

IUCN - The World
Conservation Union

External Review of the Biodiversity Programme

Summary of the Meeting
Gland, 19-20 April 1996

Opening remarks by IUCN Director General David McDowell

The Director General welcomed the participants who had been invited for their expertise in biodiversity issues. He urged them to be critical and welcomed specific suggestions on how the Biodiversity Programme (BDP) can improve its performance. He noted that the Union's work in biodiversity goes beyond the BDP, in the Secretariat and the Commissions. The Secretariat is proud of what the Biodiversity Programme has accomplished and the historic role of the Union in helping formulate the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). But now that the Convention has entered into force, the time has come to review what kind of role the Secretariat should continue to play in the process, for example by working with the Parties to implement the CBD on the ground. An Internal Review several weeks ago had discussed in-house and organizational matters relating to the BDP and how it could improve its internal linkages with different sectors of the Union.

An External Review of the entire IUCN Programme, through visits to IUCN operations in central America, west and southern Africa, and a quick review of the Species Survival Commission (SSC) and Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas (CNPPA), pointed to the problem of a gap between headquarters-run theme programmes and regional field programmes. Further, it recommended that the BDP should undertake activities that will have greater impact at local and national levels.

According to the Director General, there is a clear continuing need for a BDP, but it may need some redirection, possibly taking on a more integrative role within the Union. He reminded the participants that IUCN's mission statement is "to *influence, encourage and assist* societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable". The structure of the Union has big implications for the way it functions and it works on the principle of "sound science, socially delivered". The Commission networks are basic to the Union and their expertise must be tapped.

Finally, what matters is what the Union can deliver on the ground in terms of biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. Because of its unique structure, it can work at all levels of society.

Session 1. Chair: Kenton Miller (WRI)

The external reviewers were invited to introduce themselves and make a brief statement about the issues they would like to see discussed (a participants list can be found in Annex 1 of this

report).

Kenton Miller, a former Director General of IUCN and Chair of CNPPA, focuses his activities at WRI to resolving issues at national levels. He wanted the Review to determine three or four things the BDP could do to deepen the effectiveness of IUCN on the ground. The various components of the Union must be integrated to bring this about. Public perception of biodiversity has moved on from the old "species" concept to one of "capital stock" which has relevance to security and employment and is, therefore, an essential part of national well-being, not a peripheral issue.

Charles Perrings of the University of York's Department of Economics has a particular interest in the economics of biodiversity. He stated that a missing feature of the BDP is a link between the Programme and the nature of the problem. The BDP should focus its resources on biodiversity as a "local public good".

Jean-Bernard Dubois is from the Swiss Development Corporation which has been supporting the BDP since 1993. He thought that a clear vision is needed to continue this support. Although a first step in examining the *process* of the Programme, there remains the need for indicators to measure the Programme's impact at both macro and micro levels. Since much work has already been done at the macro level, the loop between this level and the micro (field) level needs to be closed. IUCN's membership structure will be important to this effect.

Adrian Phillips is Chair of the CNPPA for which biodiversity is of central interest. The Review was seen as an opportunity to assist the BDP to draw up a list of priorities, with the IUCN mission statement as a unifying theme to bring together the diverse views of the Union's membership. The BDP could make better use of the CNPPA network. CNPPA is in a good position to contribute in a variety of ways to an Advisory Group on Biodiversity.

Alicia Barcena, an IUCN Councillor, of the Earth Council Institute in Mexico and UNEP, stressed the growing power of NGOs at national and local levels. Increasingly, governments are seen as not taking care of the public interest. Consumers, religious groups, local authorities and others are becoming the key agents of change in society, and IUCN must use these bodies to communicate the importance of biodiversity. Often there is confusion at the national level because of this new multiplicity of players.

Linda Warren is at the Centre for Marine Law and Policy of the University of Wales and is on the Countryside Council for Wales. She is particularly interested in the use of law to implement scientific policy. Despite a plethora of action plans and other plans, the UK is heading for crisis because of poor implementation of such plans at a local level. IUCN has a role to play in assisting and encouraging local authorities to be more effective in implementing Biodiversity Action Plans and must continue to push for better cross-sectoral approaches. To do this IUCN needs to improve the integration of its internal Programmes.

Manuel Rodriguez-Becerra of INDERENA in Columbia is a public servant involved in national environment planning and development, particularly forest issues. The CBD has some weaknesses that IUCN could help strengthen (e.g. trade liberalisation). IUCN should also look at North-South relationships and in particular the issue of financial resources for implementation of the Convention. Biodiversity issues have low priority in developing countries because people do not see the linkage between biodiversity and development.

Although sustainable use of biological resources is a key part of the CBD, it needs to be emphasised and demonstrated.

Peter Schei of Norway's Directorate for Nature is the current Chair of the CBD's Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA). He noted that biodiversity should be integrated into all aspects of IUCN's work. The underlying causes of global biodiversity loss need to be addressed and the role IUCN can play in influencing the major players such as the World Trade Organization should be discussed. Whose responsibility is it within IUCN to deal with these global economic and trade organizations? Action at the local level is even more important than at national level, but horizontal linkage between sectors is important. Norway is developing criteria for municipalities to receive funds for activities relating to biodiversity. The BDP has produced many important documents, but local users may be overwhelmed by the wealth of information; extract key messages need to be extracted.

Setijati Sastrapradjia is Executive Director of the Indonesian Biodiversity Foundation and Senior Government Scientist at the Indonesian Institute of Sciences. As a biologist her main interest is in genetic resources particularly of native crops such as fruit trees and legumes. IUCN's Red Data Books are well-known, but people want to know how to implement conservation on the ground especially at small, local levels. At a global level, IUCN needs to work closely with UNESCO, UNDP, FAO and UNEP. Many NGOs such as WWF are working in Indonesia but there is confusion about the role of IUCN in a country where the Secretariat has no presence.

Norman Myers began looking at extinction rates 25 years ago, then at priority planning for conservation then at conservation economics. He developed and is refining the "hotspot strategy", based on the fact that 40% of the world's plant species and 25% of mammals and birds are confined to 1.5% of earth's surface in very vulnerable areas. Consequence of species loss is an impoverished biosphere extending for the next 5-25 million years. There is a need to investigate the capacity of evolution for restoring the damage focusing on more on plants, insects and other invertebrates rather than charismatic megafauna which are evolutionary dead ends. IUCN has vital role as an innovative think-tank in areas where government are slow to act, for example in agrarian reform. It is becoming clear that the old approaches have not worked, as the driving forces policy-makers need to be targeted. For example, in many developing countries there is a tidal wave of jobless people moving into marginal areas which are rich in biodiversity. Is enough being done to address such issues?

Veit Koester from the Danish Ministry of the Environment and Energy is a lawyer and former IUCN council member who has been involved in the CBD process from the start. Two different kinds of work need to be done: the daily work related to what is happening on ground - "real life"; and the "artificial life" to do with the CBD process. IUCN should maintain its role in the CBD process and not be involved too closely with the Conference of the Parties (COP). In other words, to stay out of politics but remain flexible to address the work programme of the COP.

Françoise Burhenne, Head of IUCN's Environmental Law Centre, sees IUCN's ability to adapt to future challenges as one of its strengths. Particularly important from the legal perspective is synergy between global, national and local levels, between various legal instruments such as Conventions and between various programmes of IUCN.

Steve Edwards is directing IUCN's Sustainable Use Initiative (SUI). Following the Buenos Aires General Assembly the Union's activities in this field have become more decentralised. Fourteen regional networks are contributing to the SUI. The SUI is exploring the factors affecting sustainability, and social factors are seen to be just as important as biological. The networks are developing a provisional "Principles of Sustainability" to be presented at the next Congress. This meeting will help the SUI understand how it can contribute to BDP and which audiences it should be addressing.

Graham Kelleher is Vice-Chair, Marine, of CNPPA. He sees integrated ecological management as the only hope to sustain biodiversity and productivity. Increasing human population and use of resources must be acknowledged and addressed if we are to do anything effective.

George Rabb is Chair of SSC and Director of Chicago Zoological Park, Brookfield Zoo. SSC has fostered the SUI, a reversal of the previous top-down approach for species conservation. Brookfield Zoo is involved with initiatives in arid lands of southern Australia and also with Chicago Wilderness -- conservation of biodiversity in a metropolitan area with various ecotones. He wished to see prioritization of initiatives for biodiversity result from this meeting.

Walter Lusigi, a former IUCN councillor from Kenya, coordinates the interests of the World Bank, UNDP and UNEP for the Global Environment Facility (GEF). He wants to see conservation planning translated into action on the ground and is concerned about continued environmental degradation, particularly in Africa. Since 1969 he has been urging that conservation be part of land-use policies which integrate conservation and people. IUCN has come a round to this way of thinking. As biodiversity conservation is central to IUCN's role it has a unique opportunity to lead the implementation of the CBD through its membership network.

Colin Rees is with the Environment Department of the World Bank. The WB has 1,700 projects ongoing and 1,300 in the pipeline - 3,000 "living laboratories" of which 60-70% are susceptible to improved practices in terms of biodiversity conservation. From 1988-1995, the WB invested \$1.2 billion in biodiversity conservation in Bank-sponsored projects and has 280 environment specialists. The Bank is looking for productive partnerships to mainstream sustainable development practices. Protected areas cannot answer all biodiversity conservation concerns. People and livelihoods are key as are expanded partnerships with communities. The Bank needs to know what the priorities are for biodiversity conservation. This may mean being involved in regional strategies and action plans. A new initiative is the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund -- \$20 million a year for next 5 years -- to engage communities to conserve areas outside protected areas. IUCN can help WB work in partnership with local communities.

Angela Cropper, formerly Executive Secretary of the Secretariat of the CBD (SCBD), is now senior advisor in environment and development at UNDP and is particularly concerned with biodiversity as it relates to development. She sees the major challenge facing IUCN and the BDP as obtaining the resources needed to continue their contribution to biodiversity conservation.

Chris Hails is Director of the Conservation Programme at WWF-International. He expressed

wanting feedback from this Review on three issues: How does one pull together a wide diversity of programmes within an organization? How does one build linkages between global policy work and projects in the field? And how can the WWF programme link into the IUCN BDP?

Chip Barber is at WRI and based in the Philippines. BDP has been influential not only through its many publications but through its work in the regions. There is a need to focus on action on the ground and transfer skills of the BDP down to local level. In spite of the Earth Summit process, things are still getting worse on the ground. There has not been a focus on issues of power and accountability - there are powerful forces who do not want to see things done. There is also a need to focus in on the influence of the private sector on natural resources. Can IUCN address the new global power structure?

Jorgen Thomsen is responsible for the Conservation Biology Department of Conservation International, an IUCN member with a field-based programme. How can the BDP be more useful to IUCN members such as CI? How can greater synergy be established between the BDP and other IUCN programmes? What is the real impact of the BDP and are there indicators for its success? He felt that the BDP has too narrow a focus on policy. It should be rooted in the Commissions and particularly in the regional programmes but field practitioners had not been invited to this Review. There are two areas where BDP can be useful: in setting priorities, because biodiversity is not evenly distributed, and in implementing points set out in "Caring for the Earth."

Patrick Dugan coordinates IUCN support for the Regional Programmes and sees the need for both horizontal and vertical integration of biodiversity concerns. There is a need to think about how the BDP can address the needs of the Union's members, Commissions and Secretariat and keep the mission statement in mind.

Kenton Miller summarised the issues raised as follows:

- ensure appropriate conservation use and equity. All biodiversity is ultimately in someone's back yard;
- monitor the effects of our work;
- feedback between decisions made in capital cities and local action;
- work at ecosystem level, at scales where people are inside rather than outside the model;
- unpackage the concept of "NGO" which has become too broad. Some are more powerful than others;
- innovative thinking -- a think tank that can leap ahead twenty years;
- examine the nature of the connection between the BDP and the CBD;
- learn from experience on the ground: adaptive management;
- examine the need a for a BDP at all;
- address issues of power, crime and corruption.

Jeffrey McNeely, Chief Scientist of IUCN and Head of BDP, reviewed the work of the BDP to date. The focus of the BDP has been deliberately wide to illustrate how biodiversity cuts

across a wide variety of issues. Biodiversity has become a growth industry. The terminology and concepts behind the CBD are now in the public consciousness. The **Global Biodiversity Strategy** (WRI, IUCN, UNEP, 1992) was a bottom-up process with regional input, and indicated different levels for action, from the ground up. Most species loss is incidental to other human activities. Consumers are ultimately to blame. Sociologists point to a number of factors which add up to a homogenization of global systems rather than a diversity of local systems. How do we work with local people, to tie them into this global system or to build up their self-reliance? There is a need to be involved in politics to the extent we think we know what the public needs, rather than what politicians think the public wants. People in both developed and developing countries see species loss and the environment as important issues, but how do we "sell" biodiversity? There is a need to: build on science to demonstrate real benefits; balance the concern about species loss with concern on how to use systems sustainably; and build a broader constituency among business, the public, and academics.

Politicians agreed on the objectives of the CBD: to conserve biological diversity, to use biological resources sustainably, and to provide access to genetic resources. 141 countries have now ratified the CBD. A range of approaches are required to implement it, from protected areas to agro-ecology. Bioregional management is a promising initiative. The BDP has come to the end of its awareness-raising phase and must now focus more narrowly. One of the items it might focus on is capacity-building -- there is an inverse ratio between the scientists present in a country and its biodiversity. Other items are biodiversity planning and reaching the public. It is difficult to get people to change their behaviour, especially when there is no easily identifiable "villain" (the villain is the consumer!) and the importance of species loss is difficult to get across.

There are three main institutional actors on the conservation stage: the private sector, the public sector and the independent sector (IUCN). IUCN needs to be able to reach out to the private sector. Questions of land tenure, agriculture, biotechnology, climate change and trade also need to be addressed -- how do we do that?

The BDP's strengths and areas requiring greater attention have been identified through the Internal Review Process. The Regional Offices (RCOs) have identified what they want from the BDP and in turn, BDP has identified what the RCOs can offer. The External Review is a second step in the process of narrowing down the BDP's focus. It should be kept in mind that the BDP has finite resources and its limited staff is already extended.

Session 2. Chair: Linda Warren

The aim of this session was to give the external reviewers the opportunity to critically assess the proposed objectives and activities of the BDP for 1997-1999. These were reviewed by Jeffrey McNeely and are listed in Annex 1. Participants were asked to try to prioritize these objectives.

Much of the discussion focused on Objective A (integrating biodiversity into the national planning process). One participant thought that this should be coming from the IUCN members rather than the HQ. This meant forging new partnerships with members working at national level (for example with UNDP resident representatives). Several speakers felt that BDP is spreading its efforts too thin; perhaps it should target core countries where it could

work in depth. A technical support package could be made available to other countries through regional workshops. Core countries could be picked out in terms of biodiversity importance, willingness to work with IUCN, etc. One goal would be for at least one selected country in each region to fully incorporate biodiversity into its national planning process. It was pointed out that IUCN's role and influence in national planning efforts vary regionally. For example, it is in a weak position in some Latin American countries. The political standing of its RCOs must also be evaluated. The idea of "key sectors" is important as it can push biodiversity concerns through these. New initiatives, such as incentives, are needed to incorporate biodiversity into the various sectors such as agriculture.

There was discussion about the difficulties of realising effective implementation of the CBD on the ground. In Latin America, the current land-tenure system is a major factor in biodiversity loss and must be addressed before any of the objectives or activities can be achieved. Another major issue is "non-planned" development where millions of marginalised people are moving into new areas. More recognition should be given to these driving forces behind biodepletion that are outside the formal planning process. New allies were seen to be needed, for example with the private sector, which was formerly regarded as "the enemy".

There was also considerable discussion on the formulation of the objectives. One speaker felt that since the objectives are preset, there was little freedom for discussion. The membership should be consulted as it has been in the SUI process. Some saw the stated objectives as activities rather than objectives. It was pointed out, however, that these objectives have already been through extensive review by the members and approved by the IUCN council. Mersie Ejigu admitted that there was confusion between means and goals. The overall objective is perhaps to influence global thinking. On objective A, BDP thinks it should operate at the national level to influence the decision-making process, building on lessons learned from formulation of national conservation strategies. At this level BDP should work through our partners. Veit Koester wondered why Objective A was the only one where the CBD is mentioned despite the fact that the objectives of the CBD pervade all the other stated objectives.

Several speakers urged that a clearer vision of the desired outcomes of these activities after three years was required. There needed to be an over-arching goal, such as to incorporate biodiversity into sustainable development. The BDP's intra- and extra- IUCN roles needed to be defined more clearly. Further, some thought that the BDP needed to contribute to other IUCN programmes, to learn from the experience of IUCN members, and to develop success criteria and compliance measures.

Kenton Miller presented the objectives in two categories -- new initiatives versus the regular work of the Union. He proposed that Objectives A,E, and F could be restated as new initiatives using regional members and through regional offices, and B,C,D and G as basic service functions of IUCN.

There was general agreement on the importance of the BDP refocusing its efforts to national and local levels. But despite lively discussion, there was little progress on prioritizing the proposed objectives. The issue of "hotspots" as a means of focusing the BDP's efforts in a geographic sense came up several times during the Review. Several participants felt that while hotspots are a useful concept, they become politicized when countries are competing for limited conservation-oriented financial resources. Every country considers its biodiversity to be important, and to the people who live there it is crucial. An ecosystem approach may be better especially where loss of species has direct repercussions for human welfare. Integrated

ecosystem management was seen as a useful tool, while an adaptive approach allowed for development of success criteria and feedback.

Jeffrey McNeely drew the participant's attention to the Reviews paper entitled *Biodiversity Programme - Policy and Programme Description*, and specifically at the "Priorities within Programme Components" (pp 4-5 in Annex 2). These are more specific objectives that IUCN's members, Commissions and RCOs are working on at the local and national level. He pointed out that none of these components of the Union's work particularly well at bioregional level, and none of them are working at global level. He saw the BDP having a role at the global level, but with strong links to the actors at local/national levels.

Alicia Barcena presented a matrix which she felt better contextualized the stated objectives:

WHAT (Goals)	HOW (Objs + activities)	WITH WHOM (partners)
INFLUENCE GLOBAL THINKING	POLICY B. International D. GEF	WB, UNEP, UNDP, WRI etc
GENERATE INNOVATIVE THINKING & OPTIONS	ADDRESS CAUSES F. Economic H. Social	Research & Policy Institutions, Commissions
INFLUENCE DECISION MAKING	PRACTICAL TOOLS A. Planning E. Key Sectors	Natl. Committees Members, UNDP, Private Sector
LINK LOCAL REALITIES + GLOBAL PRIORITIES	NEW BRIDGES G. Understanding	Members/NGOs Focus on critical areas, pilot projects

Several participants felt that the lefthand column could be telescoped into one overarching goal -- to influence global thinking about conservation of biodiversity and sustainable development -- an echo of both the original name of IUCN and of the mission statement. One participant proposed another column on physical/biological outcomes. Other suggestions were that: the legal side should be included in economic and social causes; and the "HOW" column should include more detailed activities. The latter would need detailed information flow within IUCN, which the IUCN Biodiversity Conservation Information System (BCIS) could help achieve.

The discussion moved on to more specific actions on biodiversity that the BDP could address within the constraints of its limited staff and resources.

Biotechnology was felt to be a complex issue and some questioned whether IUCN had the capacity to deal with it. Biosafety issues vis à vis genetically modified organisms (GMOs) are very controversial and some doubted whether IUCN should be involved. One participant felt that while biotechnology politics should be avoided, biotechnology itself could not be. Françoise Burhenne pointed out that within IUCN the term biotechnology also includes "access to genetic resources" which was important. It was generally felt that biosafety issues should be looked at from a legal perspective.

Regarding **agriculture** as a specific activity, one speaker stated that in Europe, given the

number of players already involved in EU policy, there may be more of a need for IUCN in Central and Eastern Europe, at least to help avoid repeating mistakes. Other proposals for the BDP included: cooperation with FAO to persuade them to incorporate biodiversity concerns in their work; addressing trade of agricultural products; and focus on a bioregional approach to agriculture in relation to conservation, and not repeat work of the FAO. Agrobiodiversity is key issue, but this is a sensitive area, as people must eat! Who will pay the cost of maintaining traditional agriculture methods? And yet it is crucial to maintain wild genetic resources, particularly for long-term food security in places such as India. Landscape should be looked at as a whole and the interface between protected areas and agriculture should be addressed. To be effective, the members and partners should be used (e.g., WWF) and there should be a focus on certain geographic areas. IUCN could advise CGIAR how a regional/ ecosystem approach can be used. It would also work on agroecology, for example, on integrated pest control, and look at economics and perverse incentives.

On **climate change** (this was discussed in Session 4 but presented here for reasons of continuity): Public and governments do not see a linkage between biodiversity loss and climate change, even though the media and WWF have been giving it some attention. Several speakers felt that the BDP could confirm and emphasize these linkages. The issue of adaptive management strategies to cope with climate change should be addressed, and BDP could kick-start the process within IUCN and look at the capacity of ecosystems to adapt to climate change. It was noted that the planting of trees to sequester carbon has been misguided, since they are often the wrong species. Climate change has grave implications for food security, which has not been taken on board by FOA

Other issues raised included the importance of land tenure. In some cases where indigenous people have been granted rights their quality of life has not necessarily improved - is this a failure of the model? Corruption in the area of natural resources is becoming an important issue even among NGOs and needs to be addressed innovatively.

In response to questions raised during this session, Jeffrey McNeely informed the group that IUCN's Social Policy Programme is working on community-based programmes and land tenure issues. He said that the BDP is in fact expanding with biodiversity staff placed in RCOs which will enhance the effectiveness of the Programme on the ground. He agreed that the BDP should work with the CGIAR and with FAO on agriculture issues and to look at areas where real breakthroughs can be made, often resulting from the synergy between different sectors, for example Law Programme and Economics.

As an adjunct exercise, each participant was asked to list the five most globally important biodiversity issues and for each issue, the three most important actions IUCN could undertake to address it, given its competence and resources. A consolidated list is appended in Annex 3.

Session 3. Chair: Walter Lusigi

This session focused on applying the principles of the CBD and the GBS to real problems on the ground.

This session began with a clarification from Mersie Ejigie on how IUCN operates. The biodiversity theme runs through all the Secretariat's work. Biodiversity is highly integrative both in horizontal and vertical sense. In vertical sense the work of IUCN on global level does filter down to regions - but it is a two way flow of information. The Regional Support Group (RSG) will coordinate with the Conservation Networking Group of which the BDIP is a part. Biodiversity Officers in RCOs will be answerable to the BDP. The mission statement and the CBD provide a framework for IUCN's goals and priorities. IUCN guides and manages its programme development through triennial programmes, annual work plans and a monitoring and evaluation system. He reminded the participants that discussion about the linkages between various sectors of IUCN are not the brief of this Review and urged that they concentrate on extra-IUCN issues.

Jeffrey McNeely drew attention to the Review paper *Applying Global Principles on the Ground* (see in Annex 2) and particularly the following questions:

- How can BDP ensure that its work helps RCOs, members and Commissions influence decision makers at national levels and influences them directly where IUCN has no RCOs (e.g., Indonesia)?
- How can the BDP provide support at national and local levels for the design and implementation of biodiversity projects? (e.g., relate them to the CBD?)
- What kind of activities could be carried out at the regional, national and local levels? Should IUCN work on these at these levels? If not, which should be done at which levels? (e.g., land tenure questions)
- How can IUCN establish realistic processes to improve work at these levels? (i.e., be cost-effective)
- Should the BDP access directly Membership for its policy and technical work at global level? Or through RCOs? What should be the role of RSG in this?
- Should BDP access Commission directly or through the responsible technical programmes? (this is an internal question).

An additional question was raised: what achievement indicators should we use?

From the wide-ranging discussion that followed, the following points emerged:

- **On information flows:** IUCN could help institutions by giving feedback from problems and issues encountered on projects. Case studies from field should be compiled. There is no universal blueprint for actions, so they must be targeted at specific-local situations. Ulf Svenson emphasized that often local people -- farmers and foresters -- are unsure exactly what to do to maintain biodiversity. In Sweden, foresters are under pressure from consumers to change their practices, but had little guidance on how to do this and it is difficult especially for small-scale foresters. What is in it for them? While we don't want to have a situation where we have protected areas in an ocean of uniformity, we cannot work with hypotheses - we must be able to give them advice. Kenton Miller felt that another way of linking with local communities is through involving them in monitoring -

by observing the status and trends of certain indicators. Local people can help in this, for example by testing air or water quality, or cyanide levels in reef fish. Monitoring of birds by local people is already done on a worldwide basis, this could be extended to other taxa. Another participant felt that information from World Conservation Monitoring Center (WCMC) needs to be more user-friendly and more accessible.

- **On tailoring activities to local situations:** It is often difficult to get local perspectives on biodiversity issues. Rural peoples should be consulted by asking the right questions and their concerns incorporated into project design (adaptive management). Biodiversity is not widely understood outside conservation circles, and conservation is not always a priority for local people. An example was given of an indigenous group from Irian Jaya, Indonesia, who saw their natural resources as a means for improving their quality of life, in other words as a source of cash.
- **On funding for local activities:** There is often a large distance between the funding source and local activities, with many filters in between them to prevent the actual money from reaching the ground. GEF is a case in point and is not yet effective at the local level. Another problem is that local-level work does not need much money and is a slow process; big donors want to give large amounts and want fast results. New rapid funding mechanisms need to be identified, for example through private sector or local NGOs. Perhaps IUCN could leverage funds to complement the WB critical Ecosystem Fund through its national members and institute effective disbursement. Examples of local initiatives for funding were given: the Indonesian Biodiversity Foundation is considering giving selected communities \$10,000 each to enable them to conserve biodiversity. This idea is being tested in one district. IUCN could help by liaising with NGOs present in Indonesia to develop awareness in local communities, for example on conserving agrobiodiversity in buffer zones. Similar local funding initiatives are emerging in the Philippines, and in Colombia there is an Ecofund managed by 340 NGOs which have a regional approach to priority setting. Frank Vorhies talked about new private sector financing mechanisms at local level and global level.
- **On political issues:** local issues such as land tenure and benefit-sharing are not necessarily decided at the local level but as national policy. Local groups are often themselves involved in politics. In this sense it is easier for local NGOs to be involved rather than bilateral agencies. IUCN needs to find the right person to lobby at the local level, but should involve the authorities no matter how difficult they are to work with. IUCN can make a valuable contribution by establishing a methodology for local organisations to undertake local-level work and not expect local people to necessarily fit into global expectations. One participant felt that the increasing politicization on biodiversity issues needs to be addressed, pointing to a GEF project in Colombia which has become highly politicized.
- **On geographic priority-setting:** One participant felt that IUCN needs to be restructured into national or regional biodiversity groupings. This is already being tested in Latin America. If hotspots are not accepted as the best approach for setting priorities, other themes should be considered such as watersheds, and local knowledge that has not necessarily been published should be used. Some felt that conservation resources should not be squandered in countries where corruption would limit their effectiveness. Weak governments often see NGOs as threats.

-
- **On legal issues at local level:** national commitments on biodiversity, for example by a signatory to the CBD, should be implemented at local level rather than leaving responsibility for implementation up to local authorities. On the other hand, local people need access to the courts if they have objections. IUCN could ensure that national policies carry with them absolute responsibility for implementation and publicise citizen's rights. However, the type and effectiveness of legal instruments and access to legal redress varies widely from country to country. Regarding "legislation for biodiversity", it is extremely difficult as there is no scientific basis for such laws. For example, it is unknown how much biodiversity is needed for ecosystem function. However, as nature is dynamic it is not necessary to legislate at too detailed a level; risk can be minimized and options maintained. IUCN could advise on appropriate legal instruments in areas where ignorance prevails on the appropriate mix of biodiversity objectives.

Jeffrey McNeely brought the discussion to a close by saying that globalization is a great homogenizer. As governments are under all kinds of pressures and local institutions are undertaking greater responsibility, there is a need to get tools into the hands of members working on ground. Legal issues are the remit of the IUCN Law Centre, and species of the SSC. Something specific that the BDP should be looking at is agrobiodiversity around protected areas. Priorities are set at many different levels. The CBD calls on governments to set their own priorities, so governments should look at hotspots within their own countries and members could help identify these at national level. As for the dynamism of natural systems, conservation must be constantly adaptive. Conservation must be balanced with sustainable use and sharing of benefits. IUCN needs to develop appropriate eco-technologies together with FAO, which does excellent work at project level, and this is an example of linking conservation with development.

Session 4. Chair: Angela Cropper

Participants were asked to consider the relationship of the BDP to the Convention (see background paper *IUCN's Current work in context of CBD and options for future work in Annex 2*).

In the discussion, the following points emerged:

- **On the relationship of IUCN to the SCBD:** Angela Cropper had found the work of IUCN invaluable when she headed the CBD Secretariat, as it was too small to do all the work itself. In answer to the question of whether the SCBD still desired this close relationship with IUCN, the reviewers were informed that the SCBD had requested the BDP to write papers for SBSTFA and to run workshops. Funding was needed for this.
- **On the involvement of IUCN in the COP:** Several reviewers felt that IUCN should continue to keep a low profile at COP. However, IUCN has an important role to play at COP to coordinate NGO discussion, outside plenary sessions. The Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF) is important and IUCN is best suited to prepare the organising principle of the programme of work of the CBD, such as the "ecosystem-by-ecosystem" rotation and the different tools to be used. Founders are interested to donate towards workshops on

this. It was felt that IUCN has a bigger role at technical meetings and should budget the needs of technical fora into its work programme. SBSTTA is a strategic vehicle for IUCN to bring in its expertise as a preparatory process to COP. Peter Schei felt that the GBF was a useful exercise and that IUCN should contribute to background papers for SBSTTA and be present at SBSTTA meetings. He would welcome an IUCN workshop before this year's meeting on terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems and their relationship to agriculture (such as the marine workshop before the first meeting of SBSTTA, held in Paris in 1995).

- **On the role of BDP in implementing the CBD:** IUCN should now be looking at the implementation of COP decisions at local level and work with local members of SBSTTA. IUCN is needed by states implementing CBD, for example by using its networks to put together national biodiversity strategies and action plans. It also has a role in technical fora, developing new approaches to achieving the objectives of the CBD. IUCN can link the SBSTTA process and the GEF process. One participant urged caution regarding GEF. Policy guidance must come from Parties but IUCN can assist. Walter Lusigi stressed that states needed guidance for formulating proposals for GEF funded projects. Regarding implementation, Ulf Svenson expressed his desire to see the scientific team who put together the Global Biodiversity Assessment utilized. Incorporating this team into the existing IUCN scientific network would be welcomed by donors.
- On IUCN's relation with other partners:
 - 1) **With Academia:** Perrings opened the discussion by saying that research relating biodiversity to the dynamic behaviour of ecosystems is not generally accessible to decision makers. IUCN has done good job in transmitting such results to important organisations and should continue. But IUCN also needs to provide feedback to academia as to the nature of problems to be investigated. (A specific IUCN membership category is to be created for academic institutions).
 - 2) **With WWF:** Hails said that WWF would like a more structured relationship between IUCN BDP and the WWF biodiversity team. WWF and IUCN are developing a joint proposal on incentive measures, but there are other areas such as forests and marine thematic programmes where a closer linkage would be useful. WWF could help at project implementation level.
 - 3) **With Conservation International:** Thomsen said that CI was uncomfortable with the idea that IUCN might get involved with advocacy and campaigning. It would interfere with work of other NGOs such as CI and weaken IUCN's credibility. On the implementation of CBD, CI could help in countries where it has strong presence, for example Brazil, and in thematic areas such as coastal/marine and tropical forests. CI is looking at best practices in extractive industries. IUCN could identify voluntary mechanisms in private sectors e.g., petroleum, logging. On the sociological/anthropological side, CI expertise could be used by IUCN.
 - 4) **With WRI:** WRI and IUCN have been collaborating in the last several months to develop the "Biodiversity Capacity Initiative", building on the model of the Guidelines For National Biodiversity Planning, which is based on experience from 17 countries. IUCN could take lead on developing similar modules.

-
- 5) **With GEF:** Achim Steiner has worked on setting up the partnerships of IUCN with those involved in the GEF (UNEP, UNDP, WB). IUCN has opened up new channels for dialogue with GEF and has also acted as focal point for a new NGO-GEF network. These initiatives tend to reinforce each other by making GEF better understood. IUCN has published a Guide to GEF for NGOs.
 - 6) **With UNDP:** Angela Cropper said UNDP has not yet taken biodiversity issues on board except in its GEF unit. There is a new Division on Sustainable Energy and Environment. Probably the best way to incorporate biodiversity would be into existing programmes; it may need help with this. UNDP is to become more programme-oriented and will need close relationships with key organizations in the various areas. The partnership agreement with IUCN should give UNDP access to several networks. She urged that IUCN RCOs make contact with UNDP resident representatives at country level.
 - 7) **With FAO:** Peter Schei said that perhaps IUCN should develop partnership with FAO.
- **On the proposed Advisory Group on Biodiversity:** This Group would help coordinate the work of the BDP with other parts of IUCN and its members. Discussion centred on the need for such a Group; its proposed size; the input of the Global Biodiversity Forum; the need for it to be in-house and not in competition with SBSTTA; the need to include economic and social input; and the need for its agenda to be focused on specific issues. There is also a proposal for a "Global Advisory Group", perhaps composed of key players on the international scene (for example from the WTO) which would focus on following up the CBD. Such a Group might have to be *ad hoc* in nature, with clear terms of reference, in order to focus on issues as they arise. It could perhaps draw on the coordinating group for the GBF, but in any case there needs to be a "pool" of experts identified that could be drawn upon. It would be important for such people to be "wise" and not be promoting their own agendas.
 - **On the Draft Programme Resolution on Biodiversity** to be put to the World Conservation Congress (October 1996): Concern was expressed that it might be seen internally as an attempt by the BDP to be a "super-commission". The need for restructuring the Commissions was mooted and the proposal to advise IUCN members and Parties on possible positions at the COP was questioned. Does BDP really want resolutions which will require them to attend many meetings? Does it need to be so specific on which organizations it will be advising? Some of action points may not be for the BDP as such but other sectors of IUCN. There is a need to emphasize communication more. Jeffrey McNeely agreed that it should be a resolution on Biodiversity and not the BDP, but define the role of the BDP and so serve an integrative function. It will be submitted to and approved by the membership.

Kenton Miller presented a list of priorities that had emerged from the adjunct exercise initiated at the end of session 2 of the meeting (not in order of importance):

- Incorporate biodiversity into key sectors (fisheries, agriculture etc).
- Implement ecosystem/bioregional management regimes (on ground work at ecosystem

-
- level - multiple use at ecosystem and landscape level).
- Develop and promote economic incentives, valuation measures. Reorient property rights regimes.
 - Develop and apply information and indicators for priority setting, planning and monitoring status, trends and implementation.
 - Implement national strategies and build capacity.
 - Enhance and diversify financial resources, mechanisms and absorptive capacity.
 - Effectively implement CBD and other instruments, improve their synergy.
 - Broaden constituency for understanding biodiversity.

It was then pointed out that the list is virtually identical to the list of objectives of the BDP presented to participants at the beginning of the review (Objectives for 1997-1990). However points 2 and 4 were seen as new. The point was made that we need innovative thinking on some of these issues.

Jeffrey McNeely agreed that availability of information is going to be critical (in understanding the underlying causes of species loss) and the BCIS will be useful. He would build on a comment made by George Rabb and add another objective -- to support the expansion of scientific understanding of biodiversity loss. The GBA is rather unwieldy and we need information in a form we can use. We also need to address globalization/ transboundary issues. He expressed the hope that we will have a chance to come together at WCC to get the membership involved.

He said that the BDP would take all these ideas and reformulate the whole Programme, develop new project proposals and see if funding can be obtained for them. IUCN programmes are committed to working in a more integrated way. The Regional Support Group is being merged with the Conservation Networking part of IUCN, so field and HQ will be more integrated in future.

The participants were warmly thanked for their contributions, and appreciation expressed to the session Chairs.

(lac\stratrev\report)