



CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/7/INF/6
10 December 2003

ENGLISH ONLY

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Seventh meeting

Kuala Lumpur, 9-20 and 27 February 2004

Item 23 of the provisional agenda*

MOUNTAIN BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

*Synthesis of information in thematic reports on mountain ecosystems***

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its fourth meeting, the Conference of the Parties agreed that mountain ecosystems would be one of the items for in-depth consideration at its seventh meeting (decision IV/16, annex II).
2. At its sixth meeting, in decision VI/25, the Conference of the Parties adopted the guidelines and format for a thematic report on mountain ecosystems, which were prepared by the Executive Secretary following a request by the Inter-Sessional Meeting on the Strategic Plan, National Reports and the Implementation of the Convention held in Montreal, Canada from 19 to 21 November 2001.
3. Also in decision VI/25, the Conference of the Parties invited the Parties to submit their thematic reports on mountain ecosystems by October 31, 2002. At the time the present note was prepared the Secretariat had received a total of 18 reports from 17 Parties (Algeria, Austria, Canada, Colombia, Estonia, European Community, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, Poland, Singapore, Switzerland, South Africa, Tajikistan; The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia), and one non-Party (Thailand) to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Four more reports (Germany, India, Japan, Spain) were subsequently received but could not be reflected in the present synthesis. All the reports can be found at <http://www.biodiv.org/world/reports.asp?t=me>
4. The present note has been prepared pursuant to paragraph 4 of decision VI/25 of the Conference of the Parties, which provided that thematic reports should, among other things, aim to support the work of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA). Section II below briefly outlines the limitations for substantive analysis of the information received so far; section III

* UNEP/CBD/COP/7/1. and Corr.1.

** Previously circulated for SBSTTA under the symbol UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/8/INF/9.

/...

contains a statistical presentation and section IV provides a synthesis of the information received. For ease of reference, the questionnaire for a thematic report on mountain ecosystems is attached as annex to this document.

II. ANALYSIS LIMITATIONS OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE THEMATIC REPORTS RECEIVED

5. It should be noted that the following analysis is based on 13 reports only, as three of the 18 reports received indicate that most of the questions included in the format do not apply to their national circumstances and two reports were found incompatible with the format.

6. Obviously, the small number of thematic reports received makes it very difficult to develop any general conclusions about the status and trends of mountain biodiversity, as well as the actions taken at the national, regional and global levels. In addition, only 11 out of 13 reports have provided some additional information on which the future work will be based. It is therefore more appropriate to present a summary synthesis rather than a substantive analysis of the information provided.

III. STATISTICAL PRESENTATION OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE THEMATIC REPORTS

Prioritization

7. Most of the respondents give medium priority to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems. Four Parties accord high priority to this issue and one Party attaches low priority to it.

Resource availability

8. A high majority of responding Parties, both developing and developed, indicate that they have limited resources available for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems. Three respondents find resources availability adequate and one Party find resources good for their efforts in this regard.

Assistance from the Global Environment Facility (GEF)

9. Of the six responding Parties that are eligible for GEF funding, three have requested financial assistance from GEF for funding the activities for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems. The three other such Parties indicate that they have not.

Assessment, identification and monitoring

10. All but one of the respondents indicate that they have undertaken an assessment of direct and underlying causes of degradation and loss of biological diversity of mountain ecosystems. A number of them have provided detailed information concerning the measures they have taken to control the causes of loss of mountain biodiversity.

11. Eight responding Parties have identified taxonomic needs for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity of mountain ecosystems. Four of them have not, partly due to lack of funds and expertise. One country did not respond to this question.

12. Eight respondents report that they have made an assessment of the vulnerability or fragility of the mountains in their country. Four others indicate that they have not made any assessment.

13. A large majority of responding Parties have made some assessments important for conservation of biological diversity of mountain ecosystems at the genetic, species and ecosystem levels. Only one Party has made comprehensive assessments. One Party indicated that no assessments have been made.

Regulatory and information system and action plan

14. A large majority of respondents (11 out of 13) report that they have developed regulations, policies and programmes for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems.

15. Ten respondents report that they have applied the ecosystem approach to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity of mountain ecosystems. Only three respondents, including one non-Party, indicate that the ecosystem approach is not applied yet to the mountain ecosystems.

16. Three respondents report that their national biodiversity strategy and action plan (NBSAP) have not covered biological diversity of mountain ecosystems. Two Parties report that their NBSAPs are not in place yet.

Cooperation

17. A majority of respondents have undertaken some collaboration with other Parties for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems. Some of them have signed a regional or international treaty concerning mountains.

Relevant thematic areas and cross-cutting issues

18. Most respondents indicate that they have taken account of mountain ecosystems in only one or two programmes of work adopted under the Convention. Two Parties have included mountain ecosystems in all programmes of work. Three respondents report that they have not done so yet.

19. Most of the respondents indicate that they are in the early or advanced stages of developing measures to ensure that tourism in mountains is sustainable. Only two Parties report that relatively comprehensive measures have been put in place for this purpose. One Party indicates that no measures have been taken.

20. Seven Parties report that they are in the early stages of developing the measures to protect the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems. Only two respondents indicate that they are implementing some programmes for this purpose. One respondent said no measures have been taken.

21. All but two respondents report that they have developed some programmes for the protection of natural and cultural heritages in the mountains.

22. All but one respondent report that they have established protected areas in mountains.

23. All the respondents indicated that they have undertaken some activities to celebrate the International Year of Mountains and Ecotourism.

IV. SYNTHESIS OF INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THEMATIC REPORTS

A. *Assessment, identification and monitoring*

Assessment of direct and underlying causes of degradation and loss of biological diversity of mountain ecosystems

24. As indicated earlier, a great majority of responding countries have made assessments of the direct and underlying causes of degradation and loss of biological diversity of mountain ecosystems. The results of the assessments made by different countries vary, but they do share some things in common. From the additional information provided, a number of countries identified climate-related factors as one of important causes of degradation and loss of mountain biological diversity, including climate change, extreme weather conditions, climate instability, greenhouse-gas emissions. Several countries found that soil degradation and erosion, including change in land use and habitat fragmentation, contribute to the degradation and loss of mountain biological diversity. A few countries also attributed the degradation and loss of mountain biological diversity to development activities, including the establishment of road infrastructure, urbanization in areas adjacent to mountains, and tourism. Some pollution sources were found as a contribution to the degradation and loss of mountain biological diversity, such as transboundary and local air pollution, pollution caused by solid wastes and petrochemicals and mineral contamination. The introduction of alien species was identified by a few countries as one of the causes. A few countries also considered the uncoordinated development planning, forest plantation, unsustainable agricultural practices and various kinds of human disturbances to be important contributing factors.

25. In addition, some countries have identified some causes that are more specific to their national circumstances. Some studies undertaken by one country show increasing recognition of problems associated with historic fire suppression in national parks. It was found that forest age-class distribution show an abnormal distribution in many parks, with few young forests created in the past 50 to 70 years, which reduces food availability for certain animal species.

26. Meanwhile, a few countries provided additional information concerning the measures they have taken or are taking to address the causes of the degradation and loss of mountain biological diversity. A number of countries indicated that they had adopted policies and regulations governing conservation and sustainable use of mountain biological diversity, though some of them did not specifically address mountain biological diversity. To address some broad issues, like agriculture, mining and forestry, some countries have adopted ecosystem-based approaches or adaptive management strategies or put them in the broader framework of management plans, such as the catchment management plan in South Africa. One of the common measures adopted by several countries in this regard was the establishment or expansion of protected areas in mountains, including as UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserves. Some countries have initiated some research and monitoring programmes to serve their needs for conservation and sustainable use of mountain biological diversity. Some countries report that regional conventions or agreements have been concluded among the range States for this purpose, such as the Alpine Convention in Europe.

27. To address specific issues like impacts of tourism on mountain ecosystems, some countries are trying to reduce the number of tourists or visitors or human activities within the mountain area. Some countries have developed recommendations or indicators to address some new issues like alien species.

Taxonomic needs for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity of mountain ecosystems

28. A number of reporting countries have identified some taxonomic needs for the conservation and sustainable use of mountain biological diversity. Some countries and one regional economic organization report that they have carried out some work on the taxonomy of biological diversity, including development of a Red List or an inventory for certain species and habitat types. They have also identified

gaps and additional needs in this area, including certain species and habitat types to be investigated, deficiencies in capacities, facilities to house collections, information technologies, etc. On this basis, they have developed further programmes, plans and activities to promote further taxonomic understanding of mountain ecosystems, such as the new research framework of the sixth environmental action programme of the European Community. Meanwhile, it should be noted that a number of countries, including some developed countries, have not made taxonomic assessments to assist with their efforts in this field, for various reasons. According to a few reports, one major constraint is the limited capacity in this field.

Assessment of vulnerability or fragility of mountains

29. Most countries that have assessed the causes of degradation and loss of mountain biodiversity indicate that they have included fragility and vulnerability as a part of their assessments. Relatively less additional information is provided in this case since they have been covered in the response to question 4. Some countries indicate that relevant information can be found in their relevant plans, programmes as well as scientific studies in this field. From the limited case-studies and information provided, it is worth noting that some threats to mountain ecosystems have been identified in some countries, such as socio-economic shifts, increasing tourism and traffic, changes in land use, global climate change, environmental degradation resulting from current use patterns, drainage of peat-bog ecosystems, the overgrowing of meadows and pastures. Some studies undertaken by the European Community recognize that more mountain areas become endangered in some of its candidate countries as a result of rapid economic development and that reestablishing plant communities is a very slow and sometimes impossible process at the altitudes concerned. Some studies undertaken by Poland show that the long-term unfavourable reconstruction of tree-stands by introducing the spruce ecotypes that are subject to intensive logging has contributed to the depletion of mountain flora and fauna in the area under study. One assessment undertaken by South Africa of the impact of the fire frequency and season on the mountain fragility and vulnerability shows that forest ecotones (margins) have been adversely affected by controlled burning.

Assessments important for conservation of biological diversity at genetic, species and ecosystem levels

30. A number of reporting countries have made some assessments important for conservation of biological diversity of mountain ecosystems at the genetic, species and ecosystem levels. It should be noted that assessments of biological diversity of mountain ecosystems were made mostly at the species and ecosystem levels, but few at the genetic level. At the genetic level, some countries focus the assessments on certain species, ecosystems or sites that are considered important for the mountain areas or the region under study. In case of Poland, genetic investigations have started for some endangered and vanishing animal species, such as lynx, wildcat and butterfly, in the Carpathians. In the case of Austria, genetic monitoring of forest ecosystems has been undertaken, and a network of forest gene conservation reserves has been established for *in situ* conservation and forest gene banks established for *ex situ* conservation. A few countries indicate that they have established gene and germoplasm banks.

31. A few more countries have made assessments at the species level. A number of countries have compiled a Red List or inventory of some species in their mountain ecosystems. A few countries have established monitoring programmes to provide a basis for the assessment, and some facilities to house or store relevant information and specimens. At the ecosystem level, most of the assessments made so far focus on forest ecosystems, and some on aquatic ecosystems.

32. At the national level, in addition to the above, it should be noted that some assessments on mountain ecosystems have been incorporated into assessments in related fields, such as agriculture, forest management, watershed management. At the regional level, the European Community has envisaged that more assessments on mountain ecosystems at the species and ecosystem levels will be made while it implements some of its relevant programmes and initiatives, such as NATURA 2000. At the global level, it should be noted that the Global Mountain Biodiversity Assessment is under way to collect knowledge and expertise on mountain biodiversity of all major mountain regions of the world.

33. Finally, it should be noted that the assessments and monitoring activities mentioned above were mostly undertaken by the developed countries or the countries with economies in transition. In contrast, very few developing countries made any assessments or monitoring due to their limited capacity and human and financial resources.

B. Regulatory and information systems and action plans

Regulations, policies and programmes for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems

34. A number of reporting countries indicated that they have established a legal system for conservation and sustainable use of mountain ecosystems. Nevertheless, very few regulations have been developed to specifically address the issues related to biological diversity of mountain ecosystems. Most of the relevant provisions were provided in the law or regulations on land-use planning and management, forestry, agriculture, landscape and nature conservation and environmental protection.

35. Some countries have established their policies and programmes for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity of mountain ecosystems in their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, forest management programmes, sustainable development strategies, rural or agricultural development policies, environmental plans, sustainable tourism development plans and spatial planning programmes. Some countries reported that the provincial and local governments have also established policies or incentives with the objective of conserving sensitive and valuable natural areas. In case of Canada, for ecotourism operators in British Columbia, incentives have been created, such as lower taxes or public land concessions at lower rates, that promote environmentally sensitive land use. In Ontario, regulatory requirements ensure that resource stewardship agreements are established between the State and tour operators to preserve natural areas of high tourism value.

36. At the regional level, the European Community reports that it has prepared the European Union biodiversity strategy and four thematic biodiversity action plans, on: conservation of natural resources; agriculture; fisheries and development; and economic cooperation. All these strategies and action plans have included biodiversity concerns and identified relevant actions and programmes. The European Community also reports that many activities and integrated projects relevant to biodiversity within mountain areas are financed under the EC LEADER Initiative. The European Community also recognizes the role agriculture plays in maintaining landscapes and habitat management and provided examples of some measures adopted by some of its member States.

Application of ecosystem approach in the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems

37. Application of the ecosystem approach as adopted at the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in the conservation and sustainable use of mountain biodiversity seems to be in the early or initial stage in the majority of the countries that have provided additional information in this regard. However, some countries have actually applied some of the principles and operational guidance of the ecosystem approach, such as sustainable forest management in Canada and interdisciplinary conservation programmes for forest ecosystems in Poland. South Africa reports that it is consolidating catchment areas, State forests and other protected areas for integrated management by a single agency, although the ecosystem approach is not coherently applied.

38. At the regional level, the European Community reports that the ecosystem approach has been proposed as a way to implement the European Union biodiversity strategy and action plans. In addition, the ecosystem approach is being employed to establish the NATURA 2000 network and the ecosystem approach has been used to assess the adequacy of designation of habitats in the process of establishing the

NATURA 2000 network, which aims to partition the European Union into a number of biogeographical zones.

Mountain biodiversity covered in national biodiversity strategies and action plans(NBSAPs)

39. Some countries report that their national biodiversity strategies and action plans have explicitly covered most aspects of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in mountain ecosystems, and some countries indicate that their national biodiversity strategies and action plans have generally covered mountain biodiversity, but not in detail. One country indicates that mountain biodiversity is not covered in its national biodiversity strategy and action plan because this issue was not given adequate attention while it was formulated. A few countries report that mountain biodiversity has been covered not only in their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, but also in its relevant strategies, plans and sectoral or cross-sectoral strategies. The European Community reports that its biodiversity action plans both on conservation of natural resources and on agriculture specifically give special attention to mountain areas.

Dissemination of information concerning management practices, plans and programmes for conservation and sustainable use of mountain biodiversity

40. A majority of reporting countries indicate that they have disseminated relevant information concerning management practices, plans and programmes for conservation and sustainable use of mountain biodiversity. Most of them do this through establishing websites, database and publications. Some websites, databases and publications are managed by the federal or central government agencies or the specialized agencies or the relevant programmes, protected areas and national parks. One country reports that educational activities are organized to disseminate relevant information. The European Community reports that much relevant information is available through the websites established by the beneficiaries of some projects financed by the European Union under various initiatives and programmes.

C. Cooperation

Collaboration with other Parties for conservation and sustainable use of mountain biodiversity at the regional level or within a mountain range

41. A number of reporting countries indicate they have undertaken various forms of collaboration with other Parties, mostly neighbouring countries or countries that share some mountain ecosystems. Some countries have signed agreements or memoranda of understanding for this purpose. The examples of this are the Alpine Convention in Europe, a memorandum of understanding between South Africa and Lesotho, some agreements concluded between Poland and some neighbouring countries, some cooperation frameworks concluded between Peru and some neighbouring countries and collaborative planning for transboundary conservation in the Rocky Mountains between Canada and the United States of America. Some countries have established joint protected areas for conservation of mountain biodiversity. At the regional level, the European Community reports that the programmes and projects of a transboundary nature are promoted and the NATURA 2000 will extend to the ten accession countries when they join the European Union.

42. In addition, there are some regional or global mechanisms to promote the cooperation among relevant Parties or countries in this field. Examples of this are the International Commission for the Protection of the Alps, Global Mountain Biodiversity Assessment and the International Partnerships for Sustainable Development of Mountain Regions as recommended at the World Summit on Sustainable Development. Austria reports that it is establishing a Network of Excellence in Sustainable Development of Mountain Forests, which aims to achieve greater integration of know-how and research infrastructure on this subject. Austria also reports that it has been promoting scientific, technical and educational cooperation in this area through the programmes like International Masters of Science Curriculum in Mountain Forestry and Mountain Region Dialogue.

Regional or international treaties concerning mountains

43. As mentioned earlier, the Alpine Convention has been cited by a number of countries in Europe as a convention that particularly address mountains. Another related mechanism also mentioned by a number of European countries is the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe. Poland reports that it plans to sign the Convention on the Conservation and Sustainable Management in the Carpathians. However, most of the reporting countries undertake cooperation in this field through bilateral or multilateral agreements or joint plans and programmes.

D. Relevant thematic areas and cross-cutting issues*Mountain ecosystems considerations in the implementation of thematic programmes of work*

44. Most respondents indicated they have taken account of mountain ecosystems in the implementation of some thematic programmes of work, particularly forest and agricultural biodiversity. The European Community and Switzerland reported that they have covered mountain ecosystems in the implementation of most of thematic programmes of work adopted under the Convention. South Africa reported that mountain ecosystems were considered while implementing programmes for wilderness areas, national parks, indigenous forests, World Heritage sites, transfrontier conservation areas, biosphere reserves, natural heritage sites and private reserves. Peru reported that mountain ecosystems were considered in its national action plan to combat desertification.

Measures to ensure that tourism in mountains is sustainable

45. A number of reporting countries indicated that they have taken or are taking some measures to ensure that tourism in mountains is sustainable. A few countries reported that there are regulations requiring sustainable development of tourism and environmental impact assessments for tourism and other activities undertaken in mountain areas. Some countries reported that some incentives have been adopted to promote sustainable tourism. Some examples provided by Canada have already been mentioned above. Some countries undertake regular monitoring to make sure that tourism in mountains is developed sustainably. Some educational activities were undertaken by several countries to tourists and tourism operators. A few countries reported that they have published guidelines, best practices and guides for sustainable tourism. The European Community is influencing and encouraging sustainable tourism development through implementing some projects in mountain and rural areas. Some countries organized a number of activities to promote sustainable tourism while observing the International Year of Ecotourism in 2002.

Traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities in mountain ecosystems

46. A few respondents have taken some measures to protect the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in mountain ecosystems. Some countries indicated that this issue has been addressed and included in some of their relevant regulations and programmes, although not comprehensively. Two countries reported that they have established some projects in the indigenous and local communities of mountain areas. Examples include the Mnweni Donga Erosion Reclamation project and the Zululand Trail Project in South Africa. In the Andean region, a number of regulations, mechanisms and programmes have been established to protect the right of indigenous and local communities to share benefits arising from the utilization of resources in mountain areas where they live.

Programmes for protection of cultural and natural heritages in the mountains

47. A number of reporting countries have established some programmes for the protection of cultural and natural heritage in the mountains through establishing protected areas, national parks, heritage sites and landscape management. A few countries report that this has been addressed in relevant plans and programmes for forest, tourism and heritage management. Switzerland reports that it has a number of initiatives to establish inventories of heritage sites, landscape and historic sites. Some countries reported that this constitutes a part of work programmes or activities implemented under some regional conventions or networks such as the Alpine Convention and NATURA 2000. The European Community reported that a variety of funding instruments are provided to encourage the protection of natural and cultural heritages in mountainous areas.

Protected areas in mountains

48. A few countries reported that a precise estimate of protected areas in mountains is not available, though they have established some protected areas or national parks. Some countries, including Poland, South Africa and Peru, provided some statistics in this regard. Poland reported that protected areas in mountains account for 47.4 per cent of their surface area. South Africa indicated that protected areas established in mountains account for 15 per cent of its major catchments.

Activities to celebrate International Year of Mountains and Ecotourism

49. A majority of reporting countries have organized various forms of activities to celebrate the International Year of Mountains in 2002. Some countries organized workshops, meetings, exhibitions and lectures to exchange relevant information and promote awareness. One or two countries reported that specialized websites have been established for this purpose. Some countries took this opportunity to launch some initiatives and programmes in mountains, such as the Central Asian Partnership Initiative for Mountain Development. A few countries also launched some publications related to mountains, like a State of the Nations prepared by the Mountain Club of South Africa. Canada reported that a number of activities had been organized in the occasion of the World Summit on Ecotourism held in Quebec City in May 2002. The European Community reported that a conference was organized on European Union policies and mountain areas as a contribution to the International Year of Mountains.

Annex

**QUESTIONNAIRE INCLUDED IN THE FORMAT FOR A THEMATIC REPORT ON
MOUNTAIN ECOSYSTEMS**

1. What is the relative priority your country accords to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems?					
a) High		b) Medium		c) Low	
2. How does your country assess the resources available for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems, both domestic and international?					
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	d) Severely limiting
3. Has your country requested financial assistance from GEF for funding the activities for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems?					
a) no					
b) yes, please provide details					

Assessment, Identification and Monitoring

4. Has your country undertaken any assessment of direct and underlying causes of degradation and loss of biological diversity of mountain ecosystems?	
a) no, please specify the reasons	
b) yes, please specify major threats and their relative importance, as well as gaps	
c) If yes, please specify the measures your country has taken to control the causes of loss of mountain biodiversity	
5. Has your country identified taxonomic needs for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity of mountain ecosystems?	
a) no, please specify the reasons	
b) yes, please specify	
6. Has your country made any assessment of the vulnerability or fragility of the mountains in your country?	
a) no, please specify the reasons	
b) yes, please specify the results and observed impacts on mountain biodiversity	
7. Has your country made any assessment important for conservation of biological diversity of mountain ecosystems at the genetic, species and ecosystem levels? (You may wish to use the Annex I of the Convention for categories of biodiversity important for conservation)	
a) no, please specify the reasons	
b) yes, some assessments or monitoring undertaken (please specify)	
c) yes, comprehensive assessments or monitoring programmes undertaken (please specify where results can be found, and opportunities and obstacles,	

if any)	
---------	--

Regulatory and Information System and Action Plan

8. Has your country developed regulations, policies and programs for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems?	
a) no	
b) yes, please specify sectors	
9. Has your country applied the ecosystem approach (adopted at COP 5) in the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems?	
a) no	
b) yes, please provide some cases or examples	
10. Does your national biodiversity strategy and action plan cover mountain biological diversity?	
a) no, please specify why	
b) yes, please give some information on the strategy and plan, in particular on mountain biodiversity	
11. Has your country disseminated the relevant information concerning management practices, plans and programmes for conservation and sustainable use of components of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems?	
a) no	
b) yes, please provide details where information can be retrieved concerning management practices, plans and programmes	

Cooperation

12. Has your country undertaken any collaboration with other Parties for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems at the regional level or within a range of mountains?	
a) no	
b) yes, please specify the objectives of this collaboration and achievements	
13. Has your country signed or ratified any regional or international treaty concerning mountains?	
a) no	
b) yes, please specify which treaty and provide as much as possible a report on the progress in the implementation of the treaties, including any major constraints in the implementation of the treaties	

Relevant thematic areas and cross-cutting issues

14. Has your country taken account of mountain ecosystems while implementing thematic programmes of work on agricultural; inland waters; forest; and dry and sub-humid lands biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) yes – but in only one or two thematic programmes of work	
c) yes, included in all programmes of work	
d) if yes, please specify details	
15. Has your country taken any measures to ensure that the tourism in mountains is sustainable?	
a) no , please specify why	
b) yes, but in early stages of development (please specify the reasons)	
c) in advanced stages of development (please specify the reasons)	
d) relatively comprehensive measures being implemented (please specify the reasons)	
16. Has your country taken any measures to protect the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in mountain ecosystems?	
a) no	
b) not relevant	
c) yes, but in early stages of policy or programme development	
d) yes, in advanced stages of development	
e) some programmes being implemented	
f) comprehensive programmes being implemented	
17. Has your country developed any programmes for the protection of natural and cultural heritages in the mountains?	
a) no	
b) yes, please provide some information in the programmes	
18. Has your country established protected areas in mountains?	
a) no	
b) yes, please specify the percentage of mountains under protected areas out of total mountain areas in your country	
19. Has your country undertaken any activities to celebrate the International Year of Mountains and Eco-tourism?	
a) no	
b) yes, please specify	