



NBSAPs 2.0: Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Development Project



NBSAPs 2.0: Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Development First Project Workshop Report

Maun, Botswana

14-16th November, 2012

Hosted by the Ministry of Environment, Wildlife & Tourism (MEWT), Botswana

Report compiled and written by:

Abisha Mapendembe, Baboloki Autlwetse, Felix Monggae, Bontekanye Botumile, Steve Bass, Dilys Roe and Jessica Smith

NBSAPs 2.0 is funded through the UK Government's Darwin Initiative, which assists countries that are rich in biodiversity but poor in financial resources implement their commitments under the international biodiversity conventions. It is also part funded by UKaid from the UK Government, however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of the UK Government.

Table of Contents

1	Report Summary.....	3
2	Background.....	8
3	First NBSAPs 2.0 Project Workshop.....	8
4	Day 1: Tasks Ahead and the Role of the African Leadership Group (ALG)	9
4.1	Introduction and expectations	9
4.2	The role of the African Leader Group (ALG).....	9
5	How Far Have We Got? Status of Biodiversity/Development Mainstreaming	10
5.1	Mainstreaming diagnostics report-back.....	10
5.2	NBSAP SWOTs analysis	11
5.3	NBSAP revision – the CBD process	11
5.4	Lesson from mainstreaming experiences.....	12
6	Day 2: Where Do We Want To Go? Visions of a Biodiversity-Mainstreamed Future	13
6.1	What would be successful outcomes from the NBSAP transformation?.....	13
6.2	Mapping institutional change and influence.....	14
7	Convincing Stakeholders – Building the Business Case	15
7.1	Building a business case for mainstreaming	15
8	Day 3: Influencing Decision-Makers.....	16
8.1	Communications strategies and approaches case	16
8.2	How do we know we’re being successful in mainstreaming?	17
9	Firming Up the Plan of Action for the Rest of the Project.....	18
9.1	Maun statement on biodiversity and development mainstreaming	18
9.2	Plan of action and next steps	18
9.3	Closing remarks	19
10	Acknowledgements	19
11	Appendices	20
	Annex 1: List of participants.....	20
	Annex 2: Workshop programme	23
	Annex 3: Maun statement on biodiversity and development mainstreaming	31

1 Report Summary

This report documents the proceedings from the “First Workshop of the NBSAPs 2.0: Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Development Project” held in Maun, Botswana from the 14th – 16th of November 2012. The meeting brought together 37 participants from four project countries – Botswana, Namibia, the Seychelles and Uganda, and independent members of the African Leadership Group (ALG) from Namibia, Liberia, Zambia and Zimbabwe, international advisory group members (IAG), and the project team members.

The objectives and expected outcomes of the first project workshop were:

- **Group dynamics:** develop a peer group (amongst the African Leadership Group, ALG) who will support each other during the 3 year process.
- **Leadership:** Engender recognition amongst ALG members of their leadership status and the important role they can play nationally, regionally and internationally – both in the NBSAPs process and beyond.
- **Political and technical content:** Contribute to a better understanding of what successful biodiversity-development mainstreaming looks like. Understanding and managing the relevant competing visions, powers, and institutions that forms the real politics of mainstreaming as a political and institutional process. Develop a shared format for a biodiversity-development mainstreaming business case.
- **International project and processes:** Strengthen the long-term collaboration amongst the International Advisory Group (IAG) members and feed experience from the workshop back into the project planning and approach of the IAG institutions.
- **Momentum and messaging:** Develop a short message from the ALG members back to the CBD and other relevant constituencies with key resolutions and recommendations on biodiversity and development mainstreaming, emanating from the meeting.

The workshop was highly interactive and was structured to inform, share experiences and capacitate participants on successful biodiversity and development mainstreaming.

Day One: Concentrated on the NBSAPs 2.0 project, the role of the African Leadership Group (ALG), the status of biodiversity mainstreaming as per results of country diagnostics, and examples of mainstreaming experiences and lessons learned from Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe and the UNDP/UNEP Poverty – Environment Initiative (PEI). There were also official speeches from the host country and the CBD secretariat.

Day Two: Focused on country visions of a biodiversity-mainstreamed future/mainstreaming outcomes, sequence of tasks in mainstreaming, stakeholder engagement and power mapping, and country business cases for biodiversity mainstreaming. Day two also saw the production of a first draft of the Maun statement on the workshop outcomes.

Day Three: Addressed various communications approaches and tasks for the project including the role of the NBSAP Forum, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of mainstreaming. Day three also covered national, regional and international initiatives in which the NBSAPs 2.0 project could be influential (e.g. the Green economy and post-2015 (MDG) development goals, allied to the post-Rio+20 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). It also focussed on the plan of action and next steps for the project

Expectations from the Project

In summary, common expectations from the project shared by project countries included support to build strong business cases for biodiversity mainstreaming, raise the profile of biodiversity in national development planning, and resource mobilisation for mainstreaming. Other common expectations included strengthening existing in-country mainstreaming process, development of guidelines for biodiversity mainstreaming and learning and sharing experiences.

Country Diagnostics and Lessons from Existing Mainstreaming Experiences

One of the key aims of the workshop was to get an update on country progress on biodiversity mainstreaming (e.g. outcomes of mainstreaming diagnostics, analysis of existing NBSAPs and the NBSAP revision process). Country diagnostics revealed a number of commonalities: land use conflicts – or potential land use conflicts were the most common underlying problem identified by the project countries during their diagnostics.

Generally all the project countries recognise the importance of mainstreaming and the many (potential and actual) benefits that biodiversity mainstreaming can bring. These include jobs, income as well as cultural and social benefits. These benefits are potentially of interest to ordinary people, politicians and mainstream authorities. The economic case for these benefits is usually important, as many key decisions are made through the budget. However, the social case can be even more important, because fundamental decisions on biodiversity are political ones, and not just bureaucratic or technical.

Country diagnostics also revealed that all project countries have policies, processes, programmes and projects that provide perfect entry points for mainstreaming and opportunities for building convincing business cases. For example, national, urban and district development plans, nature based tourism, NBSAP review process and programmes and projects such as Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES), Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM), ecosystem valuation and assessment etc.

Key mainstreaming issues emerging from other mainstreaming experiences such as community based natural resources management and tourism initiatives in Southern Africa and work of the Poverty and Environment Initiative, reveal that many of the success stories of mainstreaming shared by the Maun Workshop participants focused on the local – community – level. This is where real integration takes place. Development paths and biodiversity assets are intensely local. The local level is a good test of whether mainstreaming is working. The involvement of people who are directly depended on biodiversity for income and subsistence is therefore important.

Several obstacles to mainstreaming were also identified by the project countries. Common among them are lack of political will, vested interests, poor cross-departmental dialogue processes, lack of budget allocation for biodiversity, challenges posed by the country planning cycles and limited experience in biodiversity valuation. As mainstreaming entails organising useful engagement between the worlds of biodiversity and development, champions, connections, coalitions, communications, political will, leadership and inter-sectoral coordination are all important to overcome the aforementioned constraints. In addition, mainstreaming requires good governance to be effective – especially stakeholder representation and accountability. Mainstreaming also requires sustained effort such as changing management, institutions and the political economy, and not just getting words into plans.

Defining Mainstreaming Outcomes

Country presentations and discussions revealed the importance of identifying biodiversity elements to be mainstreamed, and defining sectors and development aims into which biodiversity is mainstreamed. Species, populations, habitats, ecosystems and ecosystem services, or genetic diversity and protected areas were the common elements that countries identified. The sectors into which biodiversity is being mainstreamed included energy (oil and gas), mining, finance, tourism, land use, development, transport, water, poverty and business and there are all linked to the underlying problem identified.

The importance of clearly defining specific mainstreaming outcomes was stressed during the workshop. Examples from project countries include harmonised land use planning, increased tourism investment in communal land under conservation and cessation of particular behaviour threatening to biodiversity. All

these outcomes require influencing policy, plans, budget or decisions and changes to behavior, institutions and capacity.

The proposed approaches and mechanisms to achieve the mainstreamed biodiversity/development outcomes ranged widely, but concentrated on planning instruments such as Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Cost – Benefit Analysis (CBA) and spatial planning to fiscal incentives and economic instruments for biodiversity conservation. Some of these are tools to make the case – e.g. valuation and strategic environmental assessments (SEAs). Others are tools to enable the necessary reform – e.g. policy and legal reform. Yet others can then bring about that reform - e.g. education, partnerships, spatial planning and land use planning, and economic incentives such as payment for ecosystem services (PES) schemes and revenue-sharing mechanisms. It is important think through a wide range of mainstreaming tools to suit the various political, planning, and implementation tasks. Not only planning tools but budgetary tools such as expenditure reviews, fiscal tools such as tax instruments and economic instruments, management/business tools such as codes of practice and certification, and informational tools such as linked databases and monitoring. Later in the project, it would be useful to assess the utility of the range of instruments.

Business Case

The session on building the business case focussed on key ingredients and traits of a strong business case. These were inspired by a business case already prepared by hosts Botswana which among other things, stressed the range of Botswana’s biodiversity assets and their sustainability, gave evidence of what people get directly from these assets, showed how biodiversity can reduce risks and costs, emphasised the potential of the tourism sector etc. A general framework for building biodiversity business case was also developed during the workshop.

A good business case is key to influencing ‘powerful but difficult to convince’ stakeholder. The business case needs to be as specific as possible and to give evidence of direct benefits from biodiversity (i.e. revenue, jobs and products). Useful tools to make the case will depend on the audience that needs to be convinced – use valuation to generate evidence for economists; Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for policy makers and planners, etc.

The four project countries then developed their business cases. All the cases had good ingredients for the case with headline-grabbing facts and figures, showing commitment and readiness. The desired biodiversity and development outcomes that were identified are harmonised land use planning for Botswana, increased tourism investment in communal land under conservation for Namibia, increased area under conservation, improved income and job opportunities for Seychelles and mainstreaming biodiversity in oil and gases and revenue generation for Uganda.

Common social, economic and political arguments that best persuade stakeholders included minimizing red tape, reduced land use conflicts, increased contribution of tourism to Gross domestic product (GDP), job creation and rural development. Common evidence offered to support these arguments include the number of jobs created and GDP figures. However, all the business cases needs further work and countries are expected to expand on them after the first workshop.

Stakeholder Engagement

There was general agreement that successful biodiversity mainstreaming requires comprehensive engagement with stakeholders who might support or undermine progress towards the desired outcomes and understand their sources of influence. Such stakeholders commonly included ministries of finance and development, parliamentarians and high-impact businesses. During the workshop stakeholder analysis and/or power mapping was used to identify these stakeholders. Effective tactics to engage influential

stakeholders who might currently be against the mainstreaming proposal (e.g. by identifying relevant interests that can influence them such as jobs and income benefits from biodiversity) are essential.

Communications

The workshop stressed the importance of an effective strategy for communications throughout the mainstreaming process – during problem articulation, stakeholder engagement, business case development and all the other steps in mainstreaming. Effective communications requires thinking about who needs to change, what behaviours need to change and what channels of influence exist to bring about that change.

In terms of project communications, the African Leadership Group (ALG), through facilitation by the project, will share information on project management, mainstreaming methodologies, news of NBSAP revision progress, results of relevant international meetings, and disseminating new research finding and papers and mainstreaming tips and tactics. The NBSAP Forum¹ will also provide a platform for supporting communication.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E)

It was noted that a proper monitoring and evaluation (M & E) system needs to be in place to guide the mainstreaming process and determine if it is being successful. M & E should focus on the approach, outcomes and enabling factors. The lessons learned through the M & E process can help fuel a process of continuous improvement and provide valuable experience to share with others. In this project, our particular concern is to integrate issues of poverty reduction, which have not been strong to date in NBSAPs and especially their monitoring.

For M&E purposes, it is important to be particularly clear on the poverty outcome sought and to cover more than income and jobs (i.e. other biodiversity-relevant needs and deprivations such as health and vulnerability also need to be covered). It is also desirable to select a relevant poverty framework that would be open to biodiversity inclusion. The sustainable livelihoods framework was given as an example. There was also a suggestion that it might be useful for the project to propose a framework for the purpose of M & E.

Other Relevant Processes Relevant to the NBSAP 2.0 Project

In terms of the potential links of the project to other relevant processes, the workshop identified several other fora that would greatly benefit from learning and guidance from this project. These include processes such as the CBD Biodiversity and Poverty Eradication Expert Group, Green economy discussions internationally and nationally, post-2015 (MDG) development goals, allied to the post-Rio+20 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) discussion and that ALG members could actively represent the group at these important foras.

Mainstreaming Steps

The workshop presentations and discussions as well mainstreaming experiences shared by the Maun Workshop participants revealed that biodiversity mainstreaming is step-wise process. There are ten steps to biodiversity mainstreaming that includes:

1. Problem exploration and definition by stakeholders
2. Identify elements of biodiversity to be mainstreamed
3. Identify defined sectors and development aims into which biodiversity is mainstreamed
4. Identify desired biodiversity and development outcomes of mainstreaming
5. Shape strategy for communications

¹ NBSAP Forum is a community of practice that offers countries support in transforming and implementing their NBSAPs through providing easy-to-access targeted information, and sharing knowledge, experiences and resources online and in person. The Forum is a partnership between the CBD secretariat, UNEP, UNDP, governments, NGOs and others, all working to reverse the loss of biodiversity by 2020. For more information visit: <http://nbsapforum.net/>

6. Identify and engage stakeholders who might support or undermine progress towards the desired outcomes and understand their sources of influence
7. Identify enabling factors for mainstreaming
8. Identify and select a variety of approaches and mechanisms to achieve the mainstreamed biodiversity/development outcomes
9. Develop a “business case” that persuades the stakeholders who need convincing
10. Develop a monitoring and evaluation (M & E) system for biodiversity mainstreaming

Maun Statement

The workshop drafted a statement on biodiversity and development mainstreaming (also known as the “**Draft Maun Statement on Biodiversity and Development Mainstreaming**”) with a focus on biodiversity and development mainstreaming in National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), as well as mainstreaming in general. The final draft of the statement will be submitted to the CBD, and published more widely to influence a range of biodiversity and development processes, as well as the many countries currently revising their own NBSAPs.

Next Steps

In terms of next steps, the workshop concluded that:

- The “ALG network” will continue to work together, learn from each other and share experiences amongst themselves and with other countries including non- project countries.
- The ALG secretariat will organise monthly or bi-monthly tele-meeting to discuss project updates, challenges and share experiences. The project team will set up a system to enable this interaction.
- The mainstreaming diagnostic tool will finalised and translated into French and Spanish for wider use and circulation including via the CBD. The ALG members were requested to provide practical feedback on the tool.
- The project team with the support of the project countries will compile the business cases presented during the work into a report and share them with the rest of workshop participants.
- The project team will prepare a state of knowledge review on biodiversity mainstreaming.
- Namibia, Uganda and Seychelles offered to host the next project workshop in 2013. Namibia is expecting to have their draft NBSAP ready in early 2013 and it would be an opportunity for them to showcase their mainstreaming process with their NBSAPs. The project team will consult with these countries before the final decision on the next host is made.

2 Background

NBSAPs 2.0: Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Development Project is a three-year project to build resilient and effective National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) that influence development decisions and improve outcomes for biodiversity and poverty. The NBSAPs 2.0 project partners and collaborators will work on five fronts:

1. Strengthening leadership and capacity
2. Showcasing mainstreaming experience and success
3. Identifying levers of influence and entry points for policy change
4. Developing a business case for biodiversity as a development asset
5. Assessing the opportunities and constraints for mainstreaming biodiversity

At the beginning, this project will provide emphasis on mainstreaming in planning because of the ongoing National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) revision process with a focus on the diagnostics of the current situation and making a better business case. As the project moves forward, over next two years success of planning is anticipated. This will also include clarifying on what instruments and resources are needed to move forward in implementation of biodiversity mainstreaming for example , sector desk officers, new codes of practice, budgets and biodiversity expenditure review, financial mobilisation and leverage , fiscal and economic instruments (tax breaks for conservation, biodiversity offsets) and other means to do no harm and to realise biodiversity values. The project will ultimately contribute to full mainstreamed institutional and fiscal framework, a better understanding of the political economy of mainstreaming and how to work towards improved political economy of biodiversity and the environment.

3 First NBSAPs 2.0 Project Workshop

The first workshop for the *NBSAPs 2.0: Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Development* was held over three days in Maun, Botswana from the 14 – 16 of November 2012. A full list of workshop participants is presented in Annex 1 of this report.

The objectives and expected outcomes of the first project workshop were:

- **Group dynamics:** develop a peer group (amongst the African Leadership Group, ALG) who will support each other during the 3 year process.
- **Leadership:** Engender recognition amongst ALG members of their leadership status and the important role they can play nationally, regionally and internationally – both in the NBSAPs process and beyond.
- **Political and technical content:** Contribute to a better understanding of what successful biodiversity-development mainstreaming looks like. Understanding and managing the relevant competing visions, powers, and institutions that forms the real politics of mainstreaming as a political and institutional process. Develop a shared format for a biodiversity-development mainstreaming business case.
- **International project and processes:** Strengthen the long-term collaboration amongst the International Advisory Group (IAG) members and feed experience from the workshop back into the project planning and approach of the IAG institutions.
- **Momentum and messaging:** Develop a short message from the ALG members back to the CBD and other relevant constituencies with key resolutions and recommendations on biodiversity and development mainstreaming, emanating from the meeting. Special reference will be made to opportunities within the current NBSAP revision processes ongoing until 2014.

(See Annex 2 for full workshop programme)

4 Day 1: Tasks Ahead and the Role of the African Leadership Group (ALG)

4.1 Introduction and expectations

This session focussed on the introduction to the workshop, participants' expectations and the role of the African Leadership Group (ALG). The opening statements from the Council Secretary of the North West District Council and CBD Executive Secretary emphasised the timeliness of the project and the workshop. They stressed the benefits of mainstreaming biodiversity such as poverty reduction and alleviation, jobs, income as well as ensuring the availability of essential ecosystem services. The statement also lauded the innovative ALG network that is being fostered by the project and tools being developed to support countries during their NBSAP revision process.

In summary, participating countries expect the project to provide them with an opportunity to:

- Gather existing information and build a very strong business case for biodiversity mainstreaming at national level.
- Work in collaboration with, and learn from people with necessary knowledge and experience on mainstreaming within the region with the aim of improving in-country mainstreaming work.
- Strengthen existing mainstreaming processes and in translating mainstreamed national policies into practice.
- Prepare guidelines for biodiversity mainstreaming.
- Document lessons learned from biodiversity mainstreaming and subsequent knowledge management.

The independent members of the African Leadership Group (ALG) expect the project to:

- Raise the profile of biodiversity mainstreaming especially for the leaders in national development planning.
- Provide and promote innovative ways to help the whole environment sector to get integrated into development planning
- Contribute to the understating of what other resources and institutional frameworks are needed if mainstreaming into the various sectors and development aims is successful.
- Offer better ways of engaging stakeholders and broadening partnerships, of bringing data into consolidated systems, of resource mobilisation.
- Improve the political economy for biodiversity and environment
- Foster better integration of those groups in society (i.e. poor people) who directly depend on biodiversity for their livelihoods.

The project also provides the southern African region with an opportunity to lead the other 135 countries working on biodiversity mainstreaming.

4.2 The role of the African Leader Group (ALG)

The African Leadership Group (ALG) consists of project participants from all four project countries (typically government staff who are leading the NBSAP revision process and in some cases technical experts in mainstreaming, particularly affiliated with Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI) country programmes) and independent members who offer specifically relevant expertise and experience to the group namely James Murombedzi and Muyeye Chambwera (Zimbabwe), Jonathan Davies (Liberia), Ignatius Makumba (Zambia), Juliane Zeidler and Brian Jones (Namibia) and Phoebe Barnard (South Africa). Each project country agreed to nominate one or two people to be permanent contacts points of the ALG.

The main objective of the ALG in the project will be to offer support and leadership in different aspects of biodiversity/poverty linkages and in mainstreaming biodiversity and development through occasional meetings and teleconferences, and review of project outputs. ALG members would be expected to participate in three project annual workshops and other opportunities through the project life span and to review project outputs. The ALG are expected to continue play an important role on biodiversity and development mainstreaming beyond the project. The ALG has an open governance structure and may need to add additional expertise in social, economics, finance as well as members from other countries. The ALG members could also use the project outputs in their countries such as Liberia, Senegal and Zambia. It was also agreed that the ALG may need a chair. This will be discussed between the ALG and the Secretariat.

5 How Far Have We Got? Status of Biodiversity/Development Mainstreaming

This session focused on project country progress in biodiversity and development mainstreaming including on country diagnostics and a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis of their existing NBSAPs. The session also covered examples of mainstreaming experiences from Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe as well as the Poverty –Environment Initiative (PEI). At the end of this session, a group was formed to draft the Maun Recommendations.

5.1 Mainstreaming diagnostics report-back

Fragmented land –use planning and land use conflicts were the most common underlying problem identified by the project countries during their diagnostic assessments. Generally all project countries have either policies or projects in place or both. Community, trade and information initiatives stand out. For example, Botswana has a National Environment Fund and is involved in the Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES) project. Seychelles are focussing on land use planning and are in the process of harmonising environment and development legislation as well as making efforts to mainstream biodiversity in agriculture and tourism. Namibia already has draft enabling policies such as Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM), tourism, Environment Investment Fund and the Games Products Fund. In Uganda, all Government programmes be it on biodiversity conservation and management have to be aligned to, and contribute to the implementation of the National Development Plan (NDP).

Regarding business cases, opportunities for building compelling cases exist in all project countries. These include CBNRM (Botswana), nature-based tourism, access and benefit sharing (ABS), biodiversity offsets of mining sector (Namibia) and eco-tourism and community-driven protected areas (PAs) in Seychelles, value addition to biodiversity product, improved market access for biodiversity products, employment opportunities and use of biodiversity resources to alleviate poverty (Uganda).

There were many commonalities, amongst project countries, in terms of obstacles and constraints that they need to be overcome to promote further and more effective biodiversity and development integration. The main constraint highlighted included lack of political will, vested interests, poor cross-departmental dialogue processes, lack of budget allocation for biodiversity, challenges posed by the country planning cycles, low priority of biodiversity in national development planning and limited experience in biodiversity valuation.

Several mainstreaming entry points were identified by the project countries. These include existing projects and programmes (e.g. ecosystem valuation and assessment and ongoing work by the Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI)) and existing national, district and urban plans (e.g. in Botswana these include the National Development Planning (NDP), urban and district development plans especially during their review, ongoing work on natural resource accounting for livestock and water and national communications of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). Other entry points identified include introduction of TEEB methodology to open up to economics (Seychelles), NBSAP review process and existing programme to

sensitize law-makers/parliamentarians on MEAs (i.e. political opening), rights-based approach as it emphasises community/poverty angle (Namibia and Uganda).

5.2 NBSAP SWOTs analysis

Project country SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis of existing NBSAPs in relation to mainstreaming needs revealed some striking similarities between countries. Common strengths of existing NBSAPs included high-level political commitment, availability of good legal/constitutional provisions, good planning structures, clear timelines and responsibilities and a participatory NBSAP.

Weaknesses of current NBSAPs included poor coordination, not enough skills and resources to implement a mainstreamed approach, poor information flows, NBSAP not aligned to national vision, limited awareness of values of biodiversity and low priority of biodiversity as compared to other national priorities such as health, education and food security.

Opportunities from existing NBSAPs included restructuring and decentralisation including of environmental authorities, political will and international partnerships, technologies that are new are now available and many possible added value products, and market access is improving, especially in informal sector and clearing house mechanism being developed to share information.

Threats from existing NBSAPs included lack of continuity in NBSAPs, short-term planning, no budget allocation for biodiversity, stakeholder fatigue and widespread poverty.

Based on the discussions that ensued, it is clear that we need to be planning to implement mainstreaming, as if we expect to overcome many of the constraints to biodiversity mainstreaming. In countries where good legal provisions and planning structures and high-level political commitment existing (e.g. Namibia,) the coordination, resources, skills and information flows are not so strong and that is a major constraint to implement a mainstreamed approach. For successful implementation of a mainstreamed approach, it is vital to make the most of opportunities and entry points such as seizing on existing political will, using political moments in decentralisation, institutional restructuring and 'top demands' like jobs and growth.

5.3 NBSAP revision – the CBD process

This session focussed on the NBSAP revision process and what an Aichi-compatible NBSAP would look. 'Transformative' NBSAPs need to follow seven emerging principles [UNDP view]:

1. A fully participatory process with all sectors
2. An emphasis on ecosystem services valuation and biodiversity mainstreaming;
3. Protected areas can be an efficient vehicle for achieving many of the Aichi Targets;
4. The need to fully incorporate of climate change resilience principles;
5. An emphasis on restoration and natural limits;
6. Fully resourced and implementable NBSAPs
7. Need for diverse finance mechanisms (driven by sectoral valuation and mainstreaming)

Overall, the NBSAPs should place more emphasis on analysis: baseline data, especially to be clear on gaps and need for further Protected Areas (PAs), valuation and natural resources management assessment and assessment of valuation needs. Mainstreaming is a strand that binds the threads of new NBSAP together (Box 1).

Box 1: The NBSAP revision process should include the following steps:

1. Gather baseline data on biodiversity assets
2. Assess status of each key biodiversity asset (i.e. the ecological status, threat status and protection and conservation status).
3. Conduct key thematic assessments
4. Identify major strategies
5. Develop action plans
6. Assess financial resources needed
7. Share data and NBSAPs

In terms of project countries' NBSAP development process, all the countries have already gathered baseline data on biodiversity assets and assess status of these assets. Namibia is expected to have their first NBSAP draft in January 2013, Botswana in November 2013, the Seychelles in January 2014 and Uganda in July 2013. Liberia and Zambia, represented by independent members of the ALG, are expected to have their first NBSAPs draft ready in July 2013 and December 2013, respectively.

The new challenges that project countries foresee range from capacity constraints, lack of adequate resources, integration of data collected by various stakeholders, and absence of framework for implementation at local level. Other challenges include population growth and investment and industrialization pressure especially oil and gas exploration and mining.

All the project countries intend to engage a wide range of stakeholders during the NBSAP development process. These include relevant international organizations, regional government in order to enhance implementation, indigenous communities, traditional authorities and government ministries such as trade, education, finance, planning, local government, economic affairs, labour and mining ministries and the private sector in general.

New data, tools and methodologies that are required during the NBSAP development process include valuation data and methodologies, communication tools, mainstreaming tools and methodologies, co-management of protected areas, landscape and scenario management approaches, biodiversity indicators into biodiversity valuation, databases to integrate existing datasets and data on some biodiversity thematic areas.

5.4 Lesson from mainstreaming experiences

This session focussed on mainstreaming experience from the Poverty and Environment Initiative, CBNRM in Namibia and Zimbabwe, and community tourism in Zambia. In particular, the session focused on what worked, the business case involved, how it was carried forward and lessons learned. Presentations provided as powerpoints are available on the project website: <http://povertyandconservation.info/node/8083>. Key mainstreaming issues emerging from the presentations and discussions that ensued are summarised below:

There are many benefits of mainstreaming biodiversity: For example, in Namibia the benefits for biodiversity mainstreaming include jobs, income, Gross Domestic Product (GDP), comparative advantage in, for example, tourism and agriculture, delivering some Millennium Development (MDGs), attracting funds into the country/locality. The benefits differ hugely, but many are potentially of interest to ordinary people, politicians and mainstream authorities – need to get this information across.

The economic case for these benefits is usually important, as many key decisions are made through the budget: Based on the Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI) mainstreaming experience, it is of paramount importance to be clear about how a mainstreamed approach will affect income, costs, GDP, foreign currency

earnings – and especially jobs. Economic analysis, baselines and predictions can be key. There is potential demand from finance and development authorities, but we do not have adequate experience with the required valuation, internal rate of return (IRR) studies, etc. Need to constantly keep up to date. For example, discovery of oil and gas affect the economics of National Parks in Uganda.

The social case for biodiversity mainstreaming can be even more important, because fundamental decisions on biodiversity are political ones, and not just bureaucratic or technical: Biodiversity is positively correlated with cultural and social capital, with deep-seated values that often override financial concerns. Thus we must not stress economics unduly – though distributional issues (winners and losers) need to be considered if biodiversity is to contribute to reducing inequality and poverty.

Mainstreaming requires good governance to be effective – especially stakeholder representation and accountability: If biodiversity is to be linked to development, effective devolution and local finance must be available for local people to benefit. But the governance conditions are often not good. Without ways of ensuring local groups can play an active part in mainstreaming, it risks merely handing biodiversity over to powerful groups.

Many of the success stories in Botswana, Namibia and Zambia focused on the local – community – level: This is where real integration takes place. Development paths and biodiversity assets are intensely local. The local level is a good test of whether mainstreaming is working.

We need to think more about mainstreaming in implementation and not only at the plan stage (NBSAP): Mainstreaming requires sustained effort – it's about changing management, institutions and the political economy, and not just getting words into plans. Even when we have good policies and plans, they are often not resourced.

Mainstreaming is all about organising useful engagement between the worlds of biodiversity and development: Champions, connections, coalitions and communications (4C's) (e.g. Uganda clearing house for information-sharing]) are all important for 'wiring together' these otherwise separate worlds '4Cs'.

Thus we should think through a wide range of mainstreaming tools to suit the various political, planning, and implementation tasks: Not only planning tools but budgetary tools such as expenditure reviews, fiscal tools such as tax instruments and economic instruments, management/business tools such as codes of practice and certification, and informational tools such as linked databases and monitoring.

6 Day 2: Where Do We Want To Go? Visions of a Biodiversity-Mainstreamed Future

6.1 What would be successful outcomes from the NBSAP transformation?

This session concentrated on defining biodiversity mainstreaming and developing a sequence of tasks in mainstreaming. Biodiversity mainstreaming was defined as the integration of biodiversity concerns into defined sectors and development aims, through a variety of approaches and mechanisms, so as to achieve combined biodiversity and development outcomes.

The session on mainstreaming equation focussed on specific problems that mainstreaming can solve, aspect of biodiversity that is being mainstreamed, the sector(s) into which biodiversity is being mainstreamed, approach or mechanism for mainstreaming, the specific outcome or goal of mainstreaming and the factors that will enable or inhibit success.

The importance of clearly defining specific outcomes was stressed. Some country outcomes were similar: Seychelles’ and Botswana’s priority was harmonised land use planning integrating biodiversity values. Namibia focused on increased tourism investment in communal land under conservation, to realise equitable benefits from these areas. Uganda chose a broad but high-priority outcome – to halt threats to biodiversity.

Land use conflicts – or potential land use conflicts in the case of oil exploration in Uganda’s protected areas (PAs), were the most common underlying problem. Protected areas, species, populations, habitats, ecosystems and ecosystem services, or genetic diversity and protected areas were the common elements that countries identified. The sectors into which biodiversity is to be mainstreamed included energy (oil and gas), mining, finance, tourism, land use, development, transport, water, poverty and business and there are all linked to the underlying problem identified.

A common constraint to mainstreaming was perceived lack of political will and sectoral silos. The proposed responses ranged widely, but concentrated on planning instruments such as Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Cost – Benefit Analysis (CBA) and spatial planning to fiscal incentives and economic instruments for biodiversity conservation. Later in the project, it would be useful to assess the utility of the range of planning instruments.

6.2 Mapping institutional change and influence

This session focussed on identifying the change countries want to see, and institutional change and influence. This was done through an institutional change analysis, or quadrant ‘power mapping’.

Table 1: Institutional change analysis or quadrant ‘power mapping’ matrix

STAKEHOLDER SUPPORTS THE DESIRED OUTCOME	
<p>Opinion surveys, or organise joint statements, from these stakeholders – to improve their influence</p>  <p>LOW CAPACITY TO INFLUENCE</p>	<p>Identify and mobilise these stakeholders’ powers of influence: political, financial, informational, representative or positional</p>  <p>HIGH CAPACITY TO INFLUENCE</p>
 <p>[Not priority stakeholders]</p>	<p>Identify interests of these stakeholders consistent with the biodiversity outcome e.g. BD-related jobs, revenue, risk reduction, foreign investment, climate change adaptation, green economy...</p> 
AGAINST THE OUTCOME	



This exercise covered the step of engaging stakeholders including identifying who might support the required outcome, and who might resist it – and of these as well as identifying who is most influential. The discussion focused on tactics to engage influential stakeholders who might currently be against the mainstreaming proposal – identifying relevant interests that we can work with (e.g. jobs and income). Such stakeholders commonly included ministries of finance and development, parliamentarians and high-impact businesses. Based on the presentations and discussions, ten steps for biodiversity mainstreaming were suggested (Box 2).

Box 2: Ten steps to biodiversity and development mainstreaming

Typical steps for biodiversity mainstreaming, from experience and good practice to date, include:

1. Problem exploration and definition by stakeholders
2. Identify elements of biodiversity to be mainstreamed
3. Identify defined sectors and development aims into which biodiversity is mainstreamed
4. Identify desired biodiversity and development outcomes of mainstreaming
5. Shape strategy for communications
6. Identify and engage stakeholders who might support or undermine progress towards the desired outcomes and understand their sources of influence
7. Identify enabling factors for mainstreaming
8. Identify and select a variety of approaches and mechanisms to achieve the mainstreamed biodiversity/development outcomes
9. Develop a “business case” that persuades the stakeholders who need convincing
10. Develop a monitoring and evaluation (M & E) system for biodiversity mainstreaming .

7 Convincing Stakeholders – Building the Business Case

7.1 Building a business case for mainstreaming

Having identified who to convince, this session concentrated on building the business case for biodiversity mainstreaming. The session generated a series of questions that helped to frame the construction of country business cases to achieve the desired outcome. These were inspired by a business case already prepared by hosts Botswana, that:

- Emphasised the range of Botswana’s biodiversity assets and their sustainability.
- Gave evidence of what people get directly from these assets – from revenue to jobs to products.
- Showed how biodiversity can reduce risks and costs. CBNRM can do things in a more cost-effective way.
- Emphasised the potential of the tourism sector.
- Promoted how biodiversity helps the country’s overall profile regionally and globally.
- Demonstrated commitments at policy level (Gaborone Declaration) and national level (Environmental Fund).
- Admitted challenges that need investment – fragmented policies and inadequate finance.
- Asked for investment (a) for projects viable for communities – added value products, pharmaceutical potentials; (b) for securing enabling conditions (i.e. foundational investment in mainstreaming – will help lever other [domestic] investment).

A strong business case should persuade the stakeholders who need convincing. The business case needs to be as specific as possible and to give evidence of direct benefits from biodiversity (i.e. revenue, jobs and products). A good business case is key to influencing ‘powerful but difficult to convince’ stakeholders. Useful tools to make the case will depend on the audience that needs to be convinced – use valuation to generate evidence for economists; Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for policy makers and planners etc. The following framework or list of questions can help countries to frame a solid business case focused on their chosen outcome and ‘influential but difficult to convince’ stakeholders (Box 3).

Box 3: Framework for a biodiversity business case

- 1) What are your target group's priorities?
- 2) What types of arguments (economic, social and/or political) best persuade them?
- 3) What evidence can you offer to support these arguments?
- 4) What are you asking the target group to do? be specific e.g. increase budget allocation, change policy, etc
- 5) Can you identify other stakeholders who have demonstrated support or demand for this case?
- 6) What's your competence, commitment, own investment and readiness? (e.g. own environment fund, coherent policy etc)
- 7) What will happen if they do not support your proposal (costs of inaction)
- 8) What counter-arguments to your request, and how can they be rebutted?

Three further business cases were then developed – Seychelles, Namibia and Uganda and presented to participants. All the cases had good ingredients for the case with headline-grabbing facts and figures, showing commitment and readiness. The desired biodiversity and develop outcomes that identified were harmonised land use planning for Botswana, increased tourism investment in communal land under conservation for Namibia, increased area under conservation, improved income and job opportunities for Seychelles and mainstreaming biodiversity in oil and gases and revenue generation for Uganda.

Common social, economic and political arguments that best persuade stakeholders included minimizing red tape, reduced land use conflicts, increased contribution of tourism to GDP, job creation and rural development. Common evidence offered to support these arguments include the number of jobs created and GDP figures. However, all the business cases needs further work and countries are expected to expand on them after the first workshop.

8 Day 3: Influencing Decision-Makers

8.1 Communications strategies and approaches case

8.1.1 National level communication

This session addressed the range of communications approaches and tasks that are essential to bringing about desired changes in behaviour, policy and practice that are required for biodiversity mainstreaming. Communication is essential throughout the mainstreaming process – during problem articulation, stakeholder engagement, business case development and so on. Good communications consist of the following:

- Listening and empathy – not just talking about what *you* want
- Appealing initially to emotions and values, and awakening past experiences – not imparting too much information as a first step
- Clear and usually – but not always – simple messaging relevant to the audience's world – not yet promoting the full case from your world
- The messenger counts – effective communicators may be influential people from the audience's world, including 'unexpected' people delivering the biodiversity message
- Getting attention in the time available – e.g. during an elevator ride, get an appointment with a minister to share 'ideas to help his project', not delivering a biodiversity message

Effective communications requires thinking about who needs to change, what behaviours need to change and what channels of influence exist to bring about that change. It was agreed that the project should identify good guidelines on communications strategies in environmental ministries.

The session also explored the typical *stages of behaviour change*, recalling the intense investment employed by advertisers to get consumers to change. The aim is to identify where an audience (specific consumer) currently stands, and to shift them towards a stage where your message is internalised in behaviour: Disinterested > receptive > constructive > active > internalised. We then thought through *strategic pathways to change behaviour*, and mapped these in brief for the specific country outcomes identified on Day 2 of the workshop (Box 4):

Box 4: Strategic pathways to change behaviour and specific country outcomes

1. Identifying the change required
2. Clarity on target audience
3. Identifying their current (problematic) behaviour
4. Identifying their current attitude
5. Clarifying the attitude we would like them to have
6. Their desired behaviour
7. Strategy
8. Changes in context/infrastructure
9. Metrics
10. Timeline.

8.1.2 Project communications

This session touched on the communications objectives of the project.

1. Support learning between Botswana, Uganda, Namibia and Seychelles (BUNS countries) and others
2. Influence NBSAP revision worldwide
3. Improve understanding of project partners in UN
4. Provide greater insight into dynamics and issues faced to project partners (e.g. UNDP, UNEP, CBD Secretariat).

The ALG and others use a wide range of media for communicating (e.g. e-mail, mobile phones – texting and calls, Facebook, Skype, Instant messaging, Dropbox, Letters, Twitter and LinkedIn). We decided the most inclusive media for project internal communication would be: (1) email for information-sharing between the ALG (2) email and also skype for discussions; (3) physical meeting. Information-sharing is needed on project management, sharing mainstreaming methodologies, sharing news of NBSAP revision progress, spreading results of relevant international meetings, and disseminating new research findings and papers, tips and tactics.

8.1.3 NBSAP Forum and its communications

This is being designed by UNDP and will go live around February 2013. It aims to build and support a global community of practice, linking people on specific themes – thematic discussion boards, regional discussion boards. Other ideas include country pages uploadable in-country, online courses and a help-desk, seeking and offering peer review, and a consultant roster to help with NBSAPs. Its remit is broad and not focused on mainstreaming. The workshop agreed on submitting further comments on the NBSAP Forum to the UNDP representative.

8.2 How do we know we're being successful in mainstreaming?

This session touched on M&E of the mainstreaming 'equation' sequence: 1 problem – 2 biodiversity status – 3 sector – **4 approach – 5 outcomes – 6 enabling factors**. Numbers 4 and especially 5, plus 6 are the focus. Our particular concern is to integrate issues of poverty reduction, which have not been strong to date in NBSAPs and especially their monitoring. For M&E purposes, it is important to be particularly clear on the poverty outcome sought– from alleviating poverty at the margins, to complete elimination of poverty; from

changing relative poverty to removal of absolute poverty. It was also agreed that we need to cover more than income and jobs: whilst there is a correlation of these factors with biodiversity, other biodiversity-relevant needs and deprivations also need to be covered: health, vulnerability, etc. It is desirable to select a relevant poverty framework that would be open to biodiversity inclusion (e.g. the sustainable livelihoods framework, wealth framework, wellbeing framework – or a traditional/community-defined ‘standard’). It might be useful for the project to propose a framework. There was also a suggestion that it might be useful for the project to propose a framework for the purpose of M & E.

8.2.1 Other ‘corridors’ in which the project could be influential

The focus of the project is national NBSAP revision in four BUNS countries, and particularly for revising the NBSAP guidance. However, we noted several other fora which would greatly benefit from our learning and guidance, and where African leadership would be welcomed:

- National reporting to CBD – where developmental aspects are not fully considered.
- CBD Biodiversity and Poverty Eradication Expert Group
- Global Environmental Facility (GEF) 6 agreement
- Green economy discussions internationally and nationally – to expand GE concepts beyond their common focus on Green House Gasses (GHG) abatement towards adding economic value through biodiversity and better Natural Resources Management (NRM) in addition.
- Post-2015 (MDG) development goals, allied to the post-Rio+20 SD Goals discussion – so that biodiversity is wired into the putative goals more rigorously than we have now (one target in MDG7)

9 Firming Up the Plan of Action for the Rest of the Project

9.1 Maun statement on biodiversity and development mainstreaming

The workshop also drafted a statement on biodiversity and development mainstreaming (also known as the “**Draft Maun Statement on Biodiversity and Development Mainstreaming**”) with a focus on biodiversity and development mainstreaming in National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), as well as mainstreaming in general. The statement that recommends to the CBD a simple step-wise framework for biodiversity mainstreaming developed through the workshop. This is also presented as a commitment that project participants will all aspire to (Annex 3).

9.2 Plan of action and next steps

During this session, the discussion centred on the plan of action and next steps. The following was agreed on:

The African Leadership Group (ALG)

- The “ALG network” will continue to work together, learn from each other and share experiences amongst themselves and with other countries including non- project countries.
- The ALG secretariat will organise monthly or bi-monthly meetings. The project team will set up a system to enable this interaction.

Project tools and products

- *Diagnostic tool*: This tool has already been piloted by project countries. The ALG was requested to provide practical feedback on the tool. The project team will finalise the tool and translate into French and Spanish for wider use and circulation including via the CBD.
- *Business case*: The project team with the support of the project countries will compile the business cases presented into a report and share them with the rest of workshop participants.
- *State of Knowledge Review (SoK)*: The project team will prepare a state of knowledge review on biodiversity mainstreaming.

Next workshop

- *Host for the next workshop:* Namibia and Uganda offered to host the next project workshop in 2013. Namibia is expecting to have their draft NBSAP ready early next year and it would be an opportunity for them to showcase their mainstreaming work within their NBSAP. Seychelles also offered to host the workshop but indicated the need for further consultations. The project team will consult with these countries before the final decision on the next host is made.

9.3 Closing remarks

The host country represented by the Department of Environmental Affairs, Ms Ingrid Otukile and Mr. Steve Baas representing the Darwin NBSAPs 2.0 project took the floor to thank the participants for taking time to attend the workshop and above all their astute participation. Botswana was appreciated for hosting and all the donors –DEA, IIED, UNEP-WCMC, KCS, CBD, UNEP UNDP PEI, UKaid, Darwin, Defra for their special contributions.

10 Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude to the Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism (MEWT) Botswana for hosting the workshop and the Kalahari Conservation Society (KCS) for organising the workshop, coordinating logistics, resource support during the workshop and imparting their local knowledge of Botswana to participants. We would also like to thank independent ALG members and IAG members for contribution to the workshop and all the workshop participants for their commitment and contributions during the workshop.

What is the NBSAPs 2.0 Initiative?

NBSAPs 2.0: Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Development is a three-year project to build resilient and effective national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) that influence development decisions and improve outcomes for biodiversity and poverty. The project is implemented by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) in collaboration with the CBD Secretariat, UNEP, UNDP and the Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI).

Working with four African countries – Botswana, Namibia, Seychelles and Uganda – the project is encouraging leadership in biodiversity mainstreaming and highlighting the experience of these four focal countries to influence a whole new generation of NBSAPs.

NBSAPs 2.0 is funded through the UK Government's Darwin Initiative, which assists countries that are rich in biodiversity but poor in financial resources implement their commitments under the international biodiversity conventions. It is also part funded by UKaid from the UK Government, however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of the UK Government.

11 Appendices

Annex 1: List of participants

	First name	Surname	Organisation	Country	Email
1	Ronald	Kaggwa	National Environment Management Authority	Uganda	rkaggwa@nemaug.org
2	Evelyn	Lutalo	National Environment Management Authority	Uganda	elutalo@nemaug.org
3	Marie-May	Jeremie	Wildlife, Enforcement & Permits, Environment Department	The Seychelles	m.mjeremie@env.gov.sc mariemayjeremie@gmail.com
4	Shama	Blaga	International Conventions and Affairs Unit, Environment Department	The Seychelles	s.blaga@pcusey.sc shamaamesbury@gmail.com
5	Jonas Jacob	Nghishidi	Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Ministry of Environment and Tourism	Namibia	jnghishidi@gmail.com
6	Samison	Mulonga	Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Ministry of Environment and Tourism	Namibia	mulongas@yahoo.com
7	Brian Thomas Benney	Jones	Independent Consultant	Namibia	bjones@mweb.com.na
8	James	Murombedzi	CODESRIA	Senegal	jcmurombedzi@gmail.com james.murombedzi@codesria.sn
9	Jonathan W	Davies	Environmental Protection Agency	Liberia	jwdavies.epalib@gmail.com wdavies.epalib@yahoo.com
10	Juliane	Zeidler	Integrated Environmental Consultants Namibia (IECN)	Nambia	j.zeidler@iecn-namibia.com
11	Ignatius	Makumba	Environment and Natural Resources Management Department Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources	Zambia	inmakumba@yahoo.com imakumba@mtenr.gov.zm
12	Muyeye	Chambwera	UNDP Botswana	Botswana	muyeye.chambwera@undp.org muyeyec@yahoo.co.uk
13	Jamison	Ervin	UNDP and Global Project Manager, UNDP/GEF Early Action Grant on Protected Areas		jamison.ervin@undp.org

	First name	Surname	Organisation	Country	Email
14	Steve	Bass	IIED	UK	steve.bass@iied.org
15	Dilys	Roe	IIED	UK	dilys.roe@iied.org
16	Jessica	Smith	UNEP-WCMC	UK	Jessica.Smith@unep-wcmc.org
17	Abisha	Mapendembe	UNEP-WCMC	UK	abisha.mapendembe@unep-wcmc.org
18	Rosalind	Goodrich	Independent Consultant	UK	rosalind_goodrich@yahoo.co.uk
19	Ingrid	Otukile	Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism	Botswana	iotukile@gov.bw mpundu.chite@gmail.com
20	Kebonyethata	Dintwe	Department of Forestry and Renga Resources (DFRR), Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism	Botswana	kdintwe@ucla.edu
21	Fredrick Dipotso	Dipotso	Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP), Ministry of Environment Wildlife, and Tourism	Botswana	fdipotso@gov.bw
22	Annie	Isaiah	Department of National Museum and Monuments (DEA), Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism	Botswana	annie.isaiah@yahoo.com
24	Balisi	Gopolang	Climate Change Coordination Office, Ministry of Environment. Wildlife and Tourism	Botswana	bgopolang@gov.bw
25	Morati K.	Molelekeng	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation	Botswana	mkmolelekeng@gov.bw
26	Michael	Flymann	Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism	Botswana	mflyman@gov.bw
27	Moemedi	Mbakile	Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism	Botswana	mmbakile@gov.bw mbakile.moemedi@yahoo.com
28	Lucas	Rutina	Okavango Research Institute	Botswana	lprutina@ori.ub.bw
29	Barbra	Ngwenya	Okavango Research Institute	Botswana	bnngwenya@yahoo.com
30	Dineo	Gaborekwe	Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism	Botswana	ddoitsile@gov.bw dineo.gaborekwe@gmail.com
31	Kebaabetswe	Keoagile	Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism	Botswana	kebkeoagile@gov.bw kebkeoagil@gmail.com
32	Jobe	Manga	Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism	Botswana	jmanga@gov.bw mangaj25@gmail.com

	First name	Surname	Organisation	Country	Email
33	Mosimanegape	Thaka	Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism	Botswana	mnthaka@gov.bw mosinthaka@gmail.com
34	Felix	Monggae	Kalahari Conservation Society	Botswana	felixmonggae@kcs.org.bw ceo@kcs.org.bw
35	Lebo	Molefe	Kalahari Conservation Society	Botswana	lebomolefe@kcs.org.bw
36	Baboloki	Autlwetse	Kalahari Conservation Society	Botswana	baboloki@kcs.org.bw
37	Alex	Forbes	UNDP-UNEP Poverty and Environment Initiative	Kenya	alex.forbes@undp.org alex.forbes@unpei.org

Annex 2: Workshop programme

First Project Workshop

NBSAPs 2.0: Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Development

14-16 November 2012

Hosted by Botswana Ministry of Environment, Wildlife & Tourism (MEWT)

with the Kalahari Conservation Society (KCS)

Maun Lodge, Maun, Botswana

Objectives:

- **Group dynamics:** develop a peer group amongst the African Leadership Group (ALG) who will support each other during the 3 year process.
- **Leadership:** Engender recognition amongst ALG members of their leadership status and the important role they can play nationally, regionally and internationally – in the NBSAPs process and beyond.
- **Political and technical content:** Contribute to a better understanding of what successful biodiversity-development mainstreaming looks like. Understanding and managing the relevant competing visions, powers, and institutions that form the real politics of mainstreaming as a political and institutional process. Develop a shared format for a biodiversity-development mainstreaming business case.
- **International project and processes:** Strengthen the long-term collaboration amongst the International Advisory Group (IAG) members and feed experience from the workshop back into the project planning and approach of the IAG institutions.
- **Momentum and messaging:** Develop a short message from the ALG members back to the CBD and other relevant constituencies with key resolutions and recommendations on biodiversity and development mainstreaming, emanating from the meeting. Special reference will be made to opportunities within the current NBSAP revision processes ongoing until 2014.

Outputs:

- 4 x mainstreaming diagnostic papers - finalised after meeting building on insights gained during workshop.
- Guidance on building a business case for biodiversity mainstreaming (Botswana draft business case as an example).
- Elaborated ToR, work plan and modalities for the ALG. Timing and focus of the next workshop. Opportunities from the external environment identified.
- 1 page message (resolutions and recommendations) from the meeting to the e.g. CBD, African Union/, SADC, and own governments.
- Workshop report (by KCS and the project team), participants list and presentations.

WORKSHOP AGENDA

Workshop Chair: Steve Bass (NBSAPs 2.0 Project Leader)

DAY 1: Wednesday 14 November

Time	Session	Session leaders	Materials
8:00-8:30	Registration	KCS	Participant packs
SESSION 1: THE TASKS AHEAD AND THE ROLE OF THE ALG			
8:30 – 9:30	<p>Introduction to the Workshop Chair’s Opening and Introductions - Felix Monggae (KCS)</p> <p>Objectives of the Workshop and the ‘Maun Recommendations’ - Ingrid Otukile (MEWT)</p> <p>Welcoming Remarks - Council Secretary of Ngamiland District</p> <p>Introduction from the Project Team – Steve Bass and Rosalind Goodrich (IIED)</p> <p>Housekeeping - Abisha Mapendembe (UNEP-WCMC)</p>	Hosts - MEWT Botswana and KCS	
9:30 - 10:30	<p>Introduction to the NBSAPs 2.0 project Project approach - 10 min presentation (Jessica Smith) Q&A</p> <p>Roundtable on what the project could do for countries and international processes (Dilys Roe to facilitate)</p>	UNEP-WCMC (Jessica Smith) and IIED (Dilys Roe)	
10:30 - 11:00	Tea break and time for media interviews		
11:00 - 11:30	<p>Introducing the role of the African Leadership Group Terms of Reference for the African Leadership Group Discussion</p>	IIED (Steve Bass) and UNEP-WCMC (Abisha Mapendembe)	Draft terms of reference for the ALG

11:30 - 12:15	UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI) experiences and lessons learnt with mainstreaming and the business case approach	PEI (Alex Forbes)	Presentation slides (Alex Forbes) Skype link-up
SESSION 2: HOW FAR HAVE WE GOT? STATUS OF BIODIVERSITY/DEVELOPMENT MAINSTREAMING			
12:15 - 13:00	Mainstreaming diagnostic outcomes 1 Introduction of the exercise Group work: countries discuss then summarise findings of draft diagnostics on flipcharts	UNEP-WCMC (Jessica Smith)	Flip charts with categories arranged around the room (project team) Nominated rapporteurs (a) 4 x draft diagnostic papers
13:00 - 14:00	Lunch		
14:00 - 14:30	Diagnostic outcomes 2 Rapporteurs report back similarities and differences between countries for each category Discussion	UNEP-WCMC (Jessica Smith)	
15:00 - 15:30	1) NBSAP SWOT and 2) Update on Revision Process SWOT analysis of existing NBSAPs (one slide per country). Discussion of similarities and differences (facilitated by Dilys Roe) What does the NBSAP revision process entail, and what are the key issues? Group exercise facilitated by Jamison Ervin	UNDP (Jamison Ervin) and IIED (Dilys Roe)	
15:30 - 16:00	Tea break		

16:00 - 17:00	<p>Stories of change Proposed state of knowledge review (presentation by Dilys Roe)</p> <p>Examples of where mainstreaming has worked, how the change occurred, what was the business case involved, how was it carried forward, and lessons</p> <p>Presentations by the independent ALG members (10 mins each):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brian Jones • Ignatius Makumba • James Murombedzi <p>Q&A session and wrap up (facilitated by Steve Bass)</p>	IIED (Dilys Roe and Steve Bass)	<p>Presentations (Brian Jones, Ignatius Makumba, James Murombedzi)</p> <p>Outline of state of knowledge review on biodiversity-development mainstreaming</p>
17:00 - 17:15	Wrap up and introduction to day 2 programme	Lead Facilitator (Steve Bass)	

Workshop reception and dinner – Island Safari Lodge. Transport from hotel at 6.30pm

DAY 2: Thursday 15 November

Time	Session	Session leaders	Materials
8:30 - 8:45	Recap of day 1 and introduction to day 2 Housekeeping (Abisha Mapendembe)	Lead Facilitator (Steve Bass)	
SESSION 3: WHERE DO WE WANT TO GO? VISIONS OF A BIODIVERSITY-MAINSTREAMED FUTURE			
8:45-10:00	What do we want to achieve, and what are the alternatives? How does NBSAP revision fit in? Introduction to session: What would be successful outcomes from the NBSAP transformation? Country presentations (5 mins) Summarise common desirable outcomes (Jamison)	UNDP (Jamison Ervin)	4 x 3 slides on the mainstreaming outcomes countries want to see
10:00 – 12:00	Mapping institutional change and influence Identify the change you want to see, institutional change and influence Group work: Conduct institutional change analysis, or quadrant ‘power mapping’ Tea break 10:30-11:00	IIED (Steve Bass), plus resource people - Juliane Zeidler, Jamison Ervin, Dilys Roe and Jessica Smith	
SESSION 4: CONVINCING STAKEHOLDERS – BUILDING THE BUSINESS CASE			
12:00- 13:00	Building a business case for mainstreaming - example from Botswana Introduction to mainstreaming business cases and to the Dragon’s Den exercise with video clip Botswana to present its biodiversity business case to a “Dragons Den” of ALG members Q&A and feedback from the Dragons	IIED (Steve Bass, Dilys Roe) with MEWT (Dineo Gaborekwe)	1 x outline of mainstreaming business case format and approach Dragon’s Den video Draft Botswana business case Dragons: Brian Jones, James Murombedzi, Ignatius Mkumba, Jonathan Davies, Juliane Zeidler
13:00 - 14:00	Lunch – family photo		
14:00 - 15:30	Darwin countries developing their business cases Group work: Namibia, Uganda and the Seychelles developing their	Facilitators: Steve Bass and Botswana team	As above, 1 x outline of mainstreaming business case format and approach

	example business cases (with peer support from other participants)		
15:30 – 16:00	Tea break		
16:00 -17:00	Business cases Presentations from Namibia, Uganda and the Seychelles Report back, Q&A and feedback from participants	IIED (Steve Bass)	
16:45-17:00	Wrap up and introduction to day 3 programme	Lead Facilitator (Steve Bass)	
17:30-	Optional PEI seminar: Is Botswana ready for climate change? Finger foods and refreshments	PEI-Botswana	

DAY 3: Friday 15th November

Time	Session	Session leaders	Materials
8:30 - 8:45	Recap of day 2 and introduction to day 3	Lead Facilitator (Steve Bass)	
SESSION 5: INFLUENCING DECISION-MAKERS			
8:45 - 11:00	<p>Communications strategies and approaches case National level - to promote the business: What do we need to be mindful about to achieve the change we're looking for?</p> <p>NBSAP Forum and its communications</p> <p>Project level communications Group work and report back</p>	ALG member and IUCN CEC Chair Juliane Zeidler with Rosalind Goodrich (NBSAPs 2.0 project communications), and UNDP (Jamison Ervin)	Completed 'power maps'
11:00 – 11:30	Tea break		
11:30 - 12:30	How do we know we're being successful in mainstreaming? Approaches to monitoring and evaluation	UNDP (Jamison Ervin) and UNEP-WCMC (Jessica Smith)	Presentation with country example
12:30 – 13:00	A voice in complementary corridors Sharing opportunities in the external environment, taking lessons from biodiversity and development mainstreaming to other processes (facilitated discussion led by Steve Bass).	IIED (Steve Bass)	
13:00 - 14:00	Lunch		
SESSION 6: FIRING UP THE PLAN OF ACTION FOR THE REST OF THE PROJECT			
14:00 - 14:30	Message from the meeting: the Maun Recommendations Rapporteurs draft message from the meeting, review and finalise as a group	Drafting group	
14:30 - 15:30	Plan of action Work plan and project outputs in 2013. Proposals for timing and focus on 2013 workshop	IIED (Dilys Roe) and UNEP-WCMC (Jessica Smith) with Rosalind Goodrich (NBSAPs 2.0)	

		project communications)	
15:30 - 15:45	Wrap up, thanks and close	Lead Facilitator (Steve Bass) and MEWT	
16:00- 18:00	Optional 2 hour bird walk with Roger Hawker (50 Pula each) followed by a drink in the Boma		

Annex 3: Maun statement on biodiversity and development mainstreaming

The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (2011-2020) urges the mainstreaming of biodiversity and development - particularly as part of the process of revising National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). In this context, an “African Leadership Group” (ALG) on Biodiversity and Development Mainstreaming was established as an open voluntary body, and met in Maun, Botswana from 14th to 16th November 2012. At this meeting the ALG:

1. Acknowledged the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) invitation to Parties to be champions for specific Aichi Targets and in particular Aichi Target 2 on biodiversity mainstreaming into development planning.
2. Committed itself to providing leadership on advancing biodiversity and development mainstreaming through:
 - a. Peer review of biodiversity mainstreaming processes and draft National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs).
 - b. Sharing experiences, lessons learnt and best practices of biodiversity mainstreaming in the context of development.
3. Recognized that mainstreaming of biodiversity into development is mutually reinforcing, is fundamental to the entire NBSAP revision process, and is an efficient way of delivering on many of the Aichi Targets.
4. Acknowledged the various mainstreaming tools as outlined in the workshop proceedings² but further recognised the need for the development of additional tools which are necessary for the development and efficient and effective implementation of NBSAPs.
5. Recommended that the CBD Secretariat, the implementing partners and agencies, through the NBSAP Forum,³ support hands-on and practical experience-sharing and capacity-building workshops similar to the Maun workshop.
6. Recommended that the processes initiated in the Maun workshop be continued, appreciate the support of partners for this workshop, and recommend the continuation of this support.
7. Invited other regions and Parties to demonstrate similar leadership on biodiversity and development mainstreaming by forming leadership groups, hosting training workshops and sharing experiences.
8. Encouraged all countries to adopt a holistic and integrated approach to revising their NBSAPs guided by the key steps and themes of mainstreaming.
9. Accepted and endorsed the recommendations contained in the Maun workshop proceedings, including the ten steps to mainstreaming annexed below.

² Available at <http://povertyandconservation.info/en/pages/pclg-nbsaps>

³ <http://nbsapforum.net/>

Annex: Biodiversity Mainstreaming Sequence - Basic Guidance

Biodiversity mainstreaming is the integration of biodiversity concerns into defined sectors and development goals, through a variety of approaches and mechanisms, so as to achieve sustainable biodiversity and development outcomes.

Ten steps to mainstreaming

Key steps for biodiversity mainstreaming, from experience and good practice to date shared by the Maun Workshop participants included the following:

1. Problem exploration and definition by stakeholders: The mainstreaming process starts with identifying and defining the specific biodiversity – development problems that need to be addressed (e.g. unsustainable Non Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) harvesting; local hostility to protected areas; degradation of traditional subsistence crop varieties). The problem needs to be discussed with a wide range of stakeholders to understand the specific issues that mainstreaming needs to address (e.g. protected area policy, NTFP regulations etc).

2. Identify elements of biodiversity to be mainstreamed: This depends on the problems identified which might concern particular species, populations, habitats, ecosystems and ecosystem services, or genetic diversity.

3. Identify defined sectors and development goals into which biodiversity concerns are to be mainstreamed: This depends on the problem identified. It may require targeting a sector such as agriculture, forestry, and/or a development policy such as poverty reduction, food security and climate change adaptation.

4. Identify desired biodiversity and development outcomes of mainstreaming: Mainstreaming outcomes range from revised policies, plans, budgets or other decisions to behavioural, institutional, capacity and biodiversity management. Specific examples include; harmonised land use planning, increased tourism investment and elimination of particular behaviour threatening to biodiversity.

5. Shape a strategy for communication: Effective communication is essential to bringing about the changes in behaviour, policy and practice that are required for biodiversity mainstreaming. Communication is essential throughout the mainstreaming process; during problem articulation, stakeholder engagement, business case development among others. Effective communication requires identifying who needs to change, what behaviours need to change, and what methods and instruments best bring about that change.

6. Identify and engage stakeholders who might support or undermine progress towards the desired outcomes and understand their sources of influence: This involves initial discussions about associated institutional, governance, and capacity changes required to achieve desired outcomes and therefore who should be engaged. This can be done through stakeholder analysis and power mapping – a variety of tools are available.

7. Identify enabling factors for mainstreaming: Existing factors that need to be worked with – e.g. political will, leadership, media, public perception and awareness of values, inter-sectoral coordination, lobbying by interest groups, good governance, stakeholder participation and availability of funding among others. Where there is an absence of some of these, this should inform the choice of mechanisms at step 8.

8. Identify and select a variety of approaches and mechanisms to achieve the mainstreamed biodiversity and development outcomes: Various approaches may be needed to mainstream biodiversity and development. Some of these are tools to make a business case (e.g. valuation and strategic environmental assessments (SEAs)). Others are tools to enable the necessary reforms (e.g. policy and legal reforms). Others can bring about the required reforms (e.g. education, partnerships, spatial planning and land use planning and economic incentives such as payment for ecosystem services (PES) schemes and revenue-sharing mechanisms).

9. Develop a “business case” that persuades the stakeholders who need convincing: A business case needs to be as specific as possible and to give evidence of direct benefits from strategies that combine biodiversity and development (i.e. revenue, jobs and products). A good business case is key to influencing ‘powerful but difficult to convince’ stakeholders. Useful tools to make the case depend on the audience that needs to be convinced. For example, valuation can be used to generate evidence for Economists; and, SEA and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) can be used for policy makers and planners. Then build on the enabling opportunities identified above such as political will, availability of adequate funds, cross-departmental dialogue processes and among others.

10. Develop a monitoring and evaluation (M & E) system for biodiversity mainstreaming: A proper M & E system needs to be in place to guide the mainstreaming process and assess its success. M & E should focus on the approach, enabling factors and outcomes. The lessons learnt through the M& E process can help fuel a process of continuous improvement and provide valuable experience to share with others.