



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/CBW-NBSAP/SAFR/2/2
April 20 2011

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA ON UPDATING NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS INCORPORATING WORK ON VALUATION AND INCENTIVE MEASURES

Kasane, Botswana, 14-20 March 2011

REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In decision X/2, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and other Governments to develop national and regional targets, using the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 as a flexible framework, and to review, update and revise, as appropriate, their national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the guidance adopted in decision IX/9. The Conference of the Parties also urged Parties and other Governments to support the updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans as effective instruments to promote the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and to use the revised and updated NBSAPs as effective instruments for the integration of biodiversity targets into national development and poverty reduction policies and strategies, national accounting, economic sectors and spatial planning processes.

2. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties also emphasized the need for capacity-building activities and the effective sharing of knowledge to support all countries, especially developing countries, in particular the least developed countries, small island developing States, and the most environmentally vulnerable countries, as well as countries with economies in transition, and indigenous and local communities, in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

3. In response, the Executive Secretary is organizing a series of regional or sub-regional workshops on updating NBSAPs in 2011 and 2012. The workshop for Southern Africa was held in Kasane, Botswana from 14 to 20 March 2011 and was organised in collaboration with the Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism of Botswana and with the generous financial support from the Government of Japan, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the European Community and the Mercuria Energy Group.

4. This workshop was supplemented with two additional days with a specific focus on valuation and incentive measures to help to facilitate implementation of targets 2 and 3 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 as well as other related targets and decisions, and their translation into national targets and commitments.

5. The specific objectives of the workshop were to:

/...

(a) Facilitate national implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including by assisting Parties to develop national biodiversity targets in the framework of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets;

(b) Assist Parties in reviewing, updating, revising and implementing the national biodiversity strategy and action plan, with consideration given to how it can serve as an effective tool for mainstreaming biodiversity into broader national policies;

(c) Raise awareness to stimulate early actions to implement other Aichi-Nagoya outcomes, in particular, the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing and the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

(d) Support countries in making use of the findings of the third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO 3) and the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) study, and consider how the findings could be integrated into updated and revised NBSAPs;

(e) Facilitate active learning opportunities and peer-to-peer exchanges for National Focal Points and persons in charge of implementing and revising NBSAPs;

(f) Make use of the findings of the study on the Economics of Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity (TEEB);

(g) Integrate the values of biodiversity into relevant national and local policies, programmes and planning processes.

6. The workshop format featured a mix of presentations with questions and answer sessions, discussions in small working groups, interactive sessions to introduce relevant tools and a field study visit. At the beginning of each day, two participants were asked to make a summary of the main points of the previous day.

7. The workshop was attended by government-nominated officials responsible for the development and/or implementation of NBSAPs, and representatives from the development planning and finance ministries from: Angola, Botswana, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, The Republic of South Africa, Swaziland, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Additionally, representatives from indigenous and local communities (ILCs) attended. Various resource persons from the region contributed their expertise in mainstreaming biodiversity, local implementation, spatial planning, stakeholders' engagement, communications, education and public awareness (CEPA), poverty-environment initiative, work with other Conventions, resource mobilization and economic valuation. The list of participants for the workshop can be accessed at <https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/workshops2/southern-africa.shtml>. The workshop was conducted in English, however, interpretation in French and Portuguese was provided.

8. This report provides an overview of the workshop agenda sessions, discussions, the conclusions of the meeting, and the next steps going forward. annexes to this report present more detailed information about the workshop. The programme is presented in appendix I, annex V.

II. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

ITEM I. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

9. The workshop opened on Monday, 14 March 2011. During the opening ceremony, Ms. Portia Segomelo, Deputy Director of the Department of Environmental Affairs in Botswana, introduced the head of the delegation as well as the invited dignitaries, noting that the Minister of Environment, Wildlife and

/...

Tourism would host a reception later in the week. She also introduced the resource persons and representatives from the indigenous and local communities.

10. The local chief, Kgosi Morake, welcomed the guests and participants to Kasane and mentioned that the workshop will equip them in enhancing biodiversity conservation. Mr. Mathumo, Council Secretary for the Chobe District Council, officially opened the workshop and thanked the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for the opportunity to host the workshop. He started by mentioning briefly the history of the region and how it has rediscovered its worth in regards to biodiversity. He referred to the South African Development Community (SADC) which has developed and implemented various regional environmental protocols and several transboundary collaborations, such as the Kalahari Trans-frontier Park and the Okavango River Basin Commission. He highlighted the fact that Botswana has 37 per cent of its land area set aside for biodiversity conservation and has recently completed management plans, such as, the Okavango Delta Management Plan, the Makgadikgadi Plan, and will soon finalize the Chobe Management Plan.

11. On behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. Atsuhiko Yoshinaka, thanked the Government of Botswana for hosting the workshop. He stressed the importance of revising NBSAPs and informed participants that Japan has established a Japan Biodiversity Fund to assist eligible countries in translating the Aichi Targets into NBSAP before COP 11 and that additional funds for national biodiversity planning have been made available through GEF-5. He also emphasized the importance of ratifying the Nagoya Protocol and the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol now opened for signature. He finished by saying that this workshop was the first of a series of sub-regional workshops, and that the deliberations of the week could serve as a model for other regions in Africa and beyond.

12. Ms. Sakhile Koketso facilitated self introductions among the participants and asked them to discuss, with neighbouring colleagues, their expectations and commitments towards the workshop and to write them on the pieces of paper that were distributed. The notes were then shared orally amongst all participants. The most common ones included:

- (a) Aligning existing NBSAPs with the new 2011-2020 Biodiversity Targets and COP 10 outcomes.
- (b) Getting the necessary skills and processes to develop and revise NBSAPs.
- (c) Knowing the financial resources for the process.
- (d) Establishing key network and partnerships for implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.
- (e) Integrating NBSAP into planning processes at international, regional and national levels.
- (f) Understanding biodiversity (especially beyond the Convention on Biological Diversity National Focal Point).
- (g) Outreach measures.
- (h) Getting lessons and insights from other countries on NBSAP preparation, implementation and review processes.
- (i) Establish key networks and partnerships.
- (j) Bringing ownership of NBSAPs with all the different stakeholders.

13. After the participants shared their expectations, Ms Koketso, made a presentation on the workshop aims and objectives, covering the agenda day by day. She also outlined the expected outcomes of the workshop as detailed under paragraph 4 above.

14. The Minister of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism, The Honourable Onkokame Kitso Mokaila, hosted a reception dinner on the evening of Friday 18 March 2011, where he assured the participants that

the protection of biodiversity is the Ministry’s primary objective. Mr. Yoshinaka and Mr. Dittlhogo delivered statements on the highlights of the workshop.

ITEM II. REVIEW OF FINDINGS OF GBO 3 AND OVERVIEW OF THE AICHI-NAGOYA OUTCOME

15. Mr. David Cooper welcomed the participants, not only from the Ministries of Environment, but also representatives from planning and financing ministries and other partners. In his presentation, he started with the Aichi-Nagoya Outcomes: 47 decisions of COP 10, including the Nagoya Protocol on ABS, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and Aichi Targets, the Strategy for Resource Mobilization as well as the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity; 17 decisions of MOP, including the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol and the Strategic Plan for Biosafety Protocol. In addition to all these, there were also declarations and parallel meetings on Local Authorities and Cities, Parliamentarians and Biodiversity and Development.

16. Mr. Cooper also presented the results of GBO 3 and focused on The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, as well as on the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and national implementation. He covered the different mechanisms available to support implementation and the next steps to follow.

17. Mr. David Duthie made a presentation on the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization, linking it to the third objective of the Convention. He mentioned the history of the negotiations, its objective and the advantages for users and providers of genetic resources as well as for indigenous and local communities. He also referred to the funds available to support the early ratification and implementation of the Protocol, through briefing sessions for decision makers and capacity-building workshops for national focal points and indigenous and local communities. He concluded the presentation by explaining the necessary steps for signature and ratification.

18. Mr. David Duthie made a second presentation, this time on the Kuala-Lumpur Supplementary Protocol which originated in response to Article 27 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety: Liability and Redress. He spoke about the negotiation process and some of its main articles: use of terms, response measures and the implementation and relation to civil liability. He completed the presentation by mentioning the steps to follow for signature, ratification and entry into force.

ITEM III. REVIEW AND UPDATING OF NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS: LESSONS LEARNED AND NEXT STEPS

19. This agenda item was introduced using an exercise where participants were asked to write down a self assessment of their NBSAP including their achievements and challenges of implementation. Participants reported the following conclusions, awareness and educations:

NBSAP’s Achievements:	Challenges implementing NBSAP:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected areas have increased, including the whole coastal line • Biodiversity assessment, status of species-creating baselines • NBSAP prepared and in place • Establishing institutional framework for Biosafety; policy and legislation put in place • Translated NBSAP into National Biodiversity Framework (33 actions) • NBSAP translated into legal document • Enhancing capacity development into local and national plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate financial resources – Resource mobilization • Communicating the NBSAP (CEPA) • Lack of buy-in from, and participation of, key NBSAP stakeholders • Institutional fragmentation • Lack of documented traditional knowledge across SADC Member States. • In some cases, the baseline information on biodiversity is unknown • Alignment with action plans, at a level where implementation is more attainable

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing the context and creating high-level reference for national and sub-national targets • NBSAP helped in mainstreaming biodiversity into other sectors and emphasize biodiversity for development • Provincial National Action Plans 	<p>and direct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better addressing CBD's objectives 2 and 3 • Lack of capacity
--	--

20. After the exercise, a presentation of a study published by the United Nations University – Institute for Advanced Studies (UNU-IAS), on the assessment of NBSAPs was made by Mr. David Duthie. He first talked about the objective of the study, methods and obstacles of implementation. Some of the main conclusions are:

- (a) Women and indigenous communities are largely missing in the participation on NBSAP formulation.
- (b) The coverage of the Convention on Biological Diversity objectives is uneven.
- (c) Newer NBSAPs are approved at a Parliament level.
- (d) CEPA is mentioned in NBSAPs as an add on chapter but not integrated.
- (e) Not all NBSAPs place biodiversity in a broader development policy context, some NBSAPs may have strong emphasis on development, but MDG plans have no focus on biodiversity.
- (f) Most NBSAPs highlight the need to valuate and create economic incentives for biodiversity, but few move beyond general statements.
- (g) Mainstreaming with climate change and other biodiversity-related conventions is rather weak, although there are some positive signs emerging with recent national adaptation plans of action (NAPAs).
- (h) Only very few countries in very new NBSAPs include time-bound and measurable targets.
- (i) Generally there are very few NBSAPs with mechanisms for monitoring and review at the country level.
- (j) Some countries have reported full implementation of 1st generation NBSAPs, but gaps and constraints to implementation are reported in nearly all other countries.

21. Two countries presented their NBSAP experiences. South Africa's case was presented by Ms. Wilma Lutsch, who spoke about their own NBSAP development process, prepared between 2003 and 2005, including many stakeholders. She also mentioned their five strategic goals, as well as some challenges and achievements, such as clear targets with timeframes, the creation of coordinated structures and the translation of the NBSAP into a legal instrument.

22. The second country to present was Botswana, whose NBSAP was developed in 2004, and revised in 2007. Ms. Portia Segomelo presented their processes, challenges, achievements and lessons learned, such as the limited integration of NBSAP implementation into the broader environmental management. In response to a question concerning the involvement of ILCs involved in the process, Ms. Segomelo explained that in 2007 the Government adopted community-based resource management as a policy to reflect interest, and have the participation of social society in environment and other sectors. The Government has also made provisions for ILC as facilitators in between government structures and community level.

23. Ms. Fabianna Issler, representing UNDP-GEF, made a presentation on how to access funding under the GEF-5 Enabling Activities allocation. She first informed the participants that all the Parties

present were eligible for funding, and then she proceeded to explain that enabling activities could be provided for: revising NBSAPS in line with new SP, implementation of guidance to Clearing-House Mechanism (CHM), the Biosafety Second National Report (2NR), and the CBD fifth National Report (5NR). She also mentioned that Parties could be funded directly by GEF; that it was a complicated process but possible, however she stressed the point that using implementing agencies might be useful to countries, as they could provide assistance throughout the process. In response to a question concerning the eligibility of ILCs and NGOs to apply for GEF funds, Ms. Issler responded that they could access funding through the Small Grants Programme, and mentioned a programme where four NGOs are benefiting from a protected areas programme in Seychelles.

24. In the afternoon of day 3, Mr. Stephen Nash from CITES delivered a presentation on the links between NBSAPs and CITES. He stressed the need to collaborate on a local, national, regional and international level to set and implement the Aichi Targets.

ITEM IV. SETTING NATIONAL AND REGIONAL TARGETS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE AICHI-NAGOYA BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

25. This agenda item was spread over four days, and also drew upon presentations and discussions under agenda items V and VI. On the first day, Mr Cooper made a presentation on setting National Biodiversity Targets, stressing that targets must be appropriate to each country and relate to the biodiversity and socio-economic aspects to the country. He mentioned that targets were needed to move from words to action and to obtain measureable results. He covered the five Strategic Goals and the different targets under each goal. Mr. Cooper also provided some examples of current national targets.

26. As an example in target setting, the workshop addressed Target 11 (protected areas), outlining the following: (a) current extent of protected areas, (b) areas of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services not currently protected, (c) effectiveness on existing protected areas, (d) opportunities and constraints to expand them, (e) involvement of stakeholders, (f) and additional resources required to reach the national targets.

27. Some of the results reported back are presented as follows:

- (a) There is a funding need for international agreements to increase and maintain biodiversity.
- (b) There are no subsidies, or support for local government.
- (c) Co-management strategies should be in place to extend protection beyond protected areas.
- (d) Need to increase areas and programmes that benefit local communities.
- (e) Some inland waters are not protected.
- (f) Resources are available, but they are not enough.
- (g) A percentage of the revenues from protected areas should go directly to conservation, so that we don't have to rely on central government.

28. On the second day, Mr. David Cooper provided an overview of Strategic Goal B and the five targets that are under this goal. He presented a chart, which he distributed later, on threats and vulnerable ecosystems. After the presentation, participants had the opportunity to identify and assess their most vulnerable ecosystems and threats. The groups reported the following ecosystems as vulnerable: miombo, savannah, woodlands, wetlands, forest, international waters and mountains. The following were identified as major threats: invasive species, overgrazing, overexploitation, climate change, pollution.

29. After this exercise, participants were asked to work in groups and to formulate targets for their country, or group. Mr. Cooper emphasized that the targets should be in the framework of Goal B and that

these should be realistic, ambitious and time-bound. He also asked participants to indicate stakeholders, sectors and interest groups for each of the targets, identifying any steps/milestones to achieve these.

30. Some of the targets created were as follows:

Target 5

- By 2020 the gross rate of deforestation is reduced by 20 per cent and reforestation with native species increased by 20 per cent.
- To reduce, by 2020, the rate of overharvesting of the savannah by 40 per cent.
- By 2020, to have reduced anthropogenic fires by 70 per cent.
- By 2020, reforestation measures are increased by 30 per cent.
- By 2011 the rate of deforestation of mangroves would have been reduced.
- By 2015, reduce the incidence of man-made fires by 50 per cent.
- By 2020, to reduce fire incidents by 20 per cent, overgrazing reduced and habitat area increased by 35 per cent.

Target 8

- By 2020, to have reduced the pollution of all wetland ecosystems by 80 per cent.
- By 2020, reduce by 50 per cent the use of chemical substances used in the agricultural sector in harmony with the relevant supporting instruments, including POPs phase out programme.

31. The stakeholders identified were: Governments (Ministries of Environment, Defence, Education, and Agriculture), local communities, private sector, media and youth. Capacity-building was mentioned as one of the milestones, in addition to CEPA activities.

32. The last goal discussed under this item was Goal D, which was covered by a presentation from Namibia and a presentation by the Convention on Biological Diversity staff. Ms. Louisa Mupetami presented the Community-Based Natural Resource Management Network (CBNRM) Case in Namibia under Goal D and more specifically target 14. She started by mentioning the rights of communities to form conservancies, the steps for setting these up, the ecological importance of these and their economic and social benefits. Currently in Namibia there are 59 registered Conservancies.

33. After this presentation, Mr. Cooper covered Aichi Target 14, explaining the importance of protecting ecosystem services. He mentioned that 15 out of 24 ecosystems are in decline and stressed the fact that human well-being is directly linked to ecosystem goods and services. After the presentation, he asked participants to create an example of target 14 and to discuss the ecosystem services that contribute to human well being; identifying the ecosystems that provide these services. Three of the results are presented as follows:

a) *“By 2020, restore 80 per cent of the degraded ecosystem sites, through controlling overgrazing and overharvesting of services to meet the needs of indigenous women and local communities, poor and vulnerable groups.”*

Ecosystem services: Water provision, fibre (bamboo, reed dance, sleeping mats, Basotho hats), fish, other reptiles and traditional medicine (juju).

Ecosystems: Wetlands and river habitats.

b) *“By 2020, at least 65 per cent of all key wetlands should be restored and managed in a sustainable manner.”*

Ecosystem services: Water, job creation, alien clearing, harvesting of reeds to make traditional mats/baskets and traditional medicine.

Ecosystems: Wetlands

c) *“By 2020, the savannahs, forests, mountains and mangroves that provide services to people, should be protected, restored and maintained.”*

Ecosystem services: Wood for heating, medicine, food, socio-cultural needs.

Ecosystems: Forest and savannahs, continental waters and mangroves.

ITEM V. INTEGRATING BIODIVERSITY INTO RELEVANT NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING PROCESSES

34. A number of presentations were made on the second day to introduce various approaches to the integration of biodiversity into national and local planning processes. Mr. Andre Mader, representing ICLEI - Local Action for Biodiversity, delivered a presentation on the crucial role of local authorities in implementation under Strategic Goal A. He stressed the importance of cities, and how they are an opportunity for effective CEPA programmes since 50 per cent of the global population is concentrated in cities. Mr. Mader stressed the need of having Local Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans, and referred to COP 10 decisions and the study done by UNU-IAS (previously mentioned), where NBSAPs show a limited ownership at the sub-national level and weak local institutional capacity. He concluded his presentation by providing some recommendations to Parties, including the need to involve local authorities in the NBSAP process and implementation.

35. Ms. Caroline Petersen, representing SANBI, delivered a presentation on the integration of biodiversity into spatial planning and environment assessment, linking this to Aichi Target 2. She started by presenting the landscapes initiatives in South Africa, and showed in a map, the transboundary treaties signed in the region. She covered different aspects of planning such as the landscape approach, the impact of land uses and the critical biodiversity areas. She concluded by presenting the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) as a tool to provide decision makers with information on potential environmental impacts of activities and policies.

36. Mr. Ruud Jansen made a presentation on the Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI), a UNDP-UNEP joint programme. He started by explaining the mission of this programme, which is to mainstream poverty environment issues into development planning, including biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services and sustainable utilization.

37. Ms. Sakhile Koketso facilitated a panel discussion which was formed by representatives from the finance and planning development ministries. Ms. Sinovuyo Ntiyantiya, representing SANBI and Mr. Ruud Jansen, representing UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative, were also part of the group.

38. The panel focused its discussion on the opportunities and challenges to integrating biodiversity into national plans. The most important topic discussed was the need to communicate well and explain to other ministries the issues and benefits of biodiversity protection, in other words, CEPA targeted for decision makers. SANBI mentioned that capacity-building should be at the top of the list, as there is a lack of capacity to integrate biodiversity into the planning process. Mr. Jansen mentioned that the initial challenge in communication is to translate existing reports into policy briefs for policy makers. A comment was made that implementing agencies should have been present in the workshop, and the planning representative from Botswana said that they will work with the Department of Environmental Affairs to integrate biodiversity into national planning processes.

ITEM VI. VALUATION AND INCENTIVE MEASURES AS TOOLS FOR MAINSTREAMING

Valuation

39. Mr. Joshua Bishop, chief economist of the IUCN, provided an introductory presentation of the initiative on the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB), presenting the initiative's origins and mandate and explaining the TEEB approach to the valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services. He emphasized the potential of TEEB and the Ecosystem Approach as mainstreaming tools by describing a number of concrete examples, such as a numerical comparison of the costs and benefits of shrimp farms versus protecting mangroves, or an economic valuation of the water treatment benefits generated by a wetland near Kampala. Mr. Bishop also briefly introduced some of the mechanisms available to

“internalize” biodiversity values in production and consumption, such as certification and labelling of forest products.

40. The representative from South Africa explained that South Africa is in the process of developing a national TEEB study. South Africa has initiated a land-revolving fund for protected areas, where institutions can buy land and donate it with a restriction on future land use; the donor can then deduct the cost of the land from his taxes through the National Treasury. South Africa also has a system of wetland mitigation banking; if wetlands are destroyed, the person responsible has to pay to protect or restore another comparable wetland.

41. Mr. Andrew Seidl, Head of the IUCN Global Economics and the Environment Programme, and Mr. Markus Lehmann, Economist of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, presented on the valuation of biodiversity and associated ecosystems, focusing on Aichi Target 2 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. They reviewed key conceptual issues and approaches to valuation, with an emphasis on economic valuation, such as the Total Economic Value (TEV) approach. They provided a brief overview of economic valuation tools, including their strengths and limitations, and concluded by presenting a pragmatic step-wise approach to valuation.

42. Mr. Sekgowa Motsumi from Botswana presented a study on the economic valuation of the Okavango Delta. The aim of the study was to assist in decision-making processes and management issues, such as achieving the fair sharing of tourism benefits and addressing the impacts of invasive species. The values covered by the study include tourism (photographic), and natural resources (fish, reeds), as well as groundwater recharge, wildlife refuge, water purification and scientific and education value.

43. In the subsequent discussion, the following issues were raised and further clarified:

- (a) The study of the economic value of the Okavango delta, in its first phase, only covered (direct and indirect) use values. It is hoped that the research can be expanded to non-use values in subsequent phases.
- (b) Raising awareness among decision makers, and catalyzing subsequent policy action, is an important task of valuation studies. While success stories exist, communication to policymakers could be further improved.
- (c) Economic valuation focuses on the contribution of biodiversity and ecosystem services to human well-being – insofar as biodiversity and ecosystem services contribute to human well-being.

44. Participants subsequently worked in break-out groups. Based on the presentations and a number of lead questions, participants reflected on how to translate Aichi Target 2 into national targets, milestones, and possible activities. A compilation of this work is provided in annex III.

Incentive measures

45. Mr. Lehmann made a presentation on addressing incentives that are harmful to biodiversity, focusing on Aichi Target 3. He explained that harmful incentives can result from environmentally harmful subsidies; from laws and regulations governing resource use; and from the non-internalization of externalities, and provided specific examples for each of these categories. Based on the TEEB studies as well as earlier work under the Convention, he presented key lessons learnt in identifying and removing, phasing out, or reforming harmful incentives. An interactive exercise tasked participants to identify, in country or sub-regional groups; programmes or policies that they thought generate harmful incentives for biodiversity and the environment. The results of this exercise are described in annex III.

46. Mr. Bishop presented the development and application of positive incentive measures, again with a focus on Aichi Target 3.

47. Participants subsequently worked in break-out groups. Based on the presentations and a number of lead questions, participants reflected on how to translate Aichi Target 3 into national targets, milestones, and possible activities. A compilation of this work is provided in annex III.

Field Study Visit

48. Mr. Jobe Manga and Mr. Kennedy Mathame, provided an introduction to the field study component of the workshop, focusing on the integration of biodiversity in the district-level planning.

49. Participants visited three sites. The first sight was the Kalepa Community Trust Electrified Crop Field, where they met the manager to discuss the project's objectives, achievements and challenges encountered during its implementation. At this same site, participants had the opportunity to hear from another community project called the Chobe Enclave Conservation Trust (CECT). Following this, participants went to Chobe National Park to see the boreholes the Department of Wildlife and National Parks has dug to divert wildlife concentration from the Chobe River. After lunch in the park, participants went to the Biodiversity Centre.

50. In the afternoon, participants had the opportunity to have one-on-one discussions with the Convention on Biological Diversity staff on their process of revision of their NBSAPs. They also had the opportunity to meet with UNEP-GEF staff to discuss the process of applying for GEF funds.

ITEM VII. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION FOR NBSAP IMPLEMENTATION

51. Mr. Bishop presented on Resource Mobilization, starting with some lessons learned from the Kalepa Community Trust electrified fence visited during the field trip, linking it with resource mobilization. He subsequently covered Aichi Target 20, presenting means, activities, and possible indicators.

52. In the subsequent discussion, the following comments were made:

- (a) The distribution of collective funds is a complex task; regulations stipulating specific sharing rules can be helpful to avoid conflicts.
- (b) Decentralization and local empowerment is important, as well as building trust with communities and guiding them so that they are able to lead their own development and make their own decisions.
- (c) In light of the low priority frequently assigned to biodiversity, opportunities to raise funds in synergy with other objectives (e.g., job creation) need to be identified and exploited.

53. Ms. Fabianna Issler from UNDP-GEP presented the financial resources available for the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. She elaborated on the indicative deadlines for setting national targets, revising NBSAPs, implementing NBSAPs, achieving targets and submitting the fifth and sixth national reports. She also described the different types of available funding (public, including ODA, private and innovative finance), and provided examples for each of these.

54. Ms. Betty Schroder from Namibia presented an overview of Namibia's biodiversity management. She explained that the majority of Namibia's funding comes from GTZ. Other funding mechanisms include the Game Products Trust Fund, created under CITES, and the sale of ivory.

55. Ms. Sakhile Koketso presented on LifeWeb roundtables, using NBSAPs to mobilize financing for implementation. She presented some examples of using national prioritisation to mobilize and coordinate financing.

56. Mr. Andrew Seidl and Mr. Joshua Bishop facilitated an exercise on resource mobilization. Participants worked in groups to identify funding gaps against their tentative targets as well as potential ways and means to find additional resources.

ITEM VIII. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION

57. This agenda item started with a presentation on Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA): developing and implementing effective CEPA programmes as an integral part of NBSAP. This presentation was delivered by Ms. Julianne Zeidler. She invited comments from the floor on their expectations, which were presented as follows:

- (a) Learn new techniques to improve strategies on how to communicate with our communities.
- (b) How to translate the CEPA toolkit to decision makers.
- (c) Strategic information for different groups.
- (d) Impacts/consequences.
- (e) To have the CEPA toolkit in other languages, such as, Portuguese and to be more accessible to other foreign-speaking countries.

58. Ms Zeidler presented a short video called “Love not Loss”. Afterwards, participants had the opportunity to comment on it. The main focus of the presentation was a discussion about what works when communicating, and what could work better. The results were as follows:

What works:

Audience - Communities

- Local language, appropriate language
- Short and concise, package information appropriately
- Use different forms of media (e.g., radio , pictures, TV)
- Identify clients and objectives
- Focus on children
- Use pictures
- General environmental communication
- Use of billboards, they are eye-catching. Use them!

Audience: decision makers

- Use of inter-ministerial meetings and cabinet meetings
- Invite non-traditional sectors to biodiversity events

What could work better?

- Identify clients – know your audience
- Gap analysis and communication needs
- Use theatre
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Identify purpose and objectives
- Focus on one community and then use this community to train others
- Have a communication strategy, a plan and a budget
- Use different agents of communication
- Simple concepts and scientific jargon
- Include parents in kids’ activities
- Locally relevant examples
- Use appropriate technology and right message
- Messages should try to change people’s behaviour.
- Brief other Ministries
- Focus on what is relevant
- Create focus groups

- Get appropriate training in communication
- Learning by doing
- Encourage students to reach to their parents
- Consultation process is critical
- Target youth, they will spread the message

59. After the session on CEPA, a video was shown on the achievements of the International Year of Biodiversity, followed by a presentation delivered by Mr. Atsuhiko Yoshinaka on the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity. Mr. Yoshinaka explained that the Decade was established with a view to contributing to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, as well as raising awareness of biodiversity issues. He also mentioned that Focal Points, UN Agencies and other actors are encouraged to carry out actions that support the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2010, strengthen networks for implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and increase mainstreaming efforts.

60. Mr. Rodger Mpande provided a presentation on engaging stakeholders in the implementation of NBSAPs, where he mentioned various forms of engagement, such as informing, consulting, involving, collaborating and empowering. We need to know who to engage, how and when. He also presented some of the challenges engaging stakeholders and the opportunities for engagement at local, national, regional and international level.

61. Some comments were received from the floor, acknowledging that the presence of many different stakeholders at the workshop will help to revise their NBSAP. Mr. Leo Niskanen mentioned that different stakeholders, including the private sector, were involved in the process of the developing the SADC Action Plan.

62. Mr. Gladman Chibebeme made a presentation on engaging indigenous and local communities in the implementation of NBSAPs. He started by mentioning the global policy supporting ILC's participation, and COP 10 decisions on Article 8j.

63. The last presentation under this item was mainstreaming gender into NBSAPs, delivered by Ms. Sakhile Koketso. She first explained the meaning of gender, explaining that women's and men's differential access to resources is one of the key aspects of gender inequality. She presented why we should care about gender, and its considerations in the Convention on Biological Diversity.

ITEM IX. SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION – STRENGTHENING SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION IN THE REGION

64. Cathrine Mutambirwa and Mr. Alex Banda presented the SADC Regional Biodiversity Strategy and the SADC Action Plan which is to be submitted for Ministerial approval in May 2011. The process of developing the strategy was mentioned along with its constraints. The Plan of Action, its objectives, strategic areas and implementation structure were presented.

65. Under South-South Cooperation, participants were given a questionnaire to complete and discuss on three different issues: identified needs, examples of centres of excellence and their accessibility.

66. With regards to information, knowledge and technologies most needed for the NBSAPs revision and implementation, the most common answer was the need to update the Red Lists, to have a baseline and know the status of the species in their countries. The second most popular response was the need for GIS monitoring and sensing. Some other identified needs were capacity-building, research and marketing of medicinal plants, and a better understanding of traditional knowledge.

67. Some of the examples of centres of excellence mentioned were:

- (a) Regional Centre for Mapping of Resources for Development (Kenya) - provides mapping on wetlands, they also conduct surveys and offer training in other regions.

- (b) SANBI.
- (c) SADC Regional Genetic Resources Bank in Zambia.
- (d) Okavango Research Institute – offers courses of wetlands and integrating water management.
- (e) ERAVIT, regional school in DRC for tropical forest – provides training in forest management.
- (f) The Southern African Institute for Environmental Assessment (SAIEA) and the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA).
- (g) Namibia’s Training and Research Centre, deals with biodiversity research and management training.
- (h) National Biodiversity Planning Forum.
- (i) South African Botanical Diversity Network (SABONET).

A full list of these centres is provided in annex V.

68. Asked whether any of these institutions are being used and are accessible, there were some mixed responses from the participants. Some participants mentioned that they are accessible, and some mentioned that communication on the services offered by these institutes need to be improved.

69. A suggestion from the floor was that if someone is aware of a training or workshop, to send it to Mr. Banda (SADC) so that he can forward it to all SADC members. Another suggestion was to have a web-based forum, where everyone can share information. There was also a comment that the Convention on Biological Diversity’s CHM website should improve, and that SADC should have a CHM as well.

ITEM X. SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSION OF THE WORKSHOP

70. Under this item, participants were asked to write down two or three main ideas they gained from the workshop. The conclusions of these were presented on the last day. In addition, Mr. Cooper asked each of the Government representatives to state their current plans for revising and updating the NBSAP. The country representatives were also asked to complete a questionnaire regarding the revision of the NBSAPs. The results of this session, as well as the questionnaire, are presented in annex IV.

71. On the last day, a discussion on the next steps in revising and updating NBSAPs was led by Mr. Cooper, who presented once more the NBSAP indicative components and the enabling activities components.

72. Reflecting on the presentations made during the workshop, the Secretariat prepared and circulated a draft list of conclusions which was reviewed by participants who provided feedback and additional comments. The conclusions are listed below:

Key issues identified in the region:

- (a) Human-wildlife conflict.
- (b) Fire management.
- (c) CBNRM.

The NBSAP revision process should include the following elements:

- (a) Review of previous experience to elucidate lessons learned (in many countries this has been done through the fourth national reports).

- (b) Stakeholder engagement, including women, local leaders and indigenous communities in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of NBSAP.
- (c) Setting of SMART national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity targets, but taking into account national needs and priorities (annex II provides some examples of potential national targets for the region).
- (d) Developing an action plan, noting that one activity could contribute towards multiple targets.
- (e) Mainstreaming biodiversity into broader national development processes and budget processes, using valuation tools, spatial planning etc.
- (f) Developing a communication strategy.
- (g) Developing a resource mobilization strategy (or investment framework).
- (h) Arrangements for monitoring and evaluation.

The following points were emphasized:

- (a) Economic valuation of our biodiversity is useful to inform planning and policy decision making and to justify, for decision makers, the need to increase budget allocations for conservation.
- (b) There is a need for the assessment of incentives (positive and negative) of selected key policies and programmes.
- (c) There are many opportunities for resource mobilization beyond domestic government budgets and overseas aid.
- (d) Elevating CEPA as a key component of NBSAP implementation, noting the importance of audience targeting, strategizing and impact monitoring for an effective CEPA process.
- (e) Mainstreaming gender issues in biodiversity issues at all levels is important.

73. Participants outlined their plans for initiating the NBSAP revision process, applying for GEF-5 funds, setting national targets and integrating the targets and priorities in broader development plans. An indicative outline of a revised NBSAP, consistent with the points raised above as well as guidance from COP-9 and COP-10 is found in annex I. A list of example targets arising from the workshop is found in annex II. All countries indicated that they would initiate the process within the next few weeks or months and many indicated that they would expect to complete the target-setting process by COP-11 (see annex IV).

74. Participants identified the needs and opportunities for strengthened technical and scientific cooperation at the level of the sub-region (South-South Cooperation).

75. The expectations that had been outlined at the beginning of the workshop (paragraph 12) were briefly reviewed and participants agreed that the workshop had met most expectations. Participants welcomed this opportunity to discuss NBSAPs and exchange experiences with their counterparts in the region.

Expectation	Results
Link biodiversity with other sectors.	Well covered.
CEPA programmes.	Achieved half of expected.
Share experiences on biodiversity conservations.	The workshop responded well to this.

Expectation	Results
Know more about the GEF process.	Everyone now knows the process.
Integration into local and national development plans.	It was covered to some extent, we could have covered more on financial mechanism, get funding so that we can have budgets, cascading to all possible, especially local level.
How to incorporate outcomes.	Yes, it was achieved.

76. Closing remarks were delivered by Ms. Segomelo, on behalf of the Department of Environment Affairs Botswana. On behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. Yoshinaka gave some closing remarks, thanked the countries for their participation in the workshop and once again thanked Botswana for hosting the workshop. Ms. Serumola, from Botswana, gave some closing remarks. Mr. Mike Ipanga, representative from DRC, also gave some closing remarks on behalf of the participants. He thanked Kasane for hosting the workshop, and thanked Japan for the funds available for this workshop. He also thanked all the organizers, including the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Government of Botswana and Kalahari Conservation Society (KCS).

*Annex I***INDICATIVE OUTLINE OF AN NBSAP****I. INTRODUCTION**

A concise account of the necessary background, setting the scene for updated NBSAP and providing the rationale for the strategy and actions therein. Where necessary, may be complemented by in-depth studies annexed to the main NBSAP.

1. **Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services in the country and their contribution to human well-being** - Importance of biodiversity for the country. Highlight contribution to human well-being, socio-economic development, including poverty reduction. Include analysis of economic and other values.

2. **Causes and consequences of biodiversity loss** - Main threats to biodiversity (and ecosystems) and their underlying causes. Impacts of threats on biodiversity and ecosystems and socio-economic implications of the impacts. Describe the impacts of declining biodiversity and ecosystems on human well-being, livelihoods, poverty reduction, etc. Link the threats (direct drivers) with the underlying causes (indirect drivers) and relate these to the relevant economic sectors.

3. **Constitutional, legal and institutional framework** - Overview of the biodiversity policy and planning framework and relevant broader policy and planning processes (national development plans; poverty reduction strategies; climate change adaptation plans, etc.). Include an outline of any relevant constitutional, legal and institutional elements.

4. **Lessons learned from the earlier NBSAP(s) and the process of developing the updated NBSAP.** - A brief account of progress in implementing earlier NBSAPs (where relevant). Summary results of any evaluation of the effectiveness of earlier NBSAPs. What challenges and gaps need to be addressed, and main priority areas for revised NBSAP. Might also develop scenarios of biodiversity futures. Might also include brief reflections on the process of developing the previous NBSAP and how it may have influenced its effectiveness. Briefly outline the process of updating the NBSAP including stakeholder consultations.

II. NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY: PRINCIPLES, PRIORITIES AND TARGETS

The main “high-level” elements of the Strategy that provides the framework for the NBSAP as a whole:

5. **Long term vision** - Outline the long-term vision for the state of biodiversity in the country. This should be an inspirational statement that reflects the importance of biodiversity for people and is broadly shared across the country. This may be for 2050 (as is the case for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 or may be aligned with other long term national development plans).

6. **Principles governing the strategy** - Core values and beliefs underlying the NBSAP.

7. **Main goals or priority areas** - The most pressing issues that are addressed by the NBSAP. Among these should be goals to ensure the mainstreaming of biodiversity (i.e., the integration of biodiversity into broader national policies, strategies and plans).

8. **National Targets (SMART)** - National biodiversity targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. These should be strategic, specific, measurable, ambitious but realistic targets that are time-bound (usually for 2020). They maybe grouped under the main goals or priority areas.

III. NATIONAL ACTION PLAN

The details of the Strategy and the Action Plan:

9. **National actions to achieve the strategy, with milestones** -- The actions needed to achieve the targets. These should consist largely of strategic actions such as institutional, legislative, economic or

other policy and institutional actions that will provide the enabling conditions and incentives necessary to achieve the goals or priority areas and the targets of the NBSAP. More specific actions would be indicative, acknowledging that approaches will need to be adapted in light of experience of implementation. The Plan should determine who does what, where, when and how.

10. **Application of the NBSAP to sub-national entities** -- How the NBSAP will be implemented at state/provincial level (particularly important for federal countries, or quasi-federal countries which devolve territorial management to these entities) and at local or municipal levels (including cities). The national strategy and action plan might be complemented by LBSAPs developed separately.

11. **Sectoral Action - mainstreaming into development, poverty reduction and climate change plans** - Actions and steps that will be taken to integrate biodiversity into broader national policies, strategies and plans (such as national development plans; poverty reduction strategies; climate change adaptation plans, etc.) and into sectoral policies, strategies and plans, across government, the private sector and civil society.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

12. **Plan for capacity development for NBSAP implementation, including a technology needs assessment** -- The human and technical needs to implement the NBSAP and how they may be mobilized.

13. **Communication and outreach strategy for the NBSAP.** -- How the NBSAP will be promoted in the country among decision makers and the public at large (this is distinct from the CEPA activities of the NBSAP – which would go into the national and subnational actions sub-sections).

14. **Plan for resource mobilization for NBSAP implementation** -- The financial resources needed to implement the NBSAP and how they will be mobilized through all sources including the domestic budget, external assistance (where relevant) and innovative financial mechanisms.

V. INSTITUTIONAL, MONITORING AND REPORTING

15. **National Coordination Structures** -- What are the national structures, institutions, and partnerships that will guide, coordinate and ensure implementation of the NBSAP (e.g., national committees, inter-ministerial committees; and Secretariat or unit to support these) with clear identification of roles and responsibilities of various institutional actors. Where relevant, establishment of coordination mechanisms with local authorities in the development and implementation of LBSAPs and/or with regional partners in the case of regional strategies.

16. **Clearing House Mechanism** -- Including the development and/or enhancement of the national CHM and how it is being used to support the development and implementation of the NBSAP; development of national (and where relevant regional) institutional network for biodiversity.

17. **Monitoring and Evaluation** -- How the implementation of the NBSAP will be monitored and evaluated, including provisions for reporting and the identification of indicators to track progress towards national targets.

Annex II

EXAMPLE TARGETS

Strategic Goal A

Target 2 (see also annex III)

By 2015, make an assessment of Biodiversity Ecosystem Services.

By 2020, biodiversity values are fully integrated into tourism activities.

By 2020, revise the National Development Plans and PRSP and National Budget Frameworks to integrate biodiversity values development processes, to achieve poverty reduction.

By 2020, biodiversity values have been integrated with the national plans and strategies and budget processes and investment return ensured.

By 2020, innovative financial mechanisms are put in place that will help in securing and maintaining ecological service supported by water systems.

By 2012, review and reform incentives and disincentives for wildlife damage compensation schemes and Integrated Support for Arable Agriculture Development (ISPAAD) programme.

To have water security by 2020, and meet the needs of the population's agriculture and ecological services.

By 2020, innovative financial mechanisms are put in place that will help in securing and maintaining ecological service supported by water systems.

By 2020, sustainable initiatives of national resources ensured with benefits to local communities.

Target 3

Review and reform positive and negative incentives for wildlife damage compensation schemes and Integrated Support for Arable Agriculture Development (ISPAAD) programme by 2012.

Strategic Goal B

Target 5

To reduce, by 2020 the rate of overharvesting of the savannah by 40 per cent.

By 2020, to have reduced anthropogenic fires by 70 per cent.

By 2020, reforestation measures are increased by 30 per cent.

Target 8

By 2020, to have reduced by 80 per cent ,pollution of all wetland ecosystems.

By 2020, reduce by 50 per cent the use of chemical substances used in the agricultural sector in harmony with the relevant supporting instruments, including the POPs phase out programme.

Strategic Goal C

Target 11

By 2015, extend land protected areas to 50 per cent, and marine protected areas to 10 per cent.

Strategic Goal D

Target 14

By 2020, at least 50 per cent of the forestry ecosystem that contribute to the availability of water, traditional medicine, building material and food are restored, safeguarded and used in a sustainable manner, taking into account the needs of women, local communities, the poor and vulnerable groups.

By 2020, the Savannah, forests, mountains and mangroves that provide ecosystem services, are restored and safeguarded.

By 2020, Botswana has water security to meet the needs of its population's agriculture and ecological services.

By 2020, thirty percent of degraded wetlands are restored and 60 per cent are protected and continue to provide water, food, and other services to women, indigenous and local communities and other vulnerable groups.

Annex III

RESULTS OF GROUP EXERCISES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL TARGETS AND ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES, BASED ON THE GLOBAL HEADLINE TARGETS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020 FOR AICHI TARGETS 2 AND 3

AICHI TARGET 2

In their work on Aichi Target 2 (integration of biodiversity values), participants frequently identified incentive measures as practical policy tools to implement the integration of biodiversity values into policies and planning processes, thus emphasizing the linkages between targets 2 and 3 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

1. Effectively integrate biodiversity values into national plans, such as national development plans:
 - (a) Foresee necessary biodiversity investments;
 - (b) Ensure that investments are undertaken by securing and providing adequate and timely financial resources;
 - (c) Monitor plan implementation through (e.g., midterm reviews);
 - (d) Work with national statistics offices to incorporate the valuation of key ecosystems services into the national accounting systems.
2. Integration into economic sectors and associated policies and planning processes:
3. Ensure water security to meet needs of population's agriculture and ecological services.
 - (a) Economic valuation of services related to water supply and integration of water resource management into national and local development planning;
 - (b) Establish payment systems for water/hydrological ecosystem services;
 - (c) Apply other innovative financial mechanisms;
 - (d) Establish mechanisms for equitable benefit sharing from the commercial use of ecological services from transboundary water resources.
4. Increase involvement of stakeholders in sector policies (e.g., in tourism):
 - (a) Integrate biodiversity values into tourism development processes so as to achieve poverty reduction, while also employing locals;
 - (b) Tourism developers must be aware of the need to conserve biodiversity as a means towards poverty reduction;
 - (c) Adoption of a tourism sustainability label and Environmental Management Systems;
 - (d) Establish or further strengthen joint management systems involving tourism operators developed for biodiversity conservation in ecological-sensitive areas;
 - (i) Number of joint management partnerships between tourism operators and government, communities, for conservation management could serve as indicator.
 - (ii) Develop a website/clearing-house describing criteria, roles, responsibilities for partnerships and methods of monitoring and supervision of joint management in ecologically sensitive areas.
 - (e) Stakeholder capacity development necessary in order to make projects more sustainable in the long run.
 - (i) To enhance cooperation and coordination amongst stakeholders.
 - (ii) To plan and implement more effective awareness-raising.

5. Promotion the wider application of community-based natural resource management (CBNRM).
 - (a) Increase the number of communities utilizing the CBNRM policy.
 - (b) Educate communities on the importance of the CBNRM policy.
 - (c) Attach economic value to biodiversity resources found within or near a particular community.

Examples of targets drafted are found under target 2 in annex II.

AICHI TARGET 3

Addressing harmful incentives

6. Undertake comprehensive reviews of existing incentive/disincentive measures with a view to identify and remedy deficiencies, including lack of effectiveness or the generation of harmful incentives.
7. Suggested concrete activities:
 - (a) Re-assess existing Wildlife Damage Compensation Schemes with a view to improve the targeting of beneficiaries against regional differences and differences in husbandry methods.
 - (b) Review existing support policies for agricultural development with a view to improve the targeting of beneficiaries and the baselines for eligibility.
 - (c) Expand/reform agricultural support policies to cover agricultural methods and practices with benefits for biodiversity, for example, biological agriculture.
 - (d) Review existing CBNRM programmes
 - (i) Need to move from a state scale to a community scale;
 - (ii) Need to diversify programme to cover variety of natural resources;
 - (iii) Need to document effectiveness of programme. Use management-oriented monitoring system for:
 - Development of guidelines for benefit sharing
 - Capacity-building for management
 - (iv) Conservancies must be capable of managing their own finances (in some communities this is a problem).
8. Review practices, and associated policies, of mining operations, with a view to enhance inter-sectoral coordination.

Applying positive Incentives

General criteria for positive incentive measures:

- (a) Positive incentives should generate significant positive impacts.
- (b) Financial sustainability needs to be ensured.
- (c) They should operate at minimal cost.
- (d) They should be socially equitable and allow community involvement.
- (e) They should be biodiversity friendly.
- (f) They should encourage private sector involvement.

Suggested improvements to incentive programmes:

- (a) Expanding coverage:
 - (i) Increase awareness.

- (ii) Mainstream national and sectoral plans and strategies.
- (b) Improve effectiveness through regular monitoring and evaluation.
- (c) Financial Stability:
 - (i) Free collection.
 - (ii) National-sectoral budget allocation.
 - (iii) Improve market infrastructure.
 - (iv) Use of sustainable resources
- (a) Add value to harvested resources.
- (b) Introduce new positive incentives that take into consideration environmental conservation (e.g., deforestation, beekeeping).
- (c) Key steps:
 - (i) Identify stakeholders and feasibility.
 - (ii) Involve stakeholders in identifying positive incentives.
 - (iii) Budget consideration.
 - (iv) Awareness and education.

Participants identified and reviewed a number of successful incentive programmes in the sub-region:

9. Environmental stewardship programme (South Africa):
 - (a) Landholders volunteer land for conservation and receive tax deductions;
 - (b) Benefit: more land for biodiversity conservation. Cost: reduces government's tax revenues;
 - (c) High demand to participate in the programme and donate land for conservation requires the provision of management plans by conservation agencies.
10. Ecosystem certification for tourism (Botswana):
 - (a) Establishments rated in green format;
 - (b) Drawback: those with insufficient funds are unable to afford it.
11. Solar water heating subsidy (South Africa):
 - (a) Enable solar-generated electricity self-sufficiency for villages;
 - (b) Extend to rural communities currently cutting down trees to heat water;
 - (c) Expand funding sources.
12. Payments for Watershed services (South Africa):
 - (a) Use spatial biodiversity data and water yield;
 - (b) Requires willing buyer municipalities and seller conservation agencies and communities;
 - (c) Poverty and EGS maps.
13. Marine park management plan (Seychelles):
 - (a) Allow park residents to fish so they keep an eye on illegal fishing;
 - (b) Government can cut spending on police enforcement in parks, plan is not costly;
 - (c) No negative consequences.

14. Cattle fattening ranch – feedlot programme (Lesotho and Swaziland)
 - (a) Objectives: Alleviate overgrazing, upgrade livestock quality for market purposes;
 - (b) Should introduce a good pricing policy as encouragement;
 - (c) Incentives:
 - (v) Principal policy.
 - (vi) Tax levy for imports and cattle from well managed private farms.
 - (vii) Legislation to control impost.
 - (viii) Introduce livestock – diversify.
15. National Parks (Malawi):
 - (a) Utilize 15 per cent of government revenues for social projects in communities around national parks;
 - (b) Suggested activity: expand programme;
 - (c) Encourage park tour operators thus enabling collection of more revenue;
 - (d) Involve communities in deciding how to use collected money (to improve social-equity).
16. Forestry conditional cash transfer (Malawi):
 - (a) Introduce indigenous tree species, therefore ensuring minimal biodiversity threat;
 - (b) Increase economic value generated from trees;
 - (c) Requires consultation, planning, approval and training by forestry implementation.
17. Fishing Management (Angola and Mozambique):
 - (a) Management plan allowing residents to fish in marine parks, while encouraging them to keep an eye on illegal fishing.
 - (b) Law enforcement;
 - (c) Aquaculture (for artisanal fishers);
 - (d) Technical assistance;
 - (e) Financial Aid.
18. Encourage regional and domestic investment through organizations such as OMESA and SADC (Zimbabwe).
 - (a) Develop organic farming; production of organic products as an incentive;
 - (b) Take advantage of CITES and MDGs to promote these new incentives.

Funding positive incentives by negative incentives:

19. Payment for grassland/wetland destruction (South Africa).
 - (a) Financial mechanisms requiring payment for destruction of grasslands and wetlands.
 - (b) Money from payments is used to restore other ecosystems.
20. Taxes for Polluters (Tanzania) – polluter pays principle.
 - (a) Government and community benefit while private sector suffers losses.
 - (b) Suggested improvements: Involve stakeholders (private and public); implement it to a larger extent in remote areas.

*Annex IV***PLANS OF EACH COUNTRY FOR THE REVISION OF NBSAPS**

Note: Please refer to the appendix for the components of the preparation process relevant to each country.

Angola

Status of NBSAP:

- Adopted 2006, not revised.

Plans for revision and target setting:

- Planning to revise the NBSAP in 2012, some funds have been allocated by the government, working with the GEF Focal Point to obtain GEF funds and, possibly, also from bilateral donor.

Botswana

Status of NBSAP:

- Adopted 2006, not revised.

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Framework Management Plan for Makgadikgadi Wetlands Systems
- Okavango Delta Management Plan
- Environmental Management Bill
- Draft Forest Policy
- Draft Wildlife Conservation Act

Plans for revision and target setting:

- Development of a Biodiversity Policy (through the ongoing UNDP supported programme)
- Development of Biodiversity indicators
- National consultation exercise to raise awareness of the Aichi Targets. Process of developing targets will be initiated in 2011 with a view to completion in 2012
- Strengthening of capacity for Botswana to coordinate implementation of the NBSAP and related MEAs
- Already in dialogue with stakeholders on modalities to access GEF funds

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- Recognize the need to integrate the NBSAP into district/local and National Development Planning processes.
- We hope to start the new process, integrating the Aichi targets, into the process of reviewing the national development plans by 2014.

Democratic Republic of Congo

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed 1999; Adopted 2000

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Forest code (2002)
- Law on the conservation of nature
- Environmental framework (pending Parliamentary decision)

Plans for revision and target setting:

- Planning to set national targets for 2011-2020, in time for COP 11.
- Plan to have a large national consultation to identify priorities
- Application for GEF funds drafted for submission to UNEP

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- Our country is at the moment elaborating the second generation PRSP, provincial priority action plans and the five-year National Plan. Therefore there are important opportunities to integrate the different aspect of biodiversity into these plans. This is dependent upon timely access to funds.

Lesotho

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed in 2000; not updated due to lack of funds.

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Environment Act 2008
- Forestry Policy 2007
- Food security 2008
- Transport policy
- Environmental Education Strategy 2004

Plans for revision and target setting:

- Immediately after this workshop we will start meeting with the stakeholders for consultations on updating the NBSAP including SMART targets.
- A National consultant will be recruited to develop the National targets, under the supervision and guidance of the department of Environment and the National Biodiversity Committee to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are engaged and that National Targets are aligned with the Aichi Targets.

Madagascar

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed 2001

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Protected Areas Management Plan
- Management plan of coastal zones
- Natural Resources Management Law 1996
- Forestry Policy 1997
- Establishment of many community based management plans
- Rural Development Action Plan

Plans for revision and target setting:

- NBSAP currently under (further) revision; should be ready by the end of 2011.
- Aims of revision process:
 - Integrate protected areas management plans in regional and national level
 - Improve the capacities in the local communities
 - Decentralize the management of resources so that private sectors and communities are responsible for this
 - Reinforcement of monitoring actions
 - The elaboration of an ABS policy
 - The adoption of the National Strategy on Sustainable Development
 - Include more stakeholders while revising the NBSAP
- Process for setting targets:
 - Consult stakeholders
 - Identify main problems in relation to biodiversity conservation
 - Prioritize national targets
 - Resource mobilization
- Intend to submit a proposal to UNDP for GEF funding

Malawi

Status of NBSAP:

- Adopted 2006. Not revised.

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Biotechnology Policy
- Biosafety Regulations

Plans for revision and target setting:

- Plan to start revising and updating the NBSAP, in view of the new Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020
- Will use the Aichi Targets to develop National Targets based on our circumstances
- Will consult the different stakeholders in government, private sector, NGOS and communities to set harmonized targets

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- There is an opportunity to integrate biodiversity into strategic plans. The Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Environment, has submitted its Strategic areas to the Ministry of Development Planning and cooperation for consolidation into the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy for 2011-2016.

Mozambique

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed 2001.

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Policy for Conservation

Plans for revision and target setting:

- We already started preparing the terms of reference, which will be updated according to COP-10 decisions.
- To set national targets, we need to review our biodiversity status in each area and the threats we are facing, so that we can integrate scientific aspects.
- We will try to integrate gender and climate change issues.

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- We will try to integrate the national biodiversity targets into the local development plans.

Namibia:

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed in 2002

Plans for revision:

- We will make a thorough revision, aiming to complete before the end of this year, we will see what areas need to be considered, and work on realistic targets. There is political support for this process and also some funding from a bilateral partner. Additional funds will be sought from GEF via UNDP.
- Namibia's very comprehensive 4NR provides a good overview of achievements and challenges and the way forward for the revision of NBSAP.

Seychelles:

Status of NBSAP:

- The first NBSAP was developed and adopted in 1998 covering a five year period leading up to 2004; not yet revised.

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- The EMPS (Environment Management Plan of Seychelles) was formulated to incorporate environmental-related issues such as energy, transport and human well-being as well as most biodiversity priority targets identified under the NBSAP. The EMPS is being reviewed to replace the last generation (2000-2010) and to incorporate new thematic areas such as climate change and IAS. The next generation EMPS is for the period 2010-2020. The plan was however drafted before adoption of the COP 10 Decision.

Plans for revision and target setting:

- It is important to review the NBSAP so as to incorporate the recently adopted goals and targets of the Convention on Biological Diversity into national context.
- Discussion already taken place within ministerial (national) level. Review is planned for mid-2011 depending on financial availability.
- We also intent to harmonize existing legislations into a Biodiversity Act.

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs

- Biodiversity projects are already mainstreamed through a landscape approach.
- Opportunities to mainstream the NBSAP will be discussed with the Planning Ministry after the workshop.

South Africa**Status of NBSAP:**

- Adopted 2005.
- National Biodiversity Framework finished 2008. (provides the short to medium-term “Strategy”).

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- National Biodiversity Act {add dates}
- National Biodiversity (Spatial) Assessment {add dates}
- National Protected Areas Expansion Strategy

Plans for revision and target setting:

- Process already started on the basis of the National Biodiversity (Spatial) Assessment
- A consultative process to review the NBSAP will be conducted
- Next steps are to incorporate the targets. Will begin by reviewing existing targets at national level (Ministerial Delivery Agreements, National Biodiversity Framework, National Protected Areas Expansion Strategy), and align with the Aichi Targets and add as required these.
- For the NBSAP review, we held our first national workshop to explain the Aichi Targets and to set a way forward on processes to be followed for the review.
- Will apply for GEF funds through UNDP, to complement own funds;

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- The National Strategy for Sustainable Development (NSSD) was recently completed; we were involved to ensure that environment and biodiversity issues are taken into consideration.

Swaziland**Status of NBSAP:**

- Adopted 2001
- Plans to revise NBSAP have been delayed due to lack of funds.

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Biodiversity Conservation and Management Policy (Draft)
- Biodiversity Conservation and Management Bill
- Access and Benefits Sharing Bill

Plans for NBSAP revision and target setting:

- We are preparing the terms of reference for the revision of the NBSAP. The workshop has come at an opportune time and has enriched us in aligning the forthcoming NBSAP to the Aichi Targets
- A series of workshops for key stakeholders are planned to nationalize the Aichi Targets
- The current exercise of developing our state of environment report for 2011 shall help us in collecting the relevant information for the baseline data.
- We have immediate plans to access GEF funds.

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- We have an opportunity to incorporate issues in planning as they have requested to update development plan; it is an opportunity to mainstream biodiversity into national plans

Tanzania**Status of NBSAP:**

- Completed 2004; not revised.

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Environmental Policy 1997
- Fisheries 1998
- Agriculture and Livestock 1997
- Water Policy 2002

- Environmental Management Act Plan 2004
- Marine Park and Reserve Act 1994
- Forest Act 2002
- Fisheries Act 2003
- Wildlife Conservation Act 2003
(Most of these are in the process of being revised)

Plans for NBSAP revision and target setting:

- The current plan is to start embarking on revising the NBSAP in line with the Aichi Targets and National priorities.
- The plans will be adapted to involve stakeholders and create awareness to them.
- In revising the NBSAP, there is a need to set milestones.
- Aim to have national targets before COP 11.
- Steps in the revision process:
 - Need for baseline information on biodiversity/ecosystems
 - Identify the national priorities targets through stakeholders' consultation
 - Prepare action plan to address causes of the challenges
- There is a need for adequate and timely financial resources to implement NBSAP

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- There is a need for integrating biodiversity issues into the national sectoral and budget (this is the period for budget preparations, and is the right time to integrate these issues of biodiversity in the budget).

Zambia

Status of NBSAP:

- Adopted in 1999; not revised.

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- National Policy on Environment 2007
- Environmental Management Act 2011
- National climate change response strategy 2010
- Wildlife and forestry policy review
- Ecosystem Economic Valuation

Plans for NBSAP revision and target setting:

- Plan to commence NBSAP review in 2011, in line with the timetable agreed at COP 10.
- National targets to be based on SADC Regional Biodiversity Strategy Plan and the Aichi targets
- We plan to access GEF funds

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- We have started the process of integrating issues of mainstreaming into national development planning our Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP) runs up to 2015. In preparing the plan there were issues of environment, particularly climate, included. The Ministry of environment has engaged other sectors. We have an opportunity to revise the NBSAP and mainstream the NDP.

Zimbabwe

Status of NBSAP:

- Completed 1998; Adopted 2002, not revised.

Other recent relevant policies, frameworks and laws:

- Wildlife based land reform policy
- Forest based land reform policy
- National Agriculture Policy (draft)
- National Energy Policy
- Water and sanitation sector policy
- Environmental education policy
- National environmental policy and strategies

- Environmental Management Act

Plans for NBSAP revision and target setting:

- Have established a multi-stakeholder forum to start NBSAP review
- Future plans include:
 - Mobilize the resources for NBSAP review
 - National consultative workshops on ecosystems approach
 - Develop a strategy based on our development agenda drawing from the Convention on Biological Diversity Strategic Plan
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - For target setting, we will use the Global Framework (Aichi Targets) but let sectors develop their own targets and these will be incorporated into the national targets
- We would access the GEF funds through UNDP local office for easier access. We would also look to access funds through the UNDP regional office as a cluster of Southern Africa region, so that we share experiences in our NBSAP process.

Mainstreaming NBSAPs into National Development Plans and PRSPs:

- We are going to report back to the Ministry of Economic Planning and National Development the NBSAP review and update process. The Ministry should present the state of the National Development Plan (NDP) sustainability. We will then identify opportunities to mainstream biodiversity issues into NDPs.

Table 1

RELEVANCE OF AN INDICATIVE LIST OF STEPS IN THE PROCESS OF UPDATING NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

Cluster	Component	Ang	Bot	DRC	Les	Mal	Moz	Nam	Sey	S.A	Swz	Tan	Za	Zim
I Preparation	1. Rapid stocktaking and review of relevant plans, policies and reports		X	X		X		X		X		X	X	X
	2. Identifying stakeholders; consultations, and awareness			X		X		X		X		X	X	X
	3. Supplementary studies (e.g., threats, economic value, etc)			X		X		X		X	X	X	X	X
II Setting national priorities and targets	4. Setting national targets, principles, & main priorities of the strategy (national consultations)			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
III. Developing the strategy and action plan	5. Developing the strategy and actions to implement the agreed targets through national consultations			X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
	6. Application and implementation of the NBSAP at sub-national levels (consultations with sub-national authorities)					X		X		X	X	X	X	X
	7. Sectoral integration including mainstreaming into development, poverty reduction and climate change plans (sectoral consultations)			X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X
IV. Development of Implementation plans and related	8. Developing a plan for capacity development for NBSAP implementation	X		X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X
	9. Conducting a technology needs assessment alternative: developing a plan for increasing technical capacity.	X				X				X	X		X	X

	10. Developing a communication and outreach strategy for the NBSAP	X	X			X		X		X	X		X	X
	11. Developing a plan for resource mobilization for NBSAP implementation	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X
V. Institutional, monitoring, reporting and exchange	12. Establishing/strengthening of national coordination structures	X	X			X				X	X		X	X
	13. CHM development.	X				X		X	X	X	X		X	X
	14. Development of indicators and monitoring approach	X	X			X		X	X	X	X		X	X
	15. Fifth national reports	X		X		X		X		X	X		X	X
VI. Adoption by the government	16. Adoption	X				X		X	X	X	X		X	X

*Annex V***SCIENTIFIC TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL COOPERATION (REGIONAL OR SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION)****1. What do you think about the effectiveness and efficiency of the biodiversity-related information exchange/knowledge sharing mechanism within your country?**

Who (e.g., business, scientific communities, local communities, governments, etc.) are the users? Who should be the users but are not yet? Why? What are the constraints for the exchange/transfer?

There are some mixed results, some Parties think that the information exchange is not efficient and there are not organized systems in place, however some Parties mentioned several mechanisms that exist in their countries such as resource centres, databases, libraries, universities.

South Africa is the only Party to report a good mechanism, however they recognize the need to improve in business, tourism, agriculture and local government. More engagement is needed.

Seychelles reported a 24 hour system called “greenline”, where general public can express concerns and receive advice on biodiversity related issues.

The users are academia, institutions, consultants, students, private sector, NGOs.

Some of the constraints mentioned are financing and capacities.

2. What information, knowledge and technologies are most needed for your country’s NBSAP revision and implementation, which you could not access at national level (gap analysis)? Are you aware of any sources for those information, knowledge and technologies in your region? Are they available and accessible?

- Update Red List, baseline, status of species
- GIS, monitoring sensing
- Capacity-building
- Research work on propagation, harvesting, marketing of medicinal plants
- Better understanding and documented traditional knowledge
- GBIF
- Lack of technical expertise
- Inadequate funds to purchase relevant equipment to implement projects

As for the availability and accessibility, most of the Parties did not respond, and those who did, mentioned that it is available and accessible.

3. Is there any facilitated or organized biodiversity information and knowledge exchange/technology transfer mechanism operational in your country? Give an example

- SANBI
- Regional Centre for Mapping of Resources for Development in Kenya
- TCFASI
- Zambezi River Authority
- OKACOM
- SAEON

- CSIR
- SANParks
- SADC
- National Biodiversity Planning Forum
- South African Botanical Diversity Network (SABONET)
- ARIPD – Has traditional knowledge systems capturing genetic resources
- Southern Africa Biodiversity Support Programme Output
- Okavango Delta Information System
- National Biodiversity Authority (ABDA), knowledge and information sharing network in Botswana
- Centre for Scientific Research on Indigenous Knowledge (Botswana)
- MIKE – Monitoring of illegal killing of elephants (Botswana)
- AMESD – African Monitoring of Environment for Sustainable Development – mainly dealing with spatial data and fire monitoring (Botswana)
- Regional Agriculture and Environment Initiative Network Africa – dealing with biotechnology and Biosafety

4. Are you aware of, and able to reach, any regional centre of excellence for technical and scientific support and assistance on your biodiversity practices?

- University of Stellenbosch – training in Forestry Universities of Malawi
- Rhode Island University USA
- University of Dar-es-salaam - centre of excellence for Biosafety SADC Regional Gene Bank
- SANBI
- GBIF (Global Biodiversity Information Facility)
- SCIR – Various biodiversity components
- SAIEIA – EIA and SEA
- University of Botswana Okavango Research Institute
- Regional Science Service Centre
- Africa Environment Information Network under UNEP
- Southern Africa Climate Change Network
- Biodiversity Indicators Capacity Strengthening for Africa
- ABS Capacity development for Africa
- IVRM training programmes

5. Are you aware of any regional biodiversity-related capacity-building/training programmes for professionals (for instance school/university curriculum)?

With the exception of Malawi, Zimbabwe and Seychelles, all Parties are aware of regional trainings and programmes such as:

- Mweka Wildlife Management Frary Institute in Tanzania
- Sokoine University of Agriculture in Tanzania
- ERAIFT – Master programme in biological sciences. University of Kisugami
- SANBI and GBIF (Global Biodiversity Information Facility – produce data to inform PES schemes)
- RAEIN-AFRICA – Biosafety capacity-building – participation and socio-economic considerations
- AMESD – GIS training on monitoring

6. What are the most important biodiversity-related fields of expertise in which your country excels, which you could and would like to offer to other partners in your region? Do you have good dissemination channels?

Malawi:

- Captured for Aquaculture fisheries (UNIMA) , and Forestry (MZUNI)
- Good dissemination?: Yes, website, brochures, newspapers

Tanzania:

- Fisheries, forestry, agriculture, wildlife
- Good dissemination?: Yes: through brochures and websites

Zimbabwe:

- CBNRM
- Community based gene banks
- Tropical Resources Ecology / Biodiversity Conservation
- Wildlife policy and legislation. In relation to CITES, we are in category 1

Namibia and Zambia:

- CBNRM
 - Financing
 - Conservancy

DRC:

- Integrated management of forests
- Good dissemination?: No, they do not have good dissemination channels

SA:

- Research into ecosystems service, identification and valuation (especially at the local level)
- Biodiversity mainstreaming mechanisms (IDP: Integrated Development Planning and Spatial Development Framework)
- Research and implementation regarding links between biodiversity and climate change, water
- Wetland restoration

Swaziland:

- Biodiversity Policy Development
- Biotechnology Taxonomy

Seychelles:

- Protected areas, habitats and species restoration and conservations

7. How to improve the use of existing institutions?

- Identify centres of excellence and create a website
- Strengthen the existing institutions so that they can be more attractive
- Regional database of experts and capacity-building institutions
- Encourage reciprocal links amongst the various national environment information systems where they exist.

Appendix I

SOUTHERN AFRICA NBSAP WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

	Monday – 14 March	Tuesday – 15 March	Wednesday – 16 March
8:30 a.m.- 10 a.m.	<p>Opening Introductions Overview of Workshop Aims Nagoya Outcomes focus on immediate actions to implement them: Entry into force of ABS protocol and L&R supplementary protocol Initiation of NBSAP revision process (including access to GEF resources)</p>	<p>Setting targets for Goal A – Targets 1 to 4: Integrating biodiversity into national and local development planning processes Landscape level planning and SEA Group exercises: national/regional diagnostic on assessing potential to contribute to global goals</p>	<p>Harmful Incentives: Global perspectives Regional experiences Group exercises – Target 3 Positive Incentives: Global perspectives Regional experiences Group exercises – Target 3</p>
10:30 a.m.- noon	<p>Review of NBSAPs – lessons learned and next steps: First round of NBSAP workshops, 4th national reports and UNU-IAS study Examples from the region</p>	<p>Panel of representatives from planning and finance ministries</p>	
1:30 p.m.-3 p.m.	<p>Revision, Updating and Implementing NBSAPs: Best Practice in NBSAP Introduction to the elements of a model NBSAP Setting national and regional targets</p>	<p>The TEEB and Ecosystems Approach as mainstreaming tools</p>	<p>Setting Targets for Goal B and Integrating Biodiversity - Targets 5 to 10 Reducing pressures on biodiversity and promoting sustainable use: addressing drivers of biodiversity loss</p>
3:30 p.m.-5 p.m.	<p>Setting Targets for Goal C and integrating biodiversity - Targets 11 to 13 Improving the status of biodiversity - Protected Areas . Group exercise.</p>	<p>Valuation: Global perspectives Regional experiences Group exercises – Target 2</p>	<p>Relevant national and regional experience Group exercise</p>

	Thursday – 17 March	Friday – 18 March	Saturday – 19 March	Sunday – 20 March	
8:30 a.m.- 10 a.m.	Field Study Visit (with focus on demonstrating integration of biodiversity district-level planning)	Setting Targets for Goal E – Targets 17 to 20 Resource Mobilisation for NBSAP Implementation – Identifying opportunities for funding, including innovative funding mechanisms.	Strategic Communications for NBSAPs Developing and implementing effective CEPA programmes as an integral part of NBSAP Group Exercises on Strategic Communication	The Roadmap for NBSAP revision: national level post-workshop activities to be undertaken in revising NBSAPs Group exercise: preparing draft outlines of NBSAPs Plenary discussion	
10:30 a.m.- noon					Engaging stakeholders in the implementation of NBSAPs Gender mainstreaming in NBSAPs: addressing inequalities
1:30 p.m.-3 p.m.			South-South Cooperation - strengthening scientific and technical cooperation in the region. Centres of excellence. National CHM nodes	Setting Targets for Goal D – Targets 14 to 16 Enhancing the benefits to all – CBNRM and ecosystems safeguarding and restoration Relevant national and regional experience Group exercise	
3:30 p.m.-5 p.m.			<i>One-to-one discussions with participants on their NBSAP and target setting processes</i> Transboundary and regional approaches to biodiversity management Overview of the SADC Regional Strategy and SADC Regional Biodiversity Action Plan		
