seconded a Programme Officer to the Secretariat for to support the SCBD Biodiversity for Development and Poverty Alleviation Initiative. The focus of the German support is to strengthen the Secretariat's capacities in building bridges between the Convention's objectives and the overarching goal of poverty alleviation. (<a href="http://www.cbd.int/development/">http://www.cbd.int/development/</a>)</p>
<p>Goal 6: Build capacity for resource mobilization and utilization and</p>	<p>⇒ On Goal 6.2) BMZ is supporting South/South and Triangular Cooperation. E.g. with Brazil Triangular Cooperation focuses on strengthening institutional capacities in order to achieve results-based South-South</p>

<p>promote South-South cooperation as a complement to necessary North-South cooperation</p>	<p>cooperation. Brazil and Germany are working together to implement projects in developing countries, for example by supporting an environmental technology centre in Peru.</p>
<p>Goal 7 Enhancing implementation of access and benefit-sharing initiatives and mechanisms in support of resource mobilization</p>	<p>⇒ On Goal 7) BMZ hosts the multi donor ABS Capacity Development Initiative. The Initiative was launched 2006 by Netherlands and Germany to support the African Group in the negotiations of an ABS agreement. Since the adoption of the Nagoya ABS-Protocol in 2010 the Initiative the ABS Capacity Development Initiative focuses on supporting developing countries in implementing suitable ABS measures at the national and (sub-) regional level. The goal is to establish and promote functioning ABS partnerships with the private sector, to the benefit of biodiversity conservation and the livelihoods of the providers of genetic resources at the local level. Meanwhile Denmark, Norway, Germany, the Institute de l'énergie et de l'environnement de la Francophonie and the EU are donors of the Initiative and the Initiative is also active in the Caribbean a Pacific region (<a href="http://www.abs-africa.info/">http://www.abs-africa.info/</a>).</p>
<p>Goal 8: Enhance the global engagement for resource mobilization in support of the achievement of the Convention's three objectives</p>	<p>⇒ On goal 8) Germany together with the European Commission launched and strongly supported the global study on 'The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity'. One of the main goals of TEEB was to raise public awareness of the crucial importance of biological diversity and the goods and services that it provides for human wellbeing and the local, national and global economy. (<a href="http://www.teebweb.org/">http://www.teebweb.org/</a>)</p>



## **Contribución Española en respuesta a la Notificación 2011-071 relativa a la comunicación de información y experiencias en la aplicación de la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos del Convenio sobre Diversidad Biológica.**

España viene desarrollando diversas iniciativas que contribuyen a la aplicación de la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos del Convenio de Diversidad Biológica y al cumplimiento de su objetivo de aumentar considerablemente los flujos financieros internacionales y la financiación nacional para la diversidad biológica, en apoyo a la consecución eficaz de los tres objetivos del Convenio.

A continuación, se señalan algunos ejemplos de medidas y experiencias desarrolladas por España que contribuyen al logro de los objetivos estratégicos de la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos.

### *• Medidas previstas en el Plan Estratégico del Patrimonio Natural y de la Biodiversidad.*

El **Plan Estratégico del Patrimonio Natural y de la Biodiversidad 2011-2017**, adoptado el 16 de septiembre de 2011 por el Consejo de Ministros mediante el Real Decreto 1274/2011, constituye el instrumento de planificación de referencia para la conservación de la biodiversidad y el patrimonio natural en España. Este Plan Estratégico incorpora los compromisos derivados del Plan Estratégico 2011-2020 del Convenio sobre Diversidad Biológica. Incluye asimismo previsiones, objetivos y medidas para la aplicación de la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos del CDB a nivel nacional, tal y como se señala a continuación.

En primer lugar, para la aplicación y desarrollo del Plan Estratégico se establecen una serie de principios directrices, algunos de los cuales son fundamentales para contribuir a la aplicación de la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos, destacando los siguientes: - la responsabilidad compartida del sector privado y la necesidad de aumentar su participación como actor clave en el desarrollo de políticas ambientales;

- la importancia de desarrollar y aplicar mecanismos innovadores de financiación, tales como el pago por servicios de los ecosistemas, para movilizar nuevos recursos financieros destinados a la conservación y el uso sostenible de la biodiversidad;
- la utilidad de la valoración económica de la biodiversidad y de los servicios de los ecosistemas y de su plena incorporación en la toma de decisiones, incluyendo la integración de los valores de la biodiversidad en la contabilidad nacional;
- la necesidad de optimizar el uso de los recursos y medios disponibles, empleándose éstos del modo más eficiente posible para el logro de los objetivos;
- la necesidad de incrementar el apoyo a terceros países en la conservación de su biodiversidad para afrontar su pérdida a escala global y contribuir al alivio de la pobreza, mediante la integración de los valores de la biodiversidad en las estrategias y planes de cooperación al desarrollo y lucha contra la pobreza.
- la conveniencia de considerar y potenciar las sinergias positivas entre las políticas de conservación de la biodiversidad y las de mitigación y adaptación al cambio climático.

El Plan Estratégico del Patrimonio Natural y de la Biodiversidad define, a partir de un análisis y diagnóstico de la situación actual, una meta general y 8 metas específicas. Una de esas metas consiste en movilizar los recursos financieros de todas las fuentes para alcanzar los objetivos de conservación de la biodiversidad. Entre las medidas previstas para alcanzar esta meta, en cuya aplicación se está trabajando actualmente, pueden destacarse las siguientes acciones por su relación directa con la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos del CDB (en adelante, EMR):

- Desarrollar sistemas de incentivos a las externalidades ambientales positivas (contribuye al objetivo 2.4 de la EMR);
- Estudio de mecanismos fiscales que favorezcan la conservación de la biodiversidad (contribuye al objetivo 2.4 y 4.3 de la EMR);
- Analizar los subsidios estatales con efectos perjudiciales sobre la biodiversidad y sus posibilidades de supresión o reconversión (contribuye al objetivo 4.3 de la EMR); - Promover el uso de

mecanismos innovadores para la financiación de la biodiversidad (contribuye al objetivo 4 de la EMR).

- Estudiar el establecimiento de sistemas de pagos por servicios ambientales (contribuye al objetivo 4.1 de la EMR).
- Estudiar y regular, si procede, la puesta en marcha de bancos de biodiversidad (contribuye al objetivo 4.2 de la EMR).
- Desarrollar un marco de acción prioritaria que identifique los objetivos y prioridades en relación con la cofinanciación para las medidas de conservación de la Red Natura 2000.
- Establecer la Contabilidad del Patrimonio Natural en el marco de las cuentas nacionales.
- Fomentar las alianzas entre el sector privado y las Administraciones Públicas para contribuir a la conservación y el uso sostenible de la biodiversidad (contribuye al objetivo 2.6 de la EMR).
- Desarrollar programas y proyectos de cooperación internacional y cooperación al desarrollo para la conservación de la biodiversidad y servicios de los ecosistemas (contribuye al objetivo 3.2 y 5 de la EMR).
- Se incluyen asimismo diversas acciones encaminadas a promover la información, concienciación y participación de la sociedad para la conservación de la biodiversidad, así como para promover la custodia del territorio para la conservación de la biodiversidad (en aplicación del objetivo 8 de la EMR).

El Plan Estratégico incluye además un capítulo relativo a la estimación de las necesidades presupuestarias para la aplicación del Plan Estratégico, lo que supone la adaptación a nivel nacional de los objetivos operativos 2.2, 2.3, 3.3 y 3.7 de la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos.

• *Evaluación de los beneficios derivados de la biodiversidad y de los costes asociados a su pérdida.*

El proyecto de **Evaluación de los Ecosistemas del Milenio de España**, promovida por la Fundación Biodiversidad del Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Medio Rural y Marino desde el año 2009, ha generado información robusta, validada científicamente, para que los gestores, los políticos y el público en general conozcan que los cambios en los ecosistemas tienen un efecto directo sobre el bienestar humano.

Este proyecto ha sido de gran relevancia para evaluar el coste económico y social de la pérdida de diversidad biológica y servicios de los ecosistemas asociados, en línea con el objetivo 1.2 de la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos.

• *Fondo para el Patrimonio Natural y la Biodiversidad.*

La Ley 42/2007, de 13 de diciembre, del Patrimonio Natural y de la Biodiversidad establece el régimen jurídico básico de la conservación, uso sostenible, mejora y restauración del patrimonio natural y de la biodiversidad. Entre otros instrumentos y medidas, esta Ley crea el **Fondo para el Patrimonio Natural y la Biodiversidad**, que actuará como instrumento de cofinanciación dirigido a asegurar la cohesión territorial y la consecución de los objetivos de esta Ley.

La creación y puesta en marcha de este instrumento contribuirá a nivel nacional al logro de varios objetivos operativos de la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos: mejorar la identificación de prioridades para la asignación de recursos (objetivo 1.3); reforzar las capacidades institucionales para la efectiva movilización y utilización de recursos (objetivo 2.1); y aumentar los esfuerzos por movilizar co-financiación en materia de biodiversidad (objetivo 3.1).

• *Concesión de ayudas y subvenciones.*

La Ley 42/2007 regula también la **concesión de ayudas a las asociaciones sin ánimo de lucro** de ámbito estatal, para el desarrollo de actuaciones cuyo fin principal tenga por objeto la conservación,

restauración y mejora del patrimonio natural y de la biodiversidad. Esta medida responde al objetivo 5.5., en cuanto que contribuye a aumentar la cooperación con organizaciones no gubernamentales e instituciones sin ánimo de lucro para la diversidad biológica y los servicios de los ecosistemas.

- *Incorporación de la diversidad biológica en la cooperación para el desarrollo.*

El **Plan Director de la Cooperación Española**, elemento básico de la planificación de la política española de cooperación internacional para el desarrollo de formulación cuatrienal, contiene las líneas generales y directrices básicas de la política española en la materia. El actual Plan Director de la Cooperación Española (2009-2012) reconoce la sostenibilidad como la base del desarrollo y lo asume como una prioridad horizontal y sectorial. En este Plan Director se establece como segundo objetivo específico “promover la conservación y uso sostenible de los servicios que ofrecen los ecosistemas para la mejora de las condiciones de vida de la población”.

Partiendo de este marco conceptual, se vela por la transversalización del medio ambiente en todas las acciones de cooperación de España. Para ello se sistematiza el empleo de herramientas que integran la consideración del medio ambiente a lo largo de todo el ciclo de los proyectos (diagnóstico, identificación, formulación, seguimiento y evaluación).

Este enfoque da respuesta al objetivo 5 de la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos, consistente en Incorporar la diversidad biológica y sus servicios de ecosistemas conexos en los planes y prioridades de cooperación para el desarrollo, incluyendo los vínculos que deben existir entre los programas de trabajo del Convenio y los Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio.

- *Consideración la diversidad biológica en los mecanismos de financiación para el cambio climático*

España contribuye a diversos fondos y programas de cooperación sobre la reducción de emisiones por deforestación y degradación de bosques; el papel de la conservación; la gestión sostenible de los bosques y la mejora de los stocks de carbono de los bosques. Estas iniciativas (la Facilidad del Partenariado del Carbono Forestal del Banco Mundial, el Programa UN-REDD de FAO, PNUD y PNUMA, el Programa de Inversión Forestal de los Fondos de Inversión Climática, y el GEF Fondo Forestal para África) consideran la conservación de la biodiversidad entre sus prioridades.

Además, España participa en diferentes fondos de carbono para la adquisición de créditos de proyectos forestales dentro del Mecanismo de Desarrollo Limpio. En este aspecto, el órgano interministerial encargado de evaluar los proyectos en los que España participa, la Autoridad Nacional Designada, valora la contribución a la conservación de la biodiversidad de estos proyectos, (en línea con el objetivo 4.6 de la EMR).

- *Contribuciones voluntarias para apoyar los tres objetivos del CDB y para nuevos programas de financiación.*

Las acciones de cooperación española al desarrollo en apoyo a la aplicación del Convenio sobre la Diversidad Biológica tienen una larga trayectoria. Son destacables las contribuciones voluntarias que España ha realizado a los fondos fiduciarios del Convenio, ascendiendo a más de 6 millones de euros en el período 2006-2011, incluyendo importantes contribuciones para el proceso de negociación del Protocolo de Nagoya sobre ABS y el apoyo de actividades relacionadas con el Artículo 8(j). Estas actividades son relevantes en relación con los objetivos 3.5 y especialmente con el objetivo operativo 7 de la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos.

La Iniciativa España-PNUMA LifeWeb, juega un importante papel en el fortalecimiento de la financiación de áreas protegidas para conservar la diversidad biológica, afrontar el cambio climático y garantizar los medios de vida. España, segunda donante mundial de la Iniciativa por medio de una alianza con el Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente, considera esta Iniciativa como una herramienta imprescindible para asegurar la conservación de la biodiversidad y la mejor gestión de los recursos naturales en los países en desarrollo.

La alianza España-PNUMA Lifeweb constituye un programa adicional de contribuciones voluntarias para apoyar los tres objetivos del Convenio. Esta iniciativa es por tanto un buen ejemplo de las acciones que se pueden llevar a cabo en relación con el objetivo 3.5 de la Estrategia de Movilización de Recursos del Convenio.

Como otro ejemplo de contribuciones voluntarias adicionales para nuevos programas de financiación que contribuyen al logro de los objetivos del Convenio, puede señalarse la aportación Española de un millón de euros al Fondo Fiduciario de la Iniciativa Yasuní ITT, puesta en marcha por el gobierno de Ecuador.

**Italian Submission on Notification 2011-071: Views, information and experience on the implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, pursuant to decision X/3, B, paragraph 4**

With reference to the CBD Notification 2011-071 on the Submission of views, information and experience on the implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, pursuant to decision X/3, B, paragraph 4, Italy wishes to provide some information about the national activities on RMS.

Last July, the Ministry of Environment, CBD Focal Point, jointly with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs organized a meeting with different Ministries for a first exchange about the drafting of a National Resource Mobilization Strategy. During this first meeting a working group on RMS was established.

The first meeting of this working group was held in November, in the premises of the Ministry of Environment. It was attended by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Policies, the Ministry of Economy and Finance and by the Ministry of Economic Development. The Regions were also invited to participate but the Piemonte Region that is the leading Region could not attend the meeting.

During this working session, it was decided to develop a national RMS in the frame of the National Biodiversity Strategy that was adopted in 2010. A link with the governance institutions of the NBS will be established so that the National RMS will be part of the NBS and will be adopted by the same institutions.

This first stage will foresee the establishment of a contact group that will work on “baseline”: the aim is to account the national biodiversity resources and expenditures (baseline amount).

The working group will also try to strengthen the contribution to the global level by collaborating with the Development Cooperation of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The next meeting will be held in January 2012.

**The United Kingdom submission on CBD notification 2011-071  
on views, information and experience on the implementation  
of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, pursuant to decision X/3, B, paragraph 4**

This submission highlights some of the recent activities of the UK government regarding the implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization. It is not meant to be an exhaustive report on all measures taken in the context of resource mobilization.

**UK National Ecosystem Assessment**

The UK National Ecosystem Assessment (UK NEA) is the first analysis of the UK's natural environment in terms of the benefits it provides to society and continuing economic prosperity reported in June 2011. The UK NEA, which analyses the value of the UK's natural environment by taking account of the economic, health and social benefits we get from nature, is the first of its kind at a fully national scale. A panel of experts involved in the process answered questions on technical aspects of the assessment and how these findings will be implemented into policy decisions. The Synthesis of the Key Findings along with the Technical Report, which forms the evidence base, can be downloaded from here:

< <http://uknea.unep-wcmc.org/Resources/tabid/82/Default.aspx>>

**Natural Environment White Paper (NEWP)**

In 2011 the UK released a White Paper on the Natural Environment (NEWP) "The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature". The NEWP is a bold and ambitious statement outlining the Government's vision for the natural environment over the next 50 years, backed up with practical action to deliver that ambition. The paper sets out a number of commitments to mainstream the value of nature across our society by: 1) facilitating greater local action to protect and improve nature; 2) creating a green economy, in which economic growth and the health of our natural resources sustain each other; and markets, business and Government better reflect the value of nature; 3) strengthening the connections between people and nature to the benefit of both; and 4) showing leadership in the European Union and internationally, to protect and enhance the natural assets globally.

An update on implementation of the NEWP can be found here:

< <http://archive.defra.gov.uk/environment/natural/documents/newp-imp-update-111013.pdf>>

the NEWP can be found here:

< <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm80/8082/8082.pdf>>

**Darwin Initiative**

The Darwin Initiative assists countries that are rich in biodiversity but poor in financial resources to meet their objectives under one or more of the three major biodiversity Conventions: the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES); and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), through the funding of collaborative projects which draw on UK biodiversity expertise. Since its launch in at the Rio Summit in 1992, over £80 million has been invested in more than 700 projects worldwide. In 2011 the UK government scaled up the financial resource available to this initiative, making more than £25 million available over the next four year for Darwin projects. This increase in funding underscores the importance the UK attaches to biodiversity, ecosystem services, and the essential role they play in our lives.

Information on the Darwin Initiative can be found here: <<http://darwin.defra.gov.uk/>>

**Accounting for biodiversity when developing any funding mechanisms for climate change**

The UK has been supporting CBD in implementing the Nagoya X/33 decision on biodiversity and climate change requesting the Executive Director to provide advice on the application of relevant safeguards for biodiversity under REDD+, in conjunction with discussions with national parties, the Secretariat of UNFCCC and other multilateral parties. This has included co-chairing and financially supporting a series of regional workshops for experts in forestry, climate change and biodiversity – in Singapore (March), Quito (July), and Cape Town (September). The UK also funded a project on operating safeguards for biodiversity under REDD+ projects, the results of which have been shared online, with CBD, and presented at Singapore and the UNFCCC inter-sessional in Bonn. The UK's 2010 Spending Review provides an International Climate Fund (ICF) of £2.9bn to deliver international climate finance for developing countries from 2011-2015. This will support climate change adaptation and low-carbon development in developing countries and help tackle deforestation. The UK has a ring-fenced £100m contribution to the ICF specifically to be spent on Forests in support of REDD+.

Research on operating safeguards for biodiversity under REDD+ projects can be found here:

<http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&ProjectID=17659&FromSearch=Y&Publisher=1&SearchText=wc1003&SortString=ProjectCode&SortOrder=Asc&Paging=10#Description>

Research supporting the International Climate Fund - Funding for Forests: UK Government support for REDD+ can be found here:

<http://www.decc.gov.uk/publications/basket.aspx?filetype=4&filepath=InternationalClimateChange%2f1832-funding-for-forests-uk-government-support-for-red.pdf&minwidth=true#basket>

### **Biodiversity Off-setting scheme**

The UK announced in the Natural Environment White Paper that we will establish a new voluntary approach to offsetting in England and will test this in a number of pilot areas. Biodiversity offsets are conservation activities designed to deliver biodiversity benefits in compensation for losses, in a measurable way. Good developments incorporate biodiversity considerations in their design, but are still likely to result in some biodiversity loss. One way to compensate for this is by offsetting: the developer secures a quantifiable amount of compensatory habitat expansion or restoration elsewhere. A consistent framework for biodiversity offsetting has the potential to improve the delivery of the requirements of the planning system. Compensation is already required in many cases, but we believe that a measurable, quantitative rather than subjective, consistent approach is more likely to lead to sustainability and to help us achieve our aim of minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. 6 pilots are due to start in April 2012, and will run for 2 years.

<http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/natural/biodiversity/uk/offsetting/>

### **Supporting implementation of the Access and Benefit Sharing Protocol**

The UK plans to contribute US\$ 500,000 to the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund. The UK has commissioned research to understand the impact of UK implementation of the Protocol.

Further information regarding this research can be found here:

<http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=17827>

### **Assessment of the Resource Mobilization Strategy Indicators**

The UK in collaboration with the Finnish Government commissioned research to assess application the 15 indicators to monitor progress on implementing the Resource Mobilization that were agreed to at COP-11. The UK was also a case study country for this research. This research fed into guidance on setting targets and baselines for these indicators developed by the CBD. Once the report is completed it will be available here:

<http://www.bipindicators.net/Default.aspx>

---

**EU submission to the CBD notification 2011-072**  
**on information and views on the further development of programme priorities,**  
**pursuant to decision X/24, paragraph 5**

The submission focuses on the process of implementation of the CBD Strategic Plan 2011-2020. Since the Convention implementation continuously evolves, the Financial Mechanism needs to follow it respectively. Hence, there is a need to improve the process of guidance to the GEF, to enable coherent policies between the CBD and the GEF. This relation and the process create a need to analyze the current priorities to make them focused on outcome in terms of implementing the CBD Strategic Plan 2011-2020.

The Environment Council of 14 October 2010 recalls that the implementation of an effective post-2010 biodiversity policy framework and of a new Strategic Plan for the CBD will require an adequately increased mobilization of resources from all possible public sources, as well as increased resources from private sources including innovative financial mechanisms, both through the involvement of key stakeholders and through a review of the guidance to and increased dialogue with the financial mechanism of the CBD – the Global Environment Facility (GEF); in this context welcomes the successful fifth replenishment, including the agreement to reform the GEF to strengthen country ownership and increasing the scope for enhancing synergies between Conventions, and reiterates the EU Official Development Assistance/Gross National Income (ODA/GNI) target as set out in the European Council conclusions of 16 and 17 June 2005 (Member States undertake to achieve the target of an ODA/GNI ratio of 0,7% by 2015, while those which have achieved that target commit themselves to remaining above that target; Member States which joined the EU after 2002 will endeavour to increase their ODA/GNI ratio to 0,33% by 2015).

The EU welcomes the adoption at COP 10 of consolidated guidance, which brought improved clarity, including areas of synergy that may facilitate the development of programme priorities. In general, the CBD should strive to provide guidance of a general, rather than specific nature. Recent GEF progress towards recipient country ownership and synergies between conventions should be promoted. The Strategic Plan 2011-2020 will help further improving the focus of the guidance, including areas of synergy.

As stated in the Convention's text, the COP is mandated to provide guidance on strategy, programme priorities and eligibility criteria. It is important that the COP fulfils this mandate in a systematic way, i.e. issuing guidance every two years. Guidance on strategy and programme priorities becomes especially relevant at COPs that precede the replenishment negotiations of the GEF, because they are the ideal moment to deliver direct input into the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy which gets updated during the replenishment process.

A good example was COP 9 in Bonn, where guidance fed into the GEF for the fifth replenishment period, i.e. the current GEF-5. In the same way, COP 11 in India (fall 2012) will be able to provide guidance for GEF-6, as the replenishment process for GEF-6 will start in early 2013 and will be completed in early 2014, in time for GEF-6 to officially commence 1 July 2014.

The EU believes that it is entirely up to the COP to define new strategic directions and programme priorities if warranted by changing situations and/or on the basis of scientific and other studies. The Convention continuously evolves and the Financial Mechanism needs to follow suit. Guidance elaborated by COP 11, if so decided, would therefore contain an important part on strategy and programme priorities.

It speaks to reason that guidance issued at "intermediate" COPs, e.g. COP 10, will also be taken into account by the GEF at the level of specific projects. However, the full integration of that kind of guidance into the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy will have to await the revision of that strategy which will occur during the replenishment process.



---

**EU submission to the CBD notification 2011-070  
on information regarding views about the basis upon which targets  
are to be adopted, pursuant to decision X/3, A, paragraph 10**

**Introduction**

In the notification 2011-070 the Parties were asked to send their views about the basis upon which targets are to be adopted, pursuant to decision X/3 A, paragraph 10. The adoption of targets is a part of a broader process, resulting from paragraph 8 of the same decision, which relates to several activities to be taken by the Parties and other Governments or the Executive Secretary in order to fulfill the commitment to substantially increase resources for biodiversity from all sources. After the COP 10 the EU expects that there should be a clear, transparent process in this regard, including the following elements, the first part of which have already taken place.

1. Submission of the Parties' views on indicators in response to the notification 2011-061 (decision X/3, A, par. 8b), the EU sent its submission on 29 June 2011;
2. AHTEG on the indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, High Wycombe, United Kingdom, 20-24 June 2011;
3. Compilation of Parties' views on indicators by the ES (decision X/3, A, par. 8b);
4. Development of the methodological guidance on the use of indicators by the ES (decision X/3, A par. 8d) and development of the guidelines by the ES for the implementation of methodology on the application of indicators and establishment of a baseline year (decision X/3, A, par. 8e), as "Methodological and implementation guidance for the Indicators for monitoring the implementation of the convention's strategy for resource mobilization" (Document sign.: UNEP/CBD/SRM/Guidance/1, the draft issued by the ES on 30 September);
5. Application of the methodological guidance by the Parties in 2011 and 2012 to measure gaps and needs, and progress in resource mobilization against the set out indicators, taking into account the establishment of a baseline year (decision X/3, A, par. 8f);
6. Submission to the ES of the Parties' information on the application of the methodological guidance (decision X/3, A, par. 8g);
7. Compilation and consolidation of information from Parties and other sources, and development by the ES of a relevant document for WGRI4 (7-11 May 2012) on draft COP 11 decisions on: the baselines (baseline year and baseline amount of resources), effective reporting framework and draft targets (decision X/3, A, par. 8h);
8. Adoption of targets at COP 11 (8-19 October 2012), provided that robust baselines have been identified and endorsed and that an effective reporting framework has been adopted (decision X/3, A, par. 8i).

It will be especially important to see how the different elements mentioned in the different paragraphs of the decision X/3, all work together to allow a productive discussion at WGRI4 and the COP11. It is necessary to understand how the indicators, the methodological guidance and the baselines will be interlinked and will form a basis for development and adoption of targets.

A scoping study on the feasibility of the adopted indicators for the Strategy on Resource Mobilization, conducted by UNEP-WCMC with funding from the Finnish Foreign Ministry, Finnish Ministry of Environment and the United Kingdom Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, was also submitted to the CBD Executive Secretary in line with the notification. The study made a number of recommendations to the ES concerning the original design of the adopted indicators, the development of methodological guidance and reporting systems, support to CBD Parties for indicator reporting and

the use of the adopted indicators for the Aichi Targets. A full list of recommendations from the scoping study is provided in an annex, as additional information to this submission.

The EU understands the term *basis* in this notification in a very general way. It could relate to the need to discuss fundamental principles that should underpin the strategy's target(s) and the conditions that must be fulfilled in order to be able to adopt this targets. In the opinion of the EU and its Member States the fundamental principles that should underpin the strategy's targets are the following:

- the targets should be realistic in terms of feasibility and affordability;
- the baselines should be robust;
- the indicators should be clear, simple and easily measurable, and take account of financial flows which benefit biological diversity including those which also benefit other purposes.

There might also be a need to reflect upon the relation between future targets and the mission of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization. The EU recalls that according to decision IX/11, 'the target of the strategy for resource mobilization is to substantially enhance international financial flows and domestic funding for biological diversity in order to achieve a substantial reduction of the current funding gaps in support of the effective implementation of the Convention's three objectives and the 2010 target'. The EU believes that, as underlined in the latter decision, this target should continue to be 'viewed as a flexible framework for the development of measurable targets and/or indicators addressing all relevant funding sources, according to national priorities and capacities, and taking into account the special situation and needs of developing countries'.

During its tenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties decided 'to adopt targets at its eleventh meeting, provided that robust baselines have been identified and endorsed and that an effective reporting framework has been adopted' (paragraph 8(i) of Decision X/3). Following this decision, the EU believes that the basis upon which targets are to be adopted at COP 11 involves two preconditions: the identification of robust baselines and the adoption of an effective reporting framework. These two elements are developed in further details below.

### **Baselines**

The EU understands the term *baselines* as referring to the various specific targets to be considered. There is a need to consider which criteria are needed to make baselines sufficiently robust.

The EU believes that it is important to consider both a baseline amount and a baseline year or period. The document: UNEP/CBD/AHTEG-SP-Ind/INF/9, paragraph 10, provides that:

*'Baselines may refer to (i) the baseline period (year or years) and (ii) to the levels of resource mobilization in this baselines period (roughly speaking the "current expenditures"). The Secretariat is expected to propose a baseline period that then will be used for assessing the levels of resource mobilization.'*

The EU understands that the Secretariat to the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD) will propose a baseline period in which the reference levels of resource mobilization should be determined and that the SCBD will define the baseline amounts for resource mobilization after collecting information on national amount of resources from the Parties during the established baseline year or period. The determined baselines will be presented to the Conference of the Parties at its eleventh meeting for agreement by the Parties. It is therefore important that the SCBD works on both aspects of the baselines in preparing for WGRI4.

The EU supports the process suggested by the SCBD in document UNEP/CBD/SRM/ Guidance/1 of September 2011 Section VII.

In order to establish a baseline year or period and to determine robust baseline of amount of resources, the development of the methodology for the application of indicators and its implementation by the Parties is of utmost importance. Such a methodological guidance should include, among other matters, comprehensive glossaries, criteria for data use and illustrated examples of the data which could be used. Where indicators relate to the number of initiatives undertaken, clear guidance is also needed on the level of initiatives that should be reported. Extensive templates providing examples of possible data sources and definitions would also be helpful.

This exercise is critical to provide a solid basis for the adoption of resource mobilization targets. Robust baselines must be reliable and provide clear and comprehensive information about the reference or initial situation. They should be based on accessible, reliable and comparable information, in order to ensure adequate follow-up and reporting. Robust baselines should consist of verifiable data that are determined at a given time (year or period).

It is also of utmost importance that Parties have enough time to appropriately apply the preliminary reporting framework to be provided by the Secretariat, in order to ensure that Parties can provide sufficient and complete information so that solid baselines can be developed.

Indicators on which targets will be based are expressed in various dimensions (money, number of items, etc.). Making the baseline year the same for every target can be considered. The OECD/DAC Creditor Reporting System (CRS++) enables possibilities to draw on data on biodiversity and others markers. Since reporting on Rio-Markers has been optional for some time most donors have some information on this. However, it was only made mandatory for the 2010 report.

Given the high inter-annual variability of financial flows, in order to avoid the results being over influenced by conditions that may exist in any one year, it might make more sense to consider an average over several years. Another factor to take into consideration is that recent figures are more reliable. Depending on how targets are worded, there might be more or less room for national flexibility. National capacity may limit the ability to measure everything against a common baseline year.

#### **Effective reporting framework.**

The adoption of an effective reporting framework is the second pre-condition needed for providing a solid basis for the adoption of resource mobilization targets. Since Decision X/3 does not provide this information there will be a need to clarify how and when this reporting framework will be adopted.

As stated in its June 2011 submission on indicators for monitoring the implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization, the EU believes that the development of the methodology for the application of indicators is crucial not only for the establishment of a robust baseline, but also for the establishment of an effective, meaningful and reliable reporting framework.

The methodology should be important to clarify questions related to the overlap, as well as the meaning and use of certain indicators, and also to understand how to measure financial flows which co-benefit biological diversity, as well as other purposes.

For each target that is adopted, it should be up to Parties to determine national targets and baseline levels. SCBD could assist Parties in this endeavour by collating information that is already available in e.g. National Reports, and information collected from multilateral institutions.

The scoping study on the feasibility of the adopted indicators for the Strategy on Resource Mobilization made a number of recommendations concerning the development of reporting frameworks (see annex).

The recommendations include:

- Separate reporting templates and guidelines should be provided for each of the different reporting entities. Templates should be extensive providing examples of possible data sources, definitions, etc.
- The use of initiative/activity level reporting could be investigated for each of the indicators, especially in regards to overlapping indicators, instead of asking parties to report on total counts or financial investments.
- A lead organization should be identified for future development and maintenance of the indicator reporting system. Organizational responsibility would include coordination of the indicator reporting system and collation of the data as well as the calculation of the global indicators and communication of the results for COPs and future editions of the Global Biodiversity Outlook, etc.
- The use of an online reporting system for the adopted indicators should be considered.

The process for the adoption of the effective reporting framework should therefore be closely linked to the development of the methodology for the application of indicators and to the process for the identification of baselines.

The following aspects are of particular relevance:

- The reporting framework on resource mobilization should be based on information and reporting from both donor and recipient countries, to the extent reasonable, given national capacities. Existing reporting frameworks, for example Creditor Reporting System ++ of the OECD/DAC, including Rio Markers, should be utilized to the maximum extent to ensure efficiency. A simple and shared methodology could be developed in cooperation with OECD/DAC in order to transform Rio Markers into financial data, whilst accurately reflecting contributions to biodiversity targets.
- Internationally supported activities should be integrated into the development planning of the recipient countries. The EU stresses the need to achieve implementation of the CBD Strategic Plan 2011-2020 in line with agreed principles on aid effectiveness.

### **Other elements to consider**

There is also a need to consider more widely the conditions under which targets could be adopted. The European Commission's communication on the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 gives some initial indications: 'Discussions on funding targets during COP11 should recognize the need for increases in public funding, but also the potential of innovative financing mechanisms. Financial flows (own resources and innovative sources) required to meet identified needs should be set out in national biodiversity strategies and action plans'.

Concerning innovative financing mechanisms, the EU recalls, that the following principles outlined in their June 2011 submission on the same topic, are essential when evaluating the opportunities and challenges related to the 6 categories identified in the Strategy for Resource Mobilisation (COPIX/9, Annex, Goal 4):

- IFMs should be in line with the CBD and contribute to its objectives;
- IFMs have significant potential to generate new and additional financial resources at all levels;
- IFMs should have positive impacts on biodiversity, but they do not cause adverse social impacts;
- IFMs will depend on supporting the capacity and governance structure needed to make it work, which entails also the involvement of local communities as well as the private sector.

The EU wants to stress the need to give good consideration to the aspect of availability of resources in the report on future funding needs for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

In conclusion it is crucial for the success of COP 11 and implementation of the Aichi Nagoya Targets to ensure that the concept of 'financing for biodiversity' and its different categories are understood in the same way among countries; and that common procedures and methodologies for accounting are agreed upon and established under the CBD. There should also be a close link in the discussions between the definition of baselines and the monitoring and reporting framework. Elements of the baseline will need to be reported on and the feasibility and costs of collecting the data on a regular basis should be considered.

The EU understands that COP 10 started a process towards the adoption of targets on resource mobilization, seeking clarification in the form of options on the overall process, including definitions, steps and roadmap. As part of the process, a step should be devoted to adopting the common methodologies mentioned above, including what is meant by, and how to establish, measure, monitor and report on baselines, financial flows, needs assessments, gaps, and, finally, the targets.

The EU reiterates its commitment to advance on the issues and looks forward to discussing the options that will be proposed by the Secretariat.

### **Recommendations from a scoping study to assess the adopted indicators for implementation of the Strategy on Resource Mobilization**

The scoping study report commissioned by the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finnish Ministry of Environment and Defra and conducted by UNEP-WCMC was submitted to the Executive Secretary in support of the request in Decision X/3 for information on the adopted indicators.

The scope of the report was principally a review of the data availability and national capacity for the development of the adopted indicators. Whilst the report predominately concerned the feasibility of the adopted indicators and it also addressed the use and development of reporting processes that are necessary for their production.

This annex includes the main findings of the report followed by recommendations for the CBD Secretariat concerning the development of the indicators.

#### ***Aims***

At CBD COP 10, 15 new indicators were adopted for implementation of the Strategy on Resource Mobilization. As stated in the terms of reference, this report aims to support the Executive Secretary by providing a clear understanding of the feasibility of developing and producing the adopted indicators. The objectives of the report are:

1. To review the data availability, reporting requirements, the capacity needed for national reporting, and current feasibility of reporting for each of the adopted indicators.
2. To identify key constraints, including data availability and options for establishing mechanisms to support Parties in reporting against the adopted indicators.
3. To review experiences and lessons learnt from similar processes in regard to developing reporting frameworks for implementation indicators.

#### ***Methods***

Each of the indicators was reviewed to assess:

- Policy relevance/relation to Strategy for Resource Mobilization
- Indicator Understanding (including indicator overlaps)
- Definitions and underlying concepts
- Considerations for data collection and indicator development
- Level of data collection
- Essential data fields and units
- Additional data fields for consideration
- Existing indicators
- National level data availability
- Possible data sources
- Feasibility of indicator production

The evidence base for this report is compiled principally from five sources:

1. An online questionnaire distributed internationally to CBD Resource Mobilization Focal Points and CBD National Focal Points.
2. The existence of related indicators in CBD 4<sup>th</sup> National reports.
3. A review of global and regional existing indicators and data collection mechanisms.
4. National case study reviews conducted with four countries.
5. A review similar processes for reporting on implementation indicators.

#### ***Results***

##### **Conceptual understanding of the adopted indicators**

The adopted indicators cover all eight goals of the Strategy for resource mobilization. A number of adopted indicators overlap, and these overlaps can be separated into two categories:

- Direct overlap: The indicators overlap entirely in their design,
- Indirect overlap: Certain measures or elements of the indicators overlap.

The indicators which directly overlap in their design could be evaluated to identify the justification for their separation. If the indicators are found to overlap completely then special considerations should be taken to develop data collection templates that do not require reporting entities to report that same data multiple times.

Direct indicator overlaps have implications for target setting and care is needed to ensure that overlapping indicators are not given different or incompatible targets. In the case of both direct and indirect overlaps, specific attention needs to be paid to data collection and the development of a system with well considered data fields that reduce data collection or reporting burdens.

### **Level of data collection**

The level of data collection needed for the production of global indicators varies. The majority of the indicators (9 sub indicators and 7 indicators) respond to resource mobilization activities and financial commitments at a government level and therefore data for these indicators needs to occur at the national level and be aggregated for the production of the indicators at global and regional levels. Two individual indicators and two sub indicators can only be produced at the global level using global data. Two of the indicators will rely on data collected at both the national and global scale.

### **Existing data sets**

Many of the indicators are reliant on specific national level data and existing datasets bringing together this information are few. A number of internationally recognised data sets are available and could be used for the production of two sub indicators and two indicators. However, caveats do exist with the use of these data sets and a supplementary reporting approach for these indicators could be considered.

### **Reporting entities**

A number of reporting entities were identified for the adopted indicators:

- Developed country parties
- Developing country parties
- Private Corporations
- NGOs, foundations and academia
- International Financial Institutions
- UN organizations foundations and programmes, IGOs
- CBD Secretariat (and other MEAs)

Not all indicators are applicable to all entities and as such each entity would be required to report on different combinations of the adopted indicators.

### **Data fields for indicator reporting**

The core data fields were identified for each of the adopted indicators for their production at the simplest level. There are 17 individual data fields for developed and developing country parties respectively. Many of the data fields respond to the total financial value of total number of initiatives/activities related to different aspects of resource mobilization. For the majority of the adopted indicators it would be possible for data collection to occur at the initiative or activity level. A number of advantages exist for this approach, as it:

1. Reduces reporting burden: indicator calculation – parties provide activity/initiative level data and there is no requirement for them to undertake calculations for data submission.
2. Reduces reporting burden: overlapping indicators – information provided at activity/initiative level could be used for the production of overlapping indicators
3. Ensures consistency in indicator calculation – indicators could be calculated using the underlying data from all parties and therefore reducing any discrepancy or inconsistencies in calculation processes.

4. Enhances indicator interpretation - enables the collection of supplementary information which can be used to enhance indicator interpretation.
5. Reduces the risk of double counting – enables institution/organization responsible for producing the indicator to separate out the specific data needed for indicator calculation using the additional fields to identify and correct for double counting.

The activity level data fields could be used for all indicators however this could act to increase reporting burden and can be costly. Instead of that, activity level reporting could be restricted to indicators that overlap in their design, enabling reporting entities to report data variables once with these variables being used to populate multiple indicators.

### **National Capacity for indicator reporting**

A survey was distributed to CBD Focal points and Resource Mobilization focal points to assess national capacity regarding reporting on the adopted indicators. The results found national level data availability to be low for many of the adopted indicators. Over 40% of respondents answered that no data was available for reporting against five of the indicators and three sub indicators. In addition, for many of the indicators a large percentage of respondents did not know if data was available. None of the respondents stated that data was available for reporting against indicator 12, which measures financial resources from developed to developing Parties for implementation of the Strategic plan.

### **Current feasibility of the adopted indicators**

In order to assess current feasibility each of the adopted indicators was assigned to one of the following categories:

1. **Ready for immediate use** - Existing Data Sources can support the production of the indicator in the first instance (the use of reporting for improved data collection should still be considered in the long run).
2. **Adequate reporting system needed for indicator production** – Indicators which will have to rely on reporting for data collection and over 50% of survey respondents answered that data was currently available. Adequate guidelines, technical assistance and capacity building for reporting will be needed.
3. **Technical support and capacity building needed for the development of monitoring and reporting systems** - Indicators will rely on reporting for data collection and survey results show that over 50% of the parties answered that they have no data or they didn't know what data was currently available for indicator reporting. Substantial investment in technical support and capacity building is needed to assist parties in developing monitoring and reporting systems for these indicators.
4. **Further development of indicator subject needed** – Indicators meet the same criteria as in category 3. However, the indicators are associated with new and emerging subjects within the CBD. Indicator production is dependent on the further development of these areas including the adoption of future CBD decisions.

Only four indicators and two sub indicators are ready for immediate use. Three indicators and six sub indicators would require the establishment of an adequate reporting system, before they can be developed. A high number of indicators (five indicators and five sub indicators) would require considerable investment in technical support and capacity building to develop the underlying monitoring systems needed for indicator reporting. Indicator 14 which monitors the number and financial value of new and Innovative Financial Mechanisms (IFMS) fell into category four.

### **Adopted indicators and the Aichi Targets**

Whilst all of the adopted indicators are relevant to Target 20, a number of the indicators also overlap with other Aichi targets. This overlap means that as well as monitoring implementation of the Strategy on resource mobilization and target 20, the adopted indicators can be used to interpret progress towards a number of the Aichi targets.

### ***Experiences and lessons learnt for similar indicator processes***

A review of the UNCCD reporting system for a suite of performance indicators, entitled the Performance Review and Assessment of Implementation System (PRAIS), provided a number of

relevant experiences and lessons learnt which could be utilized by the CBD for the development of a reporting system for the resource mobilization indicators. These included:

- The provision of separate guidelines for different reporting entities.
- The use of sophisticated indicator templates which collect both quantitative and qualitative data.
- The use of activity/project level reporting.

### ***Constraints for National Reporting***

Limited technical and institutional capacity was ranked as the greatest constraint for reporting on the adopted indicators. This constraint may be connected with the limited number of national resource mobilization focal points which have so far been appointed. The lack of suitable data was ranked as the second greatest constraint for indicator reporting. As shown in the review of national capacity, data availability for the adopted indicators was extremely low; with only one indicator and four sub indicators showing a reasonable amount of data availability.

### ***Options to support parties***

The online survey for this report found the following five options were given similar levels of importance in response to the question, ‘*In addition to increased funding, what are the most important ways international assistance could support reporting on the adopted indicators?*’:

- In-country capacity building workshops for the process of indicator reporting.
- Regional capacity-building and exchange workshops.
- Website/web pages with guidance, reference materials and calculation examples.
- Printed guidance on developing data gathering (monitoring) and indicator reporting systems.
- Printed guidance on reporting against the adopted indicators.

### ***Recommendations***

The following recommendations or suggestions are to assist the Executive Secretary in the production of the methodological guidelines for the adopted indicators. The recommendations are not listed in an order of priority.

#### **For the original design and conceptual understanding of the indicators:**

##### *Recommendation 1:*

The indicators which directly overlap in their design could be evaluated to identify the justification for their separation. If the indicators are found to overlap completely then special consideration should be taken when designing the reporting templates and establishing targets.

##### *Rationale:*

A number of the indicators overlap in their design and there is a lack of transparency concerning differences between them and the reason for their separation. These indicators could be investigated to determine if there is justification for the separate indicators or if the same data could be used to generate both indicators and potentially reduce reporting burden. If all indicators are taken forward, care should be taken when establishing targets for overlapping indicators to ensure that they are compatible.

##### *Recommendation 2:*

The indicators which consist of a count of the number of projects /initiatives should be reviewed to determine if they can provide adequate representation of resource mobilization efforts over time.

##### *Rationale:*



Indicators which represent a count of the number of initiatives/projects may not necessarily provide an accurate proxy for trends in resource mobilization. For example, countries could spend the same amount of money but split this across more initiatives and projects. The use of these indicators therefore needs to be considered, especially in regards to whether a greater number of initiatives/projects would necessary equate to greater support for biodiversity protection.

### **For the development of methodological guidance for the indicators:**

#### *Recommendation 3:*

The CBD should provide clear guidance for each of the adopted indicators which includes comprehensive glossaries, criterion for data use and illustrated examples of the data which could be used.

#### *Rationale:*

Different capacities exist in regards to reporting on the adopted indicators. The indicators may not necessarily align with existing monitoring systems for resource mobilization and clear guidance is needed to help reporting entities extract the appropriate data for each of the indicators.

#### *Recommendation 4:*

Indirect overlaps, where indicators share certain measures or elements, should be investigated and reviewed in regards to the development of methodological guidance and data collection processes.

#### *Rationale:*

It may be possible in the case of indicators with indirect overlaps for a common set of data fields to be used for reporting which could populate all concerned indicators. This could help reduce the reporting burden for national parties by enabling them to report once at the activity level.

#### *Recommendation 5:*

Where indicators relate to the number of initiatives undertaken, clear guidance is needed on the level of initiatives that should be reported.

#### *Rationale:*

Indicators which focus on the number of initiatives may present difficulties with cross party comparisons, as year on year changes may reflect changes in the structure of how programmes are organized rather than a real changes. There can also be different interpretations of what is considered as an 'initiative'. For example clarification is needed on whether parties are required to report at the level of umbrella initiatives or the individual projects that exist under them.

### **For the development of reporting templates:**

#### *Recommendation 6:*

Separate reporting templates and guidelines should be provided for each of the different reporting entities. Templates should be extensive providing examples of possible data sources, definitions, etc.

#### *Rationale:*

The entities responsible for reporting vary for the different indicators. Specific templates and guidelines should be provided for each entity type to reduce confusion in indicator reporting.

*Recommendation 7:*

As well as collecting the quantitative data needed for the indicators the template should also be used for the collection of supplementary data, including qualitative data that could be used to enhance indicator interpretation

*Rationale:*

The collection of supplementary information in addition to the basic data needed for the indicator could help enhance indicator interpretation. Supplementary data or information such as the specific CBD objectives targeted, exchange types, etc., would enable the indicator to be disaggregated and trends to be examined in more detail. Suggestions for additional data fields are provided in the indicator factsheets (Appendix 3). The collection of qualitative data for the indicators would enable parties to include information on the underlying reasons for positive or negative responses towards achievement of the targets.

*Recommendation 8:*

The use of initiative/activity level reporting could be investigated for each of the indicators, especially in regards to overlapping indicators, instead of asking parties to report on total counts or financial investments.

*Rationale:*

For the majority of the indicators it is possible to report at the initiative or activity level. There is a number of advantages to this approach:

- Reduces reporting burden: indicator calculation – parties provide activity/initiative level data and there is no requirement for them to undertake calculations for data submission.
- Reduces reporting burden: overlapping indicators – information provided at activity/initiative level could be used for the production of overlapping indicators
- Ensures consistency in indicator calculation – indicators could be calculated using the underlying data from all parties and therefore reducing any discrepancy or inconsistencies in calculation processes.
- Enhances indicator interpretation - enables the collection of supplementary information which can be used to enhance indicator interpretation.
- Reduces the risk of double counting – enables institution/organization responsible for producing the indicator to separate out the specific data needed for indicator calculation using the additional fields to identify and correct for double counting.

The use of activity level data fields could be used for all indicators however this could act to increase reporting burden and be costly. Instead activity level reporting could be restricted to indicators that overlap in their design, enabling reporting entities to report data variables once with these variables being used to populate multiple indicators. Activity level reporting could be conducted with the use of well structure reporting templates.

A similar approach was adopted by the UNCCD indicator reporting process, PRAIS, for the collection resource mobilization information. Parties were asked to report on all activities using the Standard Financial Annex and Project and Programme Sheets.

*Recommendation 9:*

For indicators concerned with the number of countries undertaking certain implementation activities, a scale or ranking system of response categories should be used rather than simple YES/NO categories.

*Rationale:*

The use of a scale of response categories concerning activity implementation would enhance indicator interpretation by enabling progress to be monitored adequately over time, with parties being able to move from one category to the next. This approach may also enable the formation of an index which could provide a measure of the movement of parties across the categories towards the preferred category/situation.

### **For the development and management of reporting systems:**

#### *Recommendation 10:*

A lead organization should be identified for future development and maintenance of the indicator reporting system. Organizational responsibility would include coordination of the indicator reporting system and collection of the data as well as the calculation of the global indicators and communication of the results for COPs and future editions of the Global Biodiversity Outlook, etc.

#### *Rationale:*

As with the development of any indicator reporting system organizational responsibility for its coordination is needed. For example, the PRAIS project for reporting on the performance indicators of UNCCD is a GEF funded project executed by UNEP-WCMC in collaboration with the Global Mechanism and UNCCD.

#### *Recommendation 11:*

The use of an online reporting system for the adopted indicators should be considered.

#### *Rationale:*

The data collected from individual parties would need to be collated for the calculation of the global indicators. An online reporting system could support this by holding the reported data in a database ready for analysis. The UNCCD PRAIS project developed an online system for reporting on performance indicators. Whilst posing a new set of challenges to country parties, the introduction of the online system was largely successful with only a very limited number of countries having to submit their report using an off-line format. The use of an online portal may help generate buy in with indicator reporting as it enable parties to see how the data provided is being used.

### ***For supporting CBD parties with indicator reporting:***

#### *Recommendation 12:*

Indicator reporting should be supported through regional and national capacity building and exchange workshops if possible in synergy with reporting needs under UNFCCC and UNCCD

#### *Rationale:*

National level capacity for reporting against the indicators was found to be low amongst the Parties represented in the online questionnaire. Regional capacity building workshops could provide guidance on the data needed for each of the indicators, the identification of data sources and how to complete the reporting templates. In many cases that underlying monitoring and data collection systems do not exist and workshops could provide guidance on the establishment of necessary systems. Regional workshops are more cost effective than national level workshops and enable focal points from neighbouring countries to share lessons and experiences.

#### *Recommendation 13:*

Printed guidance on developing data gathering (monitoring) and indicator reporting systems and reporting on the adopted indicator systems should be provided in addition to methodological guidance. The guidance should also be made available from the internet.

*Rationale:*

Decision X/3 calls on the Executive Secretary to provide methodological guidance on the indicators. The online survey conducted as part of this study found national capacity for reporting on the indicators to be low and there is the need for guidance concerning other aspects of reporting on the indicators, such as the establishment of data gathering systems and the process of reporting itself.

*Recommendation 14:*

Each party should consider nominating a government department or individual to coordinate reporting on the adopted indicators. This is in accordance with Decision IX/11 in which parties were invited to consider appointing a 'resource mobilization focal point' to facilitate national implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization.

*Rationale:*

The primary function of resource mobilization focal point is the organization of country specific strategies and to act as liaisons with the Secretariat for a number of purposes. It is likely that the focal points would be responsible for reporting on the adopted indicators. At a national level the data required for reporting on the indicators is likely to be contained within different Government departments. The focal point or they department in which they are positioned could act to bring together the data for the purpose of reporting.

**The adopted indicators and the Aichi targets:**

*Recommendation 15:*

The adopted indicators should not only be considered for monitoring progress towards Target 20 but also other applicable Aichi Targets.

*Rationale:*

A review by participants of the International Expert Workshop in Support of the AHTEG on Indicators the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 found that a number of the adopted indicators corresponded to targets other than target 20.