



Darwin Initiative Final Report

To be completed with reference to the Reporting Guidance Notes for Project Leaders (<http://darwin.defra.gov.uk/resources/>) it is expected that this report will be a **maximum** of 20 pages in length, excluding annexes)

Darwin project information

Project reference	EIDPO047
Project title	NBSAPs 2.0: From Policy to Practice
Host country(ies)	Botswana, Ghana, Malawi, Namibia, Seychelles, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe
Contract holder institution	IIED
Partner institution(s)	UNEP-WCMC Botswana: Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism (MEWT). Ghana: Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI). Malawi: Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining (MNREM). Namibia: Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET). Seychelles: Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change (MEECC). Uganda: The National Environment Management Authority (NEMA). Zambia: Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MLNREP) Zimbabwe: Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate (MEWC).
Darwin grant value	£150,752
Start/end dates of project	01.04.2015 – 30.06.2017
Project leader's name	Dilys Roe
Project website/blog/Twitter	http://www.iied.org/nbsaps
Report author(s) and date	Dilys Roe, Abisha Mapendembe, John Tayleur, Steve Bass and Rosalind Goodrich drawing on reports prepared by the host country partners, July 2017

1 Project Rationale

NBSAPS 2.0: From Policy to Practice was a post project to project “19-023: NBSAPs 2.0. Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Development (2012 -2015).” The NBSAPs 2.0 main project worked with four African countries – Botswana, Namibia, Seychelles and Uganda – as they revised their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), developing their capacity to incorporate development priorities and make a strong case for biodiversity as a core development asset. This post project worked with an increased number of countries (the original 4 plus Ghana, Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe) to help them to use their new NBSAPs to influence key national and/or sectoral development policy processes. Specifically, the project aimed to:

- Provide the opportunity for the learning and capacity development that has taken place during the NBSAP revision process to continue into the NBSAP implementation phase.

- Identify entry points for engaging with key development processes in each country – whether that is the national development plan, the agriculture sector strategy or the public expenditure review.
- Build relationships beyond the biodiversity sector – moving beyond the environment ministries who were the focus of the first phase to those that influence development processes in key sectors or at the national level.

The project was co-delivered with a mutually supportive project, “Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Development”, a UN Environment project supported by funding from the Germany Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and implemented by UNEP-WCMC. This arrangement enabled the increase in the number of countries from our original proposal and additional resources for capacity development workshops. For communications purposes, we described the combined projects as “The Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Development Policy and Planning Initiative”.

2 Project Partnerships

This project was implemented through a partnership between IIED and UNEP-WCMC in collaboration with partners in eight African countries. The IIED /UNEP-WCMC partnership has flourished. Whereas each institutes’ complementary skills are still recognised, IIED and UNEP-WCMC operate as an effective and integrated project team. Beyond this project the two institutes are now collaborating more than ever across a diverse set of issues. The partnership between IIED/UNEP-WCMC and the collaborating African countries has developed over the five years since their engagement in the main project. Building trusting relationships has had a demonstrable impact on the open and transparent sharing of lessons and experiences, for example at project workshops.

The African partner organisations in project countries were:

- *Botswana*: Kalahari Conservation Society (on behalf of the Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism (MEWT)).
- *Ghana*: Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI).
- *Malawi*: Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining (MNREM).
- *Namibia*: Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET).
- *Seychelles*: Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change (MEECC).
- *Uganda*: National Environment Management Authority (NEMA).
- *Zambia*: Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MLNREP)
- *Zimbabwe*: Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate (MEWC).

Collectively these countries make up the African Leadership Group (ALG) on Biodiversity Mainstreaming. The in-country partners in turn all established partners with their counterpart Ministries of Finance/Planning/development sectors and non-governmental organisations (NGOs), expanding the membership of the ALG. Ministries that engaged with project included:

- National Development Planning Commission, Ghana
- National Biodiversity Committee and Department of Botany, University of Ghana
- Conservation Alliance, Ghana
- Forestry Commission, Ghana
- National Biosafety Authority (NBA), Ghana
- Department of Economic Planning and Development, Malawi
- Ministry of Finance Trade & the Blue Economy, Seychelles
- Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development, Uganda
- National Planning Authority, Uganda
- Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development, Uganda
- Ministry of National Development Planning, Zambia
- Chinhoyi University, Zimbabwe
- National Biodiversity Forum (NBF), Zimbabwe
- Ministry of Agriculture, Zimbabwe
- Forestry Commission, Zimbabwe

In addition to the core project partners, we maintained strong links with the organisations in our main project international advisory group including the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD), the UN Development Programme (UNDP), UN Environment and UNDP– Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI). We also developed a link with the OECD Development Assistance Committee’s ENVIRONET which has been examining case studies of biodiversity mainstreaming success from

different countries around the world, and with the Netherlands Environment Agency, PBL. The collaboration with these different organisations involved participating in each other's' meetings, sharing information about our respective work, and organising joint events – for example with PBL at the May 2016 meeting of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI), and with SCBD in a full day side event at the CBD CoP 13 in December 2016.

The project has also benefitted significantly from links with the “NBSAPs Forum” - a partnership between the CBD secretariat, UN Environment and UNDP, which provides support to countries throughout the NBSAP revision and implementation processes. Project outputs are being disseminated through the Forum web portal.

3 Project Achievements

3.1 Outputs

We set three outputs for the project, all of which were achieved:

- 1) National level analyses of development planning processes and mainstreaming entry points in at least 5 countries
- 2) National level application of mainstreaming tools in at least 5 countries
- 3) Documentation and dissemination of experience and lessons learned (guidance for others) internationally

Output 1 – National level analyses

For output 1, our indicators reflected progress in conducting national analyses - including holding country workshops, writing up reports and presenting findings (see logframe in Annex 1). All eight country partners held national workshops. We provided some guidance on how to structure these workshops in order for the countries to be able to conduct a short stock-take of existing mainstreaming efforts and to identify key mainstreaming opportunities (upcoming openings in national or sectoral development policy processes). Table 1 summarises key development planning targets identified at the workshops held in each country. All the country workshop reports have been written up and posted on the project website including [Uganda](#), [Zambia](#), [Ghana](#), [Malawi](#), [Seychelles](#), [Zimbabwe](#), [Botswana](#) and [Namibia](#). The country workshop findings were shared between the project partners at an ALG workshop in Ghana in October 2016 (report available here: <http://pubs.iied.org/G04125/>) and were presented to an international audience during the CBD CoP 13 in December 2016 (report available here: <http://pubs.iied.org/G04168/>). Experiences of the country teams are reflected in the final mainstreaming guidance document produced by the project team which is available here: <http://pubs.iied.org/17608IIED>

Table 1: Mainstreaming targets and anticipated outcomes for each project country

Country	Mainstreaming target	Planned outputs/outcomes
Botswana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Development Plan and Vision • District Development Plans and Processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity emphasised in national and district development plans • Increased budget allocation to biodiversity • Development actors participating in national biodiversity forum
Ghana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium Term National Development Policy Framework (2018-2021) with emphasis on agriculture, fisheries and forestry sectors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders sensitised and influencing NDP revision • Biodiversity highlighted in sector plans
Malawi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS II) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity prioritised in MGDS and links to development sectors highlighted

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Land Policy • EIA Guidelines and Regulations • National Adaptation Plan (NAP) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation and sustainable use addressed in land use policy • Biodiversity provisions with EIA guidance/regulations • Biodiversity indicators in the NAP • Increased resource allocation for biodiversity
Namibia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Development Plan (NDP5) • Integrated Communication, Education and Public Awareness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity prominent in NDP5 • Increased public awareness and support for biodiversity • Biodiversity included in national accounts
	Strategy developed on environmental issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degraded landscapes restored
Seychelles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue Economy Road Map (BERM) • Tourism Strategic Action Plan (TSAP) • National Education Strategic Action Plan (NESAP) • Seychelles Sustainable Development Strategy (SSDS) • Seychelles Strategic Land Use and Development Plan (SSLUDP). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross policy/plan coordination (via establishment of a coordination unit) • NBSAP implementation • Biodiversity issues reflected in plans • Plans aligned with NBSAP • High biodiversity areas highlighted in spatial plans
Uganda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy Sector Development Plan (2015/16-2019/20). • National Development Plan (NDPII) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity priorities reflected in energy sector plan • Increased awareness of biodiversity issues amongst development planners • Increased budget allocation for biodiversity • Decreased deforestation for energy
Zambia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seventh National Development Plan (NDP7) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity emphasised in the plan • Increased financial resources •
Zimbabwe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The national Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of intent to address biodiversity in SDGs adopted • SDG15 highlighted as a national priority •

Output 2 – tools

The indicators for this output reflect the process of identifying capacity needs, developing tools to address those capacity needs and then assessing the effectiveness of those tools (see logframe in Annex 1). At the start of the project we held a series of one-to-one telephone calls with each of the country team leads to discuss the project approach including the plan to convene stakeholder workshops/meetings in each country to map out development planning processes and timetables and identify key mainstreaming entry points. It was clear from the discussions that the first capacity constraint the countries faced was how to effectively structure and run these workshops. We therefore developed a simple diagnostic tool to help in this process including guidance on how to apply the diagnostic in the course of a workshop process. We held a project workshop in Harare in November 2015 which brought all the country teams together and we used that opportunity to share experiences on using the diagnostic

tool and using the feedback to further improve it for those countries that had not held their national workshops and applied the tool. The final version of the diagnostic tool is available here:

<http://pubs.iied.org/17586IIED/>

During the Harare workshop we further explored the key capacity needs of the country teams to increase their mainstreaming effectiveness. The following areas were identified: (1) monitoring and evaluation of mainstreaming success / indicators of mainstreaming progress and success; (2) making a business/economic/development case for biodiversity; (3) communication skills; (4) audience identification; (5) how to build mainstreaming capacity; (6) skills in negotiation, lobbying, planning and budgeting, and (7) guides on how to write policy briefs, media briefs, factsheets and key messages.

We reminded the project teams of existing tools developed under the first phase of the project that addressed some of these issues, specifically:

- Developing a business case for biodiversity: (<http://pubs.iied.org/14627IIED/>)
- The background paper on defining and assessing success in mainstreaming (<http://pubs.iied.org/G03828/>)
- The Windhoek Statement on achieving success in biodiversity mainstreaming (<http://pubs.iied.org/G03840/>)

We recognised that a number of the capacity issues identified related to communications and we developed a new tool for the country teams on writing for different audiences, including policy-makers and the media: <http://pubs.iied.org/17582IIED/>. We also noted a strong interest in monitoring and evaluation and at our second project workshop in Ghana in October 2016 we devoted a specific session to this, exploring country team members own perceptions of practical examples of mainstreaming progress or success – from increased participation of biodiversity staff in development planning meetings and vice versa to improved status of biodiversity on the ground. We included a specific section on Monitoring & Evaluation in the overall mainstreaming guidance document that we produced as the final output of the project (available at <http://pubs.iied.org/17608IIED/>). We have also developed an expanded version of this section as a standalone tool which now requires field testing as a post project follow up activity (untested draft available on request). We are exploring options for funding this follow up work.

At the CBD CoP 13 event we didn't present on the effectiveness of the tools developed but country teams all made presentations based on their use of the diagnostic tool. We also gave a brief overview of the tools that had been developed through the project and made all available in hard copy to the 90+ participants. We have found through the project that the country teams have varied hugely in terms of their awareness and use of tools developed under the Phase 1 project and in their needs for tools under this project. We think in hindsight the tools developed have as much, if not more, value to other countries who are embarking on mainstreaming processes as to the project countries. Evidence of this is found in the apparent appetite for and uptake of these tools whenever we disseminate them at events such as the CBD meetings and other relevant national and regional meetings, and their use by others - for example Birdlife International have used them in previous initiatives and have just notified us that they would like to use and adapt them in a new initiative.

Output 3: Documentation and dissemination

The indicators for this output include sharing lessons on influencing development processes between partners, documenting lessons, sharing lessons internationally at CBD CoP 13, and documenting and disseminating overall experience and lessons internationally via various networks.

The project partners actually had opportunities to share lessons between each other at two, rather than one, project workshop. At our first [workshop in Zimbabwe](#) in November 2015, those countries that had already held their country workshops shared thoughts on potential mainstreaming targets and also on other ongoing relevant initiatives in their countries. A small group, with each of the eight countries represented, also jointly drafted the ALG [Harare Statement](#) on using NBSAPs as a tool for mainstreaming biodiversity in national development and sectoral policies. At our second workshop in Ghana, all countries presented on their experiences and lessons learned (Table 2). These are summarised in the jointly drafted [Accra Statement](#) but more details are documented in the [workshop report](#) the individual presentations are available on the project website: <https://www.iied.org/statementsworkshop-reports> .

In December 2016 we held a day-long side event at the CBD CoP 13 in Cancun, which we organised in collaboration with the CBD Secretariat. Six of the project countries participated in this event and had an opportunity to share their experiences with an international audience, and also to hear comparable experiences from other countries including Costa Rica South Africa and Mexico. One project team

member from Malawi, who had conducted an MPhil research project on learning and leadership in the ALG, presented her findings on the process of peer-to peer learning between members; peer reviews of biodiversity mainstreaming progress between countries; in-country training of key mainstreaming stakeholders; co-development and testing of simple tools and guidance to support mainstreaming; review of experiences and lessons learnt; and co-production of mainstreaming guidance for use by others. This co-production process has resulted in the final product of the project - a mainstreaming guidance document that draws on the collective experience of the ALG members during this project and the Phase 1 project (<http://pubs.iied.org/17608IIED>).

The various tools, guidance, workshop reports and statements generated through the project have all been disseminated widely through the networks of the project partners, including through the NBSAPs Forum, the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group, the Poverty Environment Initiative and the Poverty-Environment Partnership. In addition to the workshops and events described above, the project has already been presented and discussed its activities at a number of pertinent meetings:

- A CBD roundtable discussion on “Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development, 2015-2018” held in Brussels in October 2015.
- A CBD International Expert Workshop on Biodiversity Mainstreaming held in Mexico City in November 2015.
- A joint side event on “Priorities for work on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development”, with the SCBD at SBSTTA 19 in Montreal in November 2015.
- A Meeting of the OECD DAC Network on Environment and Development Cooperation (ENVIRONET) held in Paris in March 2016.
- A GIZ learning workshop on biodiversity mainstreaming held at the GIZ conference on Biodiversity, Forests and Climate Change in Bonn, Germany in August 2016. A joint side event, “The role of laws and policies to mainstream biodiversity: How to get to the next level?” at the CBD CoP13 in Cancun, Mexico on 12 December 2016.
- The JRS Biodiversity Foundation’s Partner Conference in Amsterdam, Netherlands on 24 May 2016.
- A joint side event on “Mainstreaming biodiversity in sectors: a governance perspective” at the CBD SBI1 in Montreal, Canada, on 3 May 2016.
- An IUCN workshop on the “Integration of knowledge products by IUCN and its partners for supporting land-use planning and policy in Madagascar, 20-24 February 2017.

3.2 Outcome

The intended outcome of this project was “The biodiversity-development mainstreaming plans included in revised NBSAPs of project countries (the Purpose of the Main Project) are implemented, measured and reciprocated in national development plans and processes.” The first indicator for this outcome was “**By the end of the project, provision for biodiversity is improved in at least one national or sectoral development policy/process in each of at least four countries.**” Although this was an ambitious target for a 2 year project country teams have reported some successes (summarised in Table 2) including:

- **Ghana:** To date in Ghana there has been weak integration of biodiversity issues in development planning and inadequate financial resources for biodiversity conservation. However, the project team reports that following their efforts, the latest draft of the Medium Term National Development Policy Framework (2018-2021) now makes specific reference to the NBSAP as a tool for mainstreaming biodiversity into all sector plans, especially agriculture, forestry and fisheries. The Framework is not yet finalised or in the public domain so we can’t provide verifiable evidence at this point.
- **Malawi:** Malawi identified a number of potential entry points for mainstreaming including the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II (MGDS) which is under revision; the National Land Policy; Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) guidelines and regulations; and the National Adaptation Plan (NAP). Prior to the project there was little attention to biodiversity in these policies and plans but the team reported successes in a number of areas including:¹ ○ The draft MGDS III currently has provisions on conservation of key threatened species as well as highlighting linkages between biodiversity and development

¹ Note these are all draft documents and not publicly available so we are not able to verify the impacts reported by the Malawi team

- The draft Land Policy identifies key biodiversity areas and has provisions on how such areas can be managed
 - The draft EIA guidelines has provisions on how key biodiversity areas, endemic species and threatened species should be considered during Environmental Impact Assessments
 - The NAP process has identified ecosystem based adaptation approaches as key in ensuring community resilience to climate change
 - There has been a 30% increase in the 2016/2017 budget allocation to the Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining which the project team attribute to increased awareness of the need for biodiversity conservation
- **Namibia:** Namibia identified the next iteration of its National Development Plan (NDP 5, 2018 - 2023) as a key mainstreaming target. While biodiversity was already alluded to in the previous NDP, to date it has not been emphasized in detail. Consequently Namibia's second NBSAP (developed during Phase 1 of this project) included integration into NDP 5 as a key performance indicator. Examples of the increased attention to biodiversity include an objective to enhance value addition and the sustainable utilization of biodiversity and increase benefits to communities through the establishment of a research and development centre for indigenous plant products and the growth of a bio-economy based on sustainable commercialization and value addition. NDP 5 was launched in June 2017 and is available here: <http://www.gov.na/documents/10181/14226/NDP+5/5a0620ab-4f8f4606-a449-ea0c810898cc?version=1.0>
 - **Uganda:** One of the main achievements of the project was that the First Budget Call Circular for 2017/18 issued by the Ministry of Finance advised and guided all sectors to implement the national biodiversity targets stipulated in NBSAPII (paragraph 50). This is the first time this has happened. All sectors including local governments are expected to plan for and allocate resources for implementing NBSAPII beginning FY2017/18 up to 2025 (NBSAPII runs from 2015 -2025). The budget call circular (see para 50) is available here: <http://budget.go.ug/budget/sites/default/files/First%20Budget%20Call%20Circular%20on%20Preparation%20of%20Budget%20Framework%20papers%20and%20Preliminary%20Budget%20Estimates%20for%20FY%202017-18.pdf>
 - **Zambia:** Zambia also focussed on latest iteration of its National Development Plan – NDP 7. While the NDP 6 treated environment broadly as a cross cutting issue, it lacked any specific focus on biodiversity. The emphasis has been strengthened in NDP 7 where biodiversity is included as one key component in the 2030 vision for Zambia as: “A country with rich bio-diversity where humans and the natural habitat mutually co-exist.” This is largely expected to be realised through the strengthening of its tourism industry including re-stocking of national parks. Zambia NDP 7 (see pages 70-72) is available here: http://www.mndp.gov.zm/wpcontent/uploads/dlm_uploads/2017/06/7NDP.pdf

Elsewhere efforts are continuing to mainstream biodiversity but key policy processes are still ongoing, for example:

- In **Botswana**, the latest NDP includes a commitment to “improve the status of the species (flora and fauna). A deliberate effort will be made to: improve the legislative framework; develop appropriate standards; improve inventory; and intensify compliance efforts by monitoring the status and diversity of species within the predetermined localities. In order to attain sustainable environment, education public education and awareness will be intensified.” As a result the project team are expecting an increased budget allocation for biodiversity but this is not yet confirmed.
- In **The Seychelles**, the project team has engaged with the development of the “Blue Economy Road Map”. They report buy-in to include biodiversity in this road map but the process is still ongoing.
- **Zimbabwe** has just begun to assess how to domesticate the SDGs targets in the national development and poverty reduction strategies such as ZIMASSET. The project team have succeeded in including SDG 15 within the set that will be included, but there is not documented output as yet. Specifically, the project team has worked to influence the creation of a new cluster under the SDG domestication process which focuses on SDGs related to Water, Climate and Environment, including biodiversity. A statement advocating the integration of biodiversity into national development processes was drawn up by the National Biodiversity Forum (NBF), and submitted to the Ministry of Macro Economic Planning and Investment Promotion. NBF members are participating in each SDG working group/committee and in the SDG roll out coordination team.

Table 2: Key successes and challenges reported by country teams

Country	Key successes	Key challenges
Botswana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision 2036 now has an environment chapter with biodiversity featuring prominently • NDP 11 about to be endorsed and includes NBSAP activities • An increase in budget allocated to biodiversity is expected given it is in the NDP • Also expecting a strong biodiversity element in the new environmental management act and EIA act • Mining and tourism sectors are now contributing to an environment fund. • Nature tourism identified as an economic priority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to make sure biodiversity is emphasised in the National Strategy for Sustainable Development • There are no demonstration projects at the local level that can highlight the benefits of mainstreaming • Weak capacity in some sectors and in the districts • Policy influencing has been more difficult at district level because of the problems of the project team not always being around/scheduling of meetings etc
Ghana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed to influence the NDP commission including getting attention of the DG • The Medium Term Plan incorporates aspects of the NBSAP as a tool for mainstreaming biodiversity into all sector plans especially agriculture, forestry and fisheries. • Also managed to influence the Green Economy transition process and the long term 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of techniques and tools for effective mainstreaming • Lack of demand from public and from private sector for sustainable use of biodiversity • Hard to make a strong economic case for biodiversity
	<p>development plan formulation process with strong emphasis on biodiversity now in the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a result are now expecting more attention to biodiversity in sector and district plans 	
Malawi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have managed to get biodiversity into many new policies/plans inc physical planning policy, EMA, EIA guidelines etc • Public – private conservation partnerships established 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays in policy revision processes • Lack of funding • Limited data for spatial planning • Prioritising biodiversity over other pressing issues eg food security, health
Namibia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity prominent in NDP5 (was alluded to but not prioritised in NDP4) • Have developed a communication strategy on economic value of biodiversity • Working on mainstreaming into other national strategies inc SDGs and Harambee prosperity plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small budget within Ministry of Env and Tourism • Ascertaining the economic value of biodiversity
Seychelles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement in Blue Economy Road Map process and subsequent buy in to include biodiversity • Plans for a coordination mechanism between different sectoral policies and plans put in place • Tourism sector awareness raised 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor coordination between sectors and stakeholders • Political will to revise plans and integrate biodiversity

Uganda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodiversity was already in the NDP but have now also been able to influence the budget process – biodiversity in the Budget Court Circular 2017/18 for the first time. This means that sectors and districts have to indicate the financial resources they are going to allocate to biodiversity Have participated in sector working groups in preparation of sector development plans Have managed to make the case for biodiversity helping contribute to Uganda achieving middle income status by 2020 Are expecting NR accounting to be increased and to influence GDP calculations Presidential directives made on forest restoration and wetlands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritising biodiversity is still a challenge despite the progress made – lots of other things also being mainstreamed, so allocation of resources still low across sectors Lack of up to date data eg to demonstrate economic value
Zambia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One member of the mainstreaming team invited to serve on the technical team finalising the NDP Sectoral ministries have been involved in national biodiversity stakeholder meetings Expecting that biodiversity will be in the NDP Adoption of smart planning - which has also helped identify priority biodiversity areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of coordination between sectors – silo mentality. Inconsistent funding against budget Inconsistency between policy and practice Making a strong business case for biodiversity. If moving from copper economy to agriculture economy how does biodiversity fit into that? Tools have been useful but not enough Entrenched cultural practices - eg cooking with charcoal is better
Zimbabwe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have managed to engage with the Ministry of Macro Planning and Investment promotion Top mgmt. in various sectors Have engaged with SDG domestication process and as a result an additional focus on climate and environment has been included with the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Launch of SDG process beyond the team's control Lack of funding
	National Biodiversity Forum on the steering committee	

Our second indicator for this Outcome was ***“By the end of the project, progress in implementing the NBSAP against agreed mainstreaming indicators in at least four countries has been measured and lessons learned reported.”*** We flagged in last year’s report that this indicator may not hold, depending on the extent to which countries actually deploy their NBSAPs as a mainstreaming tool and seek to integrate specific NBSAP targets into development plans. Table 3 shows that actually, to some extent, all the countries reported they were able to make progress against some of their NBSAP mainstreaming indicators. It is hard, however, to measure definitively the degree of progress – most of the targets and indicators are quite broad and not framed in SMART terms – and hard evidence of such progress has also been hard to source. The lessons learned from the country team efforts were reported at the Ghana workshop (<http://pubs.iied.org/G04125/>) although not specifically against their NBSAP targets.

Table 3: Country progress in implementing NBSAPs (as reported by country teams)

Country	NBSAP Mainstreaming Targets/Action	Indicators	Reported progress over project period
---------	------------------------------------	------------	---------------------------------------

Botswana	<p>Strategic Actions for Target 2: By 2025, planning processes at all (district, urban and national) levels, and national accounting and reporting systems in Botswana contain explicit actions to promote biodiversity conservation</p> <p>Strategic action: 2-9 To ensure that by 2017, all government and parastatal sectors specifically address biodiversity conservation in their components of district, urban and national development plans</p>	Biodiversity mainstreamed	Biodiversity in the NDP and so anticipated this will filter down to other levels
	<p>Strategic action - 2-10 To adopt, by 2020, Local Economic Development Strategies that reflect natural capital and biodiversity as drivers of the local economy and poverty eradication</p>	Local Economic Development Strategies reflective of natural capita	<p>General increase in recognition of biodiversity the economy. During the November 2016 Ghana workshop Botswana reported District Development Plan (Tutume and Lethakane Sub Districts) and Urban Development Plans (Francistown) as priority biodiversity mainstreaming targets</p>
	<p>Target 4: By 2025, at all levels, policy and regulatory instruments are in place to ensure production and consumption by government, industry and society are kept within sustainable levels and safe ecological limits.</p> <p>Strategic action 4-1 To ensure that by 2017, the Environmental Management Act and its Regulations is legislated.</p>	EMA legislated	Expecting a strong biodiversity element in the EMA and EIA act
	<p>Target 20: By 2017, at least 80% of the required budget for the revised NBSAP, generated from diverse sources, is made available for its implementation.</p> <p>Strategic action 20-2 To ensure that, by 2016, NBSAP activities are integrated into</p>	National, district, and urban plans budgets integrate NBSAP activities	Budget increase expected but not confirmed
	the national, district, and urban plans budgets		
	<p>Strategic action 20-3 To ensure that, by 2016, the National Environment Fund (NEF) is fully functional and includes a specific allocation for biodiversity conservation activities</p>	Operational NEF	Mining and tourism sectors are now contributing to NEF

Ghana	National Target - <i>Integrate biodiversity conservation strategies into national development policies and plans</i> <i>Agrobiodiversity conservation practices are integrated into strategic plans of MoFA, MoFAD, COCOBOD</i>	Agrobiodiversity conservation practices are integrated into strategic plans of MoFA, MoFAD, COCOBOD	Some progress – Medium Term plan now references NBSAP
Malawi	Objective 2: Mainstream Biodiversity Management into Sectoral and Local Development Planning Outcome	Indicator 4: Trend in integration of biodiversity and ecosystem service values into sectoral plans and development policies	Biodiversity addressed in draft MGDS and in other draft policies (Land, EIA)
		Outcome Indicator 5: Trend in mobilization of resources for effective implementation of biodiversity programmes	Malawi team reports that the national budget allocation to the Ministry of Environment has increased by 30 percent in the current financial year (2017/2018).” due to increased awareness of the policy makers on the need to for biodiversity conservation.
Namibia	1.2 By 2018, biodiversity values and prioritized ecosystem services are quantified, monitored and mainstreamed to support national and sectoral policymaking, planning, budgeting and decisionmaking frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of biodiversity issues within NDP5 • Integration of biodiversity into sectoral, regional and local plans and respective budgetary allocations 	<p>Biodiversity is prominent in NDP5.</p> <p>Progress made in linking the in-country Darwin project activities with another project on Resources Mobilization with the overall aim of increasing financial resources allocated to biodiversity conservation</p>
Seychelles	Project 9 Promotion of Ecologically Sustainable Tourism Objective: To mainstream ecologically sustainable tourism requirements and practises into the Tourism development and operational cycles	<p>Environmental sustainability criteria integrated into the tourism development cycle,</p> <p>Adoption of environmentally sustainable practices by the tourism industry.</p>	<p>Seychelles has identified the timing when biodiversity can be mainstreaming in the Mid Term review of National Plans on Tourism and Education)</p> <p>Through the support from the project, there is buy-in to include biodiversity mainstreaming into the Blue Economy Roadmap. The</p>

	1.2 National target: By 2015, NBSAPI reviewed, updated and adopted and being effectively implemented	Key issues in NBSAPII mainstreamed and budgeted for in national, sectoral and district plans and programmes	Financial commitments to implement the NBSAP included in Uganda's Second National Development Plan (2015/16-2019/20)
	Target 2. By 2020, biodiversity values have been integrated into the Seventh National Development Plan (SeNDP), provincial and district development plans and other planning processes as well as r being incorporated into national accounting and reporting systems, as appropriate	Specific chapters within the NDP7 integrating biodiversity values Number of sectoral, provincial and district development plans integrating biodiversity values identified in the SeNDP	Biodiversity/NBSAP people are part of the technical team finalizing the seventh National Development Plan. Expecting a strong biodiversity element in the NDP
	Target 1: By 2020, at least 75% of the population is aware of the values of	At least 15 champions from	The National Biodiversity Forum in Zimbabwe which
	biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably	government agencies, NGOs, private sector, educational and research institutions take a lead in running biodiversity programmes; At least five collaborative initiatives are in place between mainstream biodiversity sectors and other sectors	include representatives from different ministries and sectors implemented the project and is part of the Steering Committee for the new SDGs Cluster water, climate and environment, including biodiversity.
	Target 15: By 2015, NBSAP updated and adopted as a policy instrument, and implementation has commenced	National Biodiversity Forum and its sub- and technical committees active and fully funded; Implementation and mobilization plan in place	The National Biodiversity Forum in Zimbabwe has been Identified as key to implementation of the NBSAP and mainstreaming activities.

Our third indicator was that ***“By the end of the project at least one widely applicable tool supporting mainstreaming implementation has been developed and applied in at least four countries.”*** Our [Guide to selecting strategic development targets](#) was used by all countries with the exception of Namibia in their national workshops and in their process to identify mainstreaming entry points. We also developed a tool to support countries in [writing policy and media briefs](#). Uganda reported that this [had been useful for writing in the NEMA newsletter and also for producing topical papers on how to attain middle income status while banking on biodiversity. A team member from Malawi reported “I used it when I was doing my studies on communicating conservation and it was very helpful “and from

Zimbabwe: “Very useful in preparing policy briefs”. Countries also reported continued ad hoc use of tools developed under the Main Project.

Our final indicator was **“Project outputs are widely disseminated beyond the host countries and taken up in policy.”** All the project outputs were posted on the project website and are freely downloadable. Download statistics are summarised in Table 3 (although this provides no indication of who they were downloaded by). They were also posted on the NBSAPs Forum website.

We also disseminated hard copies of the two new tools at the CBD CoP event in December 2017 and other workshops and events mentioned in Section 3 under output 3 (250 copies of the guide to selecting strategic development targets tool and 150 copies of the writing about biodiversity tool).

Table 4: Download statistics for project outputs (April 2015 – June 2017)

IIED publications library code	Title	Month published	Total downloads	South	South (%)
G03694	A Rapid Diagnostic Tool: Biodiversity Mainstreaming - Integrating Biodiversity, Development and Poverty Reduction	201201	323	99	30.7%
G03673	Biodiversity and Development Mainstreaming: A State of Knowledge Review - Discussion Paper	201303	539	227	42.1%
14625IIED	Ten steps to biodiversity mainstreaming	201310	438	165	37.7%
14627IIED	Developing a business case for biodiversity	201402	413	151	36.6%
17572IIED	Putting biodiversity at the centre of development: a checklist for reviewing the mainstreaming potential of a country's NBSAP	201502	187	78	41.7%
17305IIED	Stories of change: mainstreaming biodiversity and development	201507	803	357	44.5%
17582IIED	Writing about biodiversity. Tips and templates for policy and media material	201603	403	151	37.5%
17586IIED	Mainstreaming biodiversity. A guide to selecting strategic development targets	201610	368	197	53.5%
G03695	Maun Statement on Biodiversity and Development Mainstreaming	201301	63	27	42.9%
G03693	Entebbe Statement on Biodiversity in Development Planning	201308	57	19	33.3%

G03840	Windhoek Statement on Achieving Success in Biodiversity Mainstreaming	201407	117	49	41.9%
G04010	Harare Statement on using NBSAPs as a tool for mainstreaming biodiversity into national and sectoral development policies	201602	90	37	41.1%
G04111	Accra statement on mainstreaming biodiversity in practice	201612	72	28	38.9%
			3,873	1,585	40.2%

3.3 Impact: achievement of positive impact on biodiversity and poverty alleviation

Impact statement from logframe: Effective contribution in support of the implementation of the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species (CMS), as well as related targets set by countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources.

The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2010-2020 is achieved - biodiversity loss is reduced and poverty alleviated through sustainable use of natural resources

The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity includes Strategic Goal A to “Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society.” Our project contributed to achievement of this goal by improving capacity of environment officials to engage with, and influence development sectors across government in eight African countries. The project also improved the capacity of officials from Ministries of Finance/Planning/development sectors to support biodiversity mainstreaming in the eight African countries. The achievements against the specific outputs and the outcome as discussed in the preceding sections provide the evidence for this.

In terms of contributions to poverty alleviation and wellbeing, our project was focused on improving attention to biodiversity with national development policy and plans. As such we did not set out to measure any direct contribution to poverty alleviation and wellbeing (and our logframe does not include any indicators). However, our project did seek to influence development and poverty reduction strategies, raising awareness of the role of biodiversity in contributing to these objectives. In addition, all the countries with which we were engaging include substantial rural populations who are directly dependent on biodiversity for their day to day livelihoods and/or key economic sectors such as tourism or fisheries that depend on biodiversity. Our project was intended to contribute to a long term strategy to reduce biodiversity loss which in turn will benefit poor people who are affected by such loss.

4 Contribution to Darwin Initiative Programme Objectives

4.1 Contribution to Global Goals for Sustainable Development (SDGs)

The most obvious SDGs that are relevant to our project are goals 14 (marine ecosystems) and 15 (terrestrial ecosystems), although obviously given our focus on mainstreaming biodiversity into national and sectoral development plans then the whole set of goals becomes potentially relevant. Indeed the intent has been to try to build of the capacity of environment officials to mainstream biodiversity across all sectors and development priorities. In some cases the SDGs have been the actual focus of efforts, for example in Zimbabwe where a process is ongoing to integrate the SDGs into national development and

poverty reduction strategies such as ZIMASSET – the current National Development Plan. There the focus of the team was to make sure that SDG 15 was included amongst the set of SDGs that the government prioritised for “domestication”. Elsewhere the project has sought to emphasise how mainstreaming biodiversity can help contribute to achievement of the broad suite of SDGs – the workshop we held at the CBD CoP in Cancun (highlighted here on the SDG Knowledge Hub (<http://sdg.iisd.org/news/cbd-secretariat-prioritizes-biodiversity-mainstreaming-for-sdg-achievement/>)) is an example of this.

4.2 Project support to the Conventions or Treaties (CBD, CMS, CITES, Nagoya Protocol, ITPGRFA))

The project was designed to help countries meet their commitments to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity which serves all the biodiversity conventions. It contributes directly to Strategic Goal A (Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society) and to Aichi Targets 1 (By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably); Target 2 (By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems) and Target 17 (By 2015 each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan). The project has also helped contribute to achieving CBD commitments within each country, supporting them in their efforts to raise support for, and implement, their NBSAPs. In a number of countries project participants included national CBD focal points.

4.3 Project support to poverty alleviation

Please see above under the reporting on Impact which also enquires after contribution to human development and wellbeing. The project has contributed to poverty alleviation indirectly through building capacity and providing institutional support of the eight project countries to use their new NBSAPs to influence key national and/or sectoral development policy and planning processes to create incentives for growth in biodiversity-dependended sectors such as tourism, fisheries and agriculture. Biodiversity mainstreaming involves bringing together biodiversity policy, aspirations and actors with those of development. The ultimate objective of biodiversity mainstreaming is to deliver positive biodiversity and development outcomes, and in particular, building capacity of institutions and improve economic, social and biodiversity assets of households, communities and countries. In the long term this project will contribute to enhanced poverty reduction efforts, improved livelihoods, biodiversity and ecosystem services tangibly contributing to livelihood security and wealth creation at the individual / household, community and other levels, improved access to biodiversity and benefit-sharing and added value of biodiversity products and services.

4.4 Gender equality

The project did not have a specific gender focus. The review of our first annual report last year highlighted this and encouraged gender issues to be raised with country teams. In practice, however, within a two year time frame we were challenged to even document policy change in favour of biodiversity quite broadly. We would need sustained engagement with each country over a much longer period to move beyond this and to start thinking about gender implications. The main priority of the country teams was 1) getting biodiversity referenced in key policy documents, and 2) securing increased budget allocations where possible. However within the project itself we made efforts to include a balance of men and women amongst the project participants. Overall the project country teams included the following balance: 16 females and 30 males.

Country	Females	Males
Botswana	0	4
Ghana	2	7
Malawi	3	2
Namibia	3	2
Seychelles	0	4

Uganda	4	3
Zambia	1	2
Zimbabwe	3	5

4.5 Programme indicators

- **Did the project lead to greater representation of local poor people in management structures of biodiversity?**

The project was not focussed on management structures of biodiversity but rather on integrating biodiversity into development policy. The stakeholder workshops held by each country during the project were focussed on engaging policy makers, and specifically those responsible for sector and national development policy, rather than direct representatives of local poor people. However, the NBSAPs of all the eight project countries, which were used as mainstreaming instruments during the project, recognise the importance of greater representation of local poor people in management structures of biodiversity. In addition, one member of the Zimbabwe project team is a recognised community champion and has initiated, guided and facilitated several community based conservation initiatives in poor rural communities in Zimbabwe and is a member of a number of key biodiversity related boards such as the Zimbabwe National Biodiversity Forum which supported the implementation of the project.

- **Were any management plans for biodiversity developed?**

No. The development of NBSAPs was the focus of the Phase 1 project. This post project focussed on integrating biodiversity into development plans.

- **Were these formally accepted?**

For some countries, national development plans were finalised during the project period, in other cases processes are ongoing (see summary under Outcome reporting)

- **Were they participatory in nature or were they ‘top-down’? How well represented are the local poor including women, in any proposed management structures?**

As above, not applicable for this project

- **Were there any positive gains in household (HH) income as a result of this project? As above, not applicable for this project**

- **How many HHs saw an increase in their HH income?**

As above, not applicable for this project

- **How much did their HH income increase (e.g. x% above baseline, x% above national average)? How was this measured? As above, not applicable for this project**

4.6 Transfer of knowledge

This project was based on a model of peer-to-peer learning amongst environment and development officials. Collectively this group was termed the African Leadership Group (ALG). Over the course of the Phase 1 project and this post project the ALG has evolved as an expanding community of practice, from a small group of environment officials to a mixed group from environment, planning, finance ministries and from civil society. As individuals change roles, sometimes moving between biodiversity and development or finance posts, so ALG membership changes.

4.7 Capacity building

Most of the project participants participated in national steering groups as one of their key mainstreaming tactics. We did not collect specific data on which individuals participated in which committees because mostly this was an arbitrary selection based on their roles within their Ministries. The project certainly enhanced capacity for mainstreaming as a result of improved skills such as communications, but we did not measure capacity building in terms of increased status.

At the national level this project has built the capacity, sensitised and championed officials from both Environment and non-Environmental Ministries. These champions have made a demonstrable impact by integrating biodiversity into a broad array of national/sectoral processes. In many countries biodiversity officials are now embedded in national tailoring of the Sustainable Development Goals, and so the project legacy will persist through the course of the 2030 agenda.

One female member of the ALG was accepted to study for an MPhil in Conservation Leadership at the University of Cambridge and she did her MPhil placement report on the project focussing on the role leadership, and in particular, of the ALG in biodiversity mainstreaming. Upon her return to Malawi she was promoted to be Principal Environment Officer responsible for Biodiversity in the Department of Environmental Affairs in Malawi.

At the regional level, the African Leadership Group has flourished and grown in confidence. The group has built trusting relationships that enable countries to share their lessons transparently. Members are keen to secure opportunities to sustain and scale up their work as a group. They are also enthusiastic to share their experiences with other regions, and support the formation of new Regional Leadership Groups.

At the international level, the African Leadership Group members are being seen as mainstreaming champions and shared their experiences and lessons at CBD CoP13 in Cancun, Mexico and also agreed to explore options for establishing a more formal community of practice to support national Sustainable Development Goals plans and their implementation among other things. They have also been asked to be speakers on biodiversity mainstreaming on other events at the CoP such as side event titled, "The role of laws and policies to mainstream biodiversity: How to get to the next level?" held at the CBD CoP13 in Cancun, Mexico on 12 December 2016.

5 Sustainability and Legacy

All of the project activities have been targeted at policy impact. In most cases the policies influenced have at least a five-year duration, therefore the legacy of the project is substantial. Please see reporting under outputs and outcomes for details of which specific policies have been influenced. Project staff are all government employees and so will continue in their existing roles with an enhanced capacity to

continue their biodiversity mainstreaming efforts beyond the life of the project. There is also enthusiasm amongst the project partners for the African Leadership Group to endure in some fashion and we are currently exploring options for next steps.

The achievements delivered through this project mark one of the very first practical examples of real-life biodiversity and development reciprocal mainstreaming. This is well recognised by the global community, and the project execution agencies have been invited to share the project approach and outcomes at numerous events. Indeed, the project's CBD CoP13 workshop attracted a huge response from respected actors in the mainstreaming arena, and has explicitly taken steps towards developing a community of practice. The SCBD have reached out to IIED and UNEP-WCMC to explore how we can work together to scale-up the ALG and replicate the leadership approach in other regions.

The ALG has matured into an effective group that shares lessons very openly and enthusiastically. The group shows great commitment and leadership, and has officially asked IIED and UNEP-WCMC to explore ways of providing continued support to their mainstreaming activities. The ALG has asked to be used as a catalyst and motivator for other regions of Africa and the world. Our shared vision is that leadership groups are nurtured nationally, regionally and globally, and that each group has the opportunity to share experiences through the full spectrum of national, regional and global levels.

The ALG peer-to-peer learning and leadership group approach biodiversity and development mainstreaming in policy and practice has garnered much support globally, and is being seen as a tried and tested model for building mainstreaming capacity in biodiversity plans, development plans, sector plans and national SDG plans. Indeed, the ALG has been catalytic in building a nascent community of practice involving key institutes and countries that are implementing mainstreaming interventions. The group has built trusting relationships that enable countries to share their lessons transparently. Members are keen to secure opportunities to sustain and scale up their work as a group. They are also enthusiastic to share their experiences with other regions, and support the formation of new Regional Leadership Groups.

As mentioned in the preceding section, at the national level this project has built the capacity, sensitised and championed officials from both Environment and non-Environmental Ministries. These champions have made a demonstrable impact by integrating biodiversity into a broad array of national/sectoral processes. In many countries biodiversity officials are now embedded in national tailoring of the Sustainable Development Goals, and so the project legacy will persist through the course of the 2030 agenda.

Another key legacy of the project is the experience of the project countries which is now available to others in the form of guidance, tools, tips and tactics. The tools and the process through which they were developed - tried, tested with stakeholders and relatively simple – have also been seen as a model for other tools that deal with complex issues such as biodiversity mainstreaming.

6 Lessons learned

As with our Phase 1 project, because this post project was focussed on engaging with government ministries and influencing government policy, our project partners were government officials. While this worked very well in terms of providing direct access to policy makers, communications were difficult at times as the officials were all busy in their “day jobs”. In particular we found it difficult to maintain communications momentum amongst the country partners outside of the face to face workshops. For the main project we were able to capitalise on the window of opportunity that the process of revising NBSAPs presented. All Parties to the CBD had to go through this process and our project provided a source of extra support and capacity development for this. For this post project, the essential business of revising NBSAPs was largely completed and we were essentially asking environment ministries to “go beyond the day job” and engage with “unusual” colleagues that they would not necessarily encounter on a routine basis.

Response times on requests for information made it hard to monitor progress of the project against our key objectives. We tried a variety of mechanisms for communicating but with none any more successful than any others. This was a very small project and perhaps hard for the country teams to prioritise amongst their existing work.

We also were aware that the timeframe for achieving policy change was very short (2 years). By contrast, the Poverty Environment Initiative suggests 10-15 years is more realistic. While we achieved

the intended outcome of the project, for most countries the process of influencing policy is still in early days and a much longer project would really be needed to properly track their success.

Working with government officials meant inevitable changes in staffing as individuals switch jobs and are moved around quite frequently. Some members of the ALG have remained constant throughout the main project and this post project, but in other case the country teams changed completely between the main and post project and even within the two years of the post project. So, we have been back to square one in some areas in terms of capacities built and needing to be built.

As with our phase 1 project we found that the opportunities for the country teams to get together were highly valued by the participants and very productive. While the individuals in the project teams have fluctuated over the years, some have remained constant and a real rapport has built up between them. Events such as these are expensive, however, and it was only because we were able to link this project with a GIZ funded initiative that we were able to fund two international workshops.

Finding opportunities to link up with other initiatives such as the UNEP/UNDP Poverty Environment Initiative, the OECD Environet and the CBD COP13 has really enriched the project and highlights the benefits from investing time in building relationships and welcoming new partnerships.

6.1 Monitoring and evaluation

Some of our logframe indicators were over-ambitious and/or we didn't have sufficient systems in place to monitor them in their entirety. Overall, however, we monitored progress through regular team meetings or catch-up calls between IIED and UNEP-WCMC and with country partners through the annual workshops and through catch up calls (when we were able to contact them – see comments on communication difficulties under lessons learned). We also found that each country has its own policy agenda that one small, externally-driven project is powerless to influence. Therefore expecting different countries to meet common indicators, timeframes and reporting formats that a logframe approach implies was challenging.

6.2 Actions taken in response to annual report reviews

The previous annual report raised a number of queries which are addressed below:

Q: Did the Project Leader attend/support each in country workshop in person (were these costs covered by funding from BMZ?), and if not, how have any risks been mitigated remotely (e.g. by connecting to workshops through videoconferencing technology or taking stock of lessons learned from initial workshops and applying these in the workshops in other countries)?

A: No, none of the IIED/UNEP-WCMC implementing team attended the country workshops. Given the size of the budget, this project was designed to provide remote technical support only. Linking the project with the BMZ funded work enabled us to run two international, face to face workshops and to increase the number of countries but not send someone to eight country workshops. We provided detailed guidance on how to structure the country workshops in order to generate the required information, and we proactively reached out to countries in advance of their workshops to talk through the tool and the approach. Most (but not all) countries followed this guidance (but note comment above about different countries having their own domestic agenda and an inability for a project such as this to dictate to a government entity how and when anything should be done).

Q: Why is there only one ALG Member in Zambia but five in Uganda?

A: Zambia was late in confirming participation in the project and by the time they did confirm the first international workshop was about to take place so there was no time for our main contact in the Ministry of Environment to identify his team. Uganda by contrast had been involved in the main project and had an existing set of participants from the National Environment Management Authority before even starting to add extra participants from the Ministry of Finance and National Planning Authority.

7 Darwin identity

The Darwin Initiative has been acknowledged on all project webpages and blogs. An acknowledgement and logo has been used on all the formally published products resulting from the project, other disseminated project documentation and in local and international presentations on the project. The Darwin Initiative funding has been recognised as part of a larger programme (ie the joint initiative

cofunded with BMZ). We have used social media – particularly Twitter – to highlight key developments in the project, particularly during the international workshop, using the hashtag #NBSAP.

8 Finance and administration

8.1 Project expenditure

Project spend (indicative) since last annual report	2016/17 Grant (£)	2016/17 Total actual Darwin costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)			6%	
Consultancy costs			11%	Small absolute variance results from greater investment in time for consultant Steve Bass than planned so he could lead on writing the final toolkit produced by the project
Overhead Costs			42%	IIED overhead policy changed during the course of the project, increasing the overhead rates charged on staff time, especially Dilys Roe who previously had a lower overrate attached to her staff rate for working from home, as well as sub-grants and consultancies
Travel and subsistence			17%	Small absolute variance results from IIED staff flights to international workshop in Ghana were higher than anticipated as a result of time of year
Operating Costs			-18%	In country workshop and stakeholder consultation costs were lower than expected with ministries participating in activities based on their own in-kind contribution of core funding to a greater extent than had been anticipated
Capital items (see below)				
Others (see below)			-41%	Publications budget for freelance editorial work lower than expected because work could ultimately be carried out by Rosalind Goodrich of IIED in the staff time budgeted for her
TOTAL	73,457	73,457	0%	

Staff employed (name and position)	Date work commenced and finished in 2016/17	Proportion of this time spent on this work	Cost (£)
Dilys Roe, Project leader IIED	Apr-Mar	10	
Fiona Roberts, Project coordinator IIED	Apr-Mar	7	
Rosalind Goodrich, Communications adviser IIED	Apr-Mar	10	
Rosy Cousins, Publications assistant IIED	Jan-Mar	2	
John Tayleur, Principal researcher WCMC	Apr-Mar	2.5	
Abisha Mapendembe, Secretariat support, WCMC	Apr-Mar	6.8	
TOTAL			22,436

Capital items – description	Capital items – cost (£)
None	None
TOTAL	

Other items – description	Other items – cost (£)
IIED project payment bank charges, office stationery etc	

IIED Publication production and printing costs	
TOTAL	2,487

8.2 Additional funds or in-kind contributions secured

Source of funding for project lifetime	Total (£)
IIED frame funds and reserves	
WCMC BMZ mainstreaming biodiversity project	
In-country contributions	
TOTAL	240,670

Source of funding for additional work after project lifetime	Total (£)
TOTAL	

8.3 Value for Money

IIED has established methodologies and processes applied on all its projects to ensure they are delivered to the highest standard at best possible cost, and project activities were successfully completed within the budget agreed with the Darwin Initiative.

Additional funds or in-kind contributions secured were increased from £206,130 at the start of the project to £240,670 by the project end. This figure includes time contributed by in-country staff to coordinate and provide inputs to the project – none of which was directly funded by the project – and a substantial amount from the synergistic UNEP-WCMC BMZ-funded project “Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Development” which funded country and ALG participation in capacity development workshops, the majority of WCMC staff time and overheads and some publication costs.

The key cost drivers of the project were in-country operating costs for stakeholder consultations and workshops, and the salaries of project personnel and related overheads. The latter reflects the technical support provided remotely to country teams and the time needed to write and produce toolkits. Staff time was costed at proposal stage using standard salary day rates and estimating carefully the number of days required. Overheads are apportioned according to staff time on projects and levied according to organisational policies in order to cover the actual organisational costs of facilitating the running of projects. The change in IIED’s overheads during the course of the project reflects a change that happened after one of its regular reviews that ensure the proportion of overheads attributed to projects are “reasonable” (i.e. necessary for supporting its activities), “allowable” (legally permissible and compliant with donor requirements), and “allocable” (providing benefit to projects in a way that can be demonstrated).” In addition, a considerable amount of project personnel and related overhead costs were covered by co-funding or in-kind contributions – over £140,000 of the total amount of co-funding.

Throughout the project, activities capitalised on established networks and resources of all partner organisations where possible. For example, IIED widely disseminated project outputs via its well-established website and publications database, building on its work carried out under the original Darwin Initiative funded NBSAPs 2.0 project, and our designer based toolkit layout on the template already developed under the previous project.

International travel was booked through a charity travel agency, whose remit is to find us transportation and accommodation at the lowest possible cost and where possible event times are fixed to reduce cost. Venues for events were chosen to balance convenience/accessibility for our partners and necessary facilitates with cost.

Annex 1 Project's original (or most recently approved) logframe, including indicators, means of verification and assumptions.

Note: Insert your full logframe. If your logframe was changed since your Stage 2 application and was approved by a Change Request the newest approved version should be inserted here, otherwise insert the Stage 2 logframe.

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Impact: Effective contribution in support of the implementation of the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species (CMS), as well as related targets set by countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources.</p> <p>The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2010-2020 is achieved - biodiversity loss is reduced and poverty alleviated through sustainable use of natural resources</p>			
<p>Outcome: The biodiversity-development mainstreaming plans included in revised NBSAPs of project countries (the Purpose of the Main Project) are implemented, measured and reciprocated in national development plans and processes. Indicator 1: By the end of the project, provision for biodiversity is improved in at least one national or sectoral development policy/process in each of at least four countries</p> <p>Indicator 2: By the end of the project, progress in implementing the NBSAP</p> <p>Outputs: 1. National level analyses of development planning processes and mainstreaming entry points in at least 5 countries</p>	<p>indicators in at least four countries has been measured and lessons learned reported.</p> <p>Indicator 3: By the end of the project at least one widely applicable tool supporting mainstreaming implementation has been developed and applied in at least four countries</p> <p>Indicator 4: Project outputs are widely disseminated beyond the host countries and taken up in policy</p> <p>Indicator 1: Project reports documenting policy changes achieved and copies of the revised policies.</p> <p>1a. 1b. 1c. etc Indicator 1: By October 2015, workshops held in each host country to</p>	<p>Indicator 2: Project reports documenting lessons learned by each country and verbal reports from the countries at CBD CoP 13 side event</p> <p>Indicator 3: Publication of tools and guidance and posting on IIED and partners' websites</p> <p>Indicator 4: Participation by project members and dissemination of outputs at CoP16 and at other CBD</p> <p>1a. 1b. 1c. Indicator 1: Annual reports to Darwin and associated project documents - meeting reports etc, final project report</p>	<p>events; mailings to CBD Focal Points mailing list; dissemination via NBSAP Forum and by all partners' websites</p> <p>Assumption 1: Environment ministries of host countries remain engaged and capacity to influence development counterparts is enhanced</p> <p>Assumption 2: Representatives of key development sectors are receptive to mainstreaming</p> <p>Assumption 3: African Leadership Group continues to provide peer-to-peer support on voluntary basis</p> <p>Assumption 1: Suitable entry points for mainstreaming are identified as occurring within the project period</p>
	<p>scope development planning processes and identify entry points</p>		

	<p>Indicator 2: By December 2015, reports documenting country planning processes posted on project website</p> <p>Indicator 3: By December 2016 analyses of national development planning processes presented at CoP 13</p> <p>Indicator 4: By March 2017 analyses of national development planning processes included in final project report</p>	<p>Indicator 2: Tools and guidance published</p> <p>Indicator 3: Project workshop materials and report</p> <p>Indicator 4: CoP13 side event materials and report</p>	<p>Assumption 2: Capacity needs can be addressed through written tools and guidance</p> <p>Assumption 3: African Leadership Group continues to provide peer-to-peer support on voluntary basis</p>
<p>2. National level application of mainstreaming tools and in at least 5 countries</p>	<p>2a. 2b. Indicator 1: By December 2015 mainstreaming priorities and strategies agreed, and capacity needs assessed</p> <p>Indicator 2: By January 2016 tools/guidance addressing capacity needs agreed</p> <p>Indicator 3: By March 2016 tools/guidance developed and published</p> <p>Indicator 4: By December 2016 effectiveness of tools presented at CoP 13)</p>	<p>2a. 2b. Indicator 1: Annual reports to Darwin and associated project documents - meeting reports etc; final project report</p> <p>Indicator 2: Tools and guidance published</p> <p>Indicator 3: Project workshop materials and report</p> <p>Indicator 4: CoP13 side event materials and report</p>	<p>Assumption 1: Suitable entry points for mainstreaming are identified as occurring within the project period</p> <p>Assumption 2: Capacity needs can be addressed through written tools and guidance</p> <p>Assumption 3: African Leadership Group continues to provide peer-to-peer support on voluntary basis</p>

<p>3. Documentation and dissemination of experience and lessons learned (guidance for others) internationally</p>	<p>3. Indicator 1: By September 2016 lessons learned on influencing development planning processes shared between countries at project workshop</p> <p>Indicator 2: By December 2016 experience of influencing development planning processes in at least four countries documented</p>	<p>3a. Indicator 1: Annual reports to Darwin and associated project documents - meeting reports etc; final project report</p> <p>Indicator 2: Tools and guidance published</p> <p>Indicator 3: Project workshop materials and report</p>	<p>Assumption 1: Suitable entry points for mainstreaming are identified as occurring within the project period</p> <p>Assumption 2: Capacity needs can be addressed through written tools and guidance</p>
	<p>Indicator 3: By December 2016 experience of influencing development planning processes in at least four countries presented at CoP 13</p> <p>Indicator 4: By March 2017 experience of influencing development planning processes and lessons learned written up as final project report and widely disseminated via partner websites, CBD focal points mailing list NBSAPs Forum</p>	<p>Indicator 4: CoP13 side event materials and report</p>	<p>Assumption 3: African Leadership Group continues to provide peer-to-peer support on voluntary basis</p>

Activities (each activity is numbered according to the output that it will contribute towards, for example 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are contributing to Output 1)

Activity 1.1: Convene a (virtual) meeting of the African Leadership Group to review key elements of each revised NBSAP and each national development plan and agree overall project approach

Activity 1.2: Country teams convene stakeholder workshops/meetings in each country to map out development planning processes and timetables and identify key entry points and indicators of success

Activity 1.3: Country teams document (with support of IIED and WCMC) development planning processes and mainstreaming entry points and strategies

Activity 1.4: IIED and WCMC produce a report summarising country processes and mainstreaming strategies and post on project website

Activity 2.1: Based on mainstreaming entry points and outline mainstreaming strategies, country teams identify capacity development needs

Activity 2.2: Virtual meeting of African Leadership Group to share results of development planning processes and capacity needs assessment and agree tools/guidance needed

Activity 2.3: IIED and UNEP-WCMC develop and publish tools and guidance

Activity 2.4: Country teams employ and adapt tools and guidance to address mainstreaming opportunities identified in Output 1

Activity 3.1: Country teams draw out lessons learned on success of mainstreaming approaches

Activity 3.2: Project workshop convened to share lessons learned, compare mainstreaming success and adapt approaches where needed

Activity 3.3: IIED and UNEP-WCMC develop project report documenting mainstreaming targets, process, tools and experiences

Activity 3.4: Side event held at CBD CoP 13 to disseminate experience

Activity 3.5: Wide dissemination of tools, guidance and lessons learned

Annex 2 Report of progress and achievements against final project logframe for the life of the project

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements
<p>Impact The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2010-2020 is achieved - biodiversity loss is reduced and poverty alleviated through sustainable use of natural resources</p>		<p>Direct contribution to Strategic Goal in eight African countries. Poverty reduction contribution via integrating biodiversity into national development and poverty reduction strategies.</p>

<p>Outcome: The biodiversity development mainstreaming plans included in revised NBSAPs of project countries (the Purpose of the Main Project) are implemented, measured and reciprocated in national development plans and processes</p>	<p>Indicator 1: By the end of the project, provision for biodiversity is improved in at least one national or sectoral development policy/process in each of at least four countries</p> <p>Indicator 2: By the end of the project, progress in implementing the NBSAP against agreed mainstreaming indicators in at least four countries has been measured and lessons learned reported.</p> <p>Indicator 3: By the end of the project at least one widely applicable tool supporting mainstreaming implementation has been developed and applied in at least four countries</p> <p>Indicator 4: Project outputs are widely disseminated beyond the host countries and taken up in policy</p>	
<p>Output 1. National level analyses of development planning processes and mainstreaming entry points in at least 5 countries</p>	<p>Indicator 1: By October 2015, workshops held in each host country to scope development planning processes and identify entry points</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completed by May 2016 2. Completed by May 2016 3. Completed in December 2016 4. Completed by March 2017

	<p>Indicator 2: By December 2015, reports documenting country planning processes posted on project website</p> <p>Indicator 3: By December 2016 analyses of national development planning processes presented at CoP 13</p> <p>Indicator 4: By March 2017 analyses of national development planning processes included in final project report</p>	
<p>Activity 1.1 Convene a (virtual) meeting of the African Leadership Group to review key elements of each revised NBSAP and each national development plan and agree overall project approach</p>	<p>COMPLETED: First workshop held in Harare, Zimbabwe in November 2015. All the eight project countries participated in the workshop</p>	
<p>Activity 1.2 Country teams convene stakeholder workshops/meetings in each country to map out development planning processes and timetables and identify key entry points and indicators of success</p>	<p>COMPLETED. Country workshops were held between September 2015 and May 2016</p>	
<p>Activity 1.3: Country teams document (with support of IIED and WCMC) development planning processes and mainstreaming entry points and strategies</p>	<p>COMPLETED: All countries prepared reports summarising results of the national scoping workshops.</p>	
<p>Activity 1.4: IIED and WCMC produce a report summarising country processes and mainstreaming strategies and post on project website</p>	<p>COMPLETED: A summary of the country mainstreaming targets, strategies and progress was including in the Ghana workshop report (http://pubs.iied.org/G04125/)</p>	
<p>Output 2. National level application of mainstreaming tools and in at least 5 countries</p>	<p>Indicator 1: By December 2015 mainstreaming priorities and strategies agreed, and capacity needs assessed</p> <p>Indicator 2: By January 2016 tools/guidance addressing capacity needs agreed</p> <p>Indicator 3: By March 2016 tools/guidance developed and published</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completed by April 2016 2. Completed – tools agreed following Harare workshop 3. Amended - Tool 1, diagnostic, drafted in August 2015 and used in country workshops, refined and finalised in Dec 2016; Tool 2; writing tips, completed and published in March 2016; Tool 3, mainstreaming indicators drafted but retained in draft format as requires further testing before finalisation 4. Amended – COP 13 presentation evolved into a one-day event which included presentations of the countries’ overall experience, not effectiveness of the tools. Tools disseminated in hard copy to 90+ participants.

	Indicator 4: By December 2016 effectiveness of tools presented at CoP 13)	
Activity 2.1. Based on mainstreaming entry points and outline mainstreaming strategies, country teams identify capacity development need		COMPLETED - country teams have reported on capacity needs in workshop reports and session also held in Harare workshop and reported in workshop report
Activity 2.2. Virtual meeting of African Leadership Group to share results of development planning processes and capacity needs assessment and agree tools/guidance needed		COMPLETED – virtual meeting was replaced with a face to face international workshop in Harare
Activity 2.3: IIED and UNEP-WCMC develop and publish tools and guidance		COMPLETED – tools published and disseminated in hard copy and via project website
Activity 2.4: Country teams employ and adapt tools and guidance to address mainstreaming opportunities identified in Output 1.		COMPLETED - all countries used diagnostic tool; Zimbabwe and Uganda are using writing tool to help produce policy briefs
Output 3. Documentation and dissemination of experience and lessons learned (guidance for others) internationally.	<p>Indicator 1: By September 2016 lessons learned on influencing development planning processes shared between countries at project workshop</p> <p>Indicator 2: By December 2016 experience of influencing development planning processes in at least four countries documented</p> <p>Indicator 3: By December 2016 experience of influencing development planning processes in at least four countries presented at CoP 13</p> <p>Indicator 4: By March 2017 experience of influencing development planning processes and lessons learned written up as final project report and widely disseminated via partner websites, CBD focal points mailing list NBSAPs Forum</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. COMPLETED – Ghana workshop held in October 2016 2. COMPLETED – all countries documented experience in form of presentations shared at Ghana workshop 3. COMPLETED - country presentations included in one day event at CBD CoP 4. COMPLETED - summary of experience captured and documented in final mainstreaming guidance (http://pubs.iied.org/17608IIED/)
Activity 3.1. Country teams draw out lessons learned on success of mainstreaming approaches		COMPLETED

Activity 3.2. Project workshop convened to share lessons learned, compare mainstreaming success and adapt approaches where needed	COMPLETED – workshop held Oct 2016
Activity 3.3. IIED and UNEP-WCMC develop project report documenting mainstreaming targets, process, tools and experiences	COMPLETED – published as final mainstreaming guidance (http://pubs.iied.org/17608IIED/)
Activity 3.4. Side event held at CBD CoP 13 to disseminate experience	COMPLETED – report available at http://pubs.iied.org/G04168/
Activity 3.5: Wide dissemination of tools, guidance and lessons learned	Ongoing - dissemination via project website, special mailings and team members' participation in international events

Annex 3 Standard Measures

Code	Description	Total	Nationality	Gender	Title or Focus	Language	Comments
Training Measures							
1a	Number of people to submit PhD thesis						
1b	Number of PhD qualifications obtained						
2	Number of Masters qualifications obtained						
3	Number of other qualifications obtained						
4a	Number of undergraduate students receiving training						
4b	Number of training weeks provided to undergraduate students						
4c	Number of postgraduate students receiving training (not 1-3 above)						
4d	Number of training weeks for postgraduate students						
5	Number of people receiving other forms of long-term (>1yr) training not leading to formal qualification (e.g., not categories 1-4 above)						
6a	Number of people receiving other forms of short-term education/training (e.g., not categories 1-5 above)	(YEAR 1 = 25)	Botswana, Ghana, Malawi, Namibia, Seychelles, Uganda, Zambia Zimbabwe	16 Males and 9 Females	Harare workshop (November 2015)	English	
		(YEAR 2 = 30)	Botswana, Ghana, Malawi, Namibia, Seychelles,	20 Males and 10 Females	Ghana workshop (November 2016)	English	

			Uganda, Zambia Zimbabwe				
6b	Number of training weeks not leading to formal qualification	2 weeks (1 week per year (project workshops))	Botswana, Ghana, Malawi, Namibia, Seychelles, Uganda, Zambia Zimbabwe	30 Males and 16 Females	Harare workshop (November 2015) Ghana workshop (November 2016)	English	
7	Number of types of training materials produced for use by host country(s) (describe training materials)	2 X tools; 1 X draft Monitoring and Evaluation tool; 1 X overall Mainstreaming guidance and lessons; 2 x statements				English	http://pubs.iied.org/17582IIED/ http://pubs.iied.org/17586IIED/ http://pubs.iied.org/17608IIED/
Research Measures		Total	Nationality	Gender	Title	Language	Comments/ Weblink if available
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) produced for Governments, public authorities or other implementing agencies in the host country (ies)						
10	Number of formal documents produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording.						
11a	Number of papers published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals						
11b	Number of papers published or accepted for publication elsewhere						

12a	Number of computer-based databases established (containing species/generic information) and handed over to host country						
12b	Number of computer-based databases enhanced (containing species/genetic information) and handed over to host country						
13a	Number of species reference collections established and handed over to host country(s)						
13b	Number of species reference collections enhanced and handed over to host country(s)						

Dissemination Measures		Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
14a	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops organised to present/disseminate findings from Darwin project work	1	International	Males 54 and 40 Females	Mainstreaming and Sustainable Development Goals	English	CBD CoP. Report available at: http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G04168.pdf
14b	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.	9	National, Regional and International		Biodiversity Mainstreaming, Development and Capacity Building	English	See section 3.1, output 3 for details

Physical Measures		Total	Comments
20	Estimated value (£s) of physical assets handed over to host country(s)		
21	Number of permanent educational, training, research facilities or organisation established		
22	Number of permanent field plots established		Please describe

Financial Measures		Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
--------------------	--	-------	-------------	--------	-------	----------	----------

23	Value of additional resources raised from other sources (e.g., in addition to Darwin funding) for project work						
----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Annex 4 Aichi Targets

	Aichi Target	Tick if applicable to your project
1	People are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.	X
2	Biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.	X
3	Incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio economic conditions.	
4	Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits.	
5	The rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced.	
6	All fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits.	
7	Areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.	
8	Pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity.	
9	Invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment.	
10	The multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.	
11	At least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.	

12	The extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.	
13	The genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socio-economically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity.	

Darwin Final report template – March 201732

14	Ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.	
15	Ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.	
16	The Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation.	
17	Each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan.	X
18	The traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels.	
19	Knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied.	
20	The mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 from all sources, and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization should increase substantially from the current levels. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resource needs assessments to be developed and reported by Parties.	

Annex 5 Publications

Type * (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Nationality of lead author	Nationality of institution of lead author	Gender of lead author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. web link, contact address etc)
Toolkit	IIED and UNEP-WCMC (2017) Mainstreaming biodiversity and development: guidance from African experience 2012-17	IIED and WCMC, various authors. Lead taken by Steve Bass – British	British	Male	IIED - London	http://pubs.iied.org/17608IIED
Draft guidance*	Mapendembe et al. (Draft 2017) Measuring biodiversity mainstreaming success: A monitoring and evaluation tool based on African experience 2012- 17	Abisha Mapendembe	Zimbabwean	Male	WCMC - Cambridge	Attached as Annex 7 to this report
Workshop report	Mapendembe A et al. (2017) Mainstreaming biodiversity in development and the Sustainable Development Goals: sharing and developing workable solutions	Abisha Mapendembe	Zimbabwean	Male	WCMC - Cambridge	http://pubs.iied.org/G04168
Workshop report	Durrah S (2017) Second International Workshop Report: Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Development Policy and Planning	Sarah Durrah	British	Female	WCMC - Cambridge	http://pubs.iied.org/G04125/
Statement	African Leadership Group (2016) Accra statement on mainstreaming biodiversity in practice	African Leadership Group	Various, African	Male and Female	IIED - London	http://pubs.iied.org/G04111/
Toolkit	Goodrich R (2016) Writing about biodiversity. Tips and templates for policy and media material	Rosalind Goodrich	British	Female	IIED - London	http://pubs.iied.org/17582IIED/
Toolkit	IIED and UNEP-WCMC (2016) Mainstreaming biodiversity. A guide	IIED and WCMC, various authors	Various	Male and Female	IIED - London	http://pubs.iied.org/17586IIED/

Darwin Final report template – March 201734

	to selecting strategic development targets (also in Russian)					Russian (http://pubs.iied.org/17586RIIED)
Statement	African Leadership Group (2016) Harare Statement on using NBSAPs as a tool for mainstreaming biodiversity into national and sectoral development policies	African Leadership Group	Various, African	Male and Female	IIED - London	http://pubs.iied.org/G04010/
Workshop report	Mapendembe A et al. (2016) Workshop Report: Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Development Policy and Planning	Abisha Mapendembe	Zimbabwean	Male	WCMC - Cambridge	http://pubs.iied.org/G04009/
Project flyer	http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G03956.pdf	IIED and WCMC	Various	Various	IIED - London	http://pubs.iied.org/G03956/

Annex 6 Darwin Contacts

Ref No	EIDPO047
Project Title	NBSAPs 2.0: From Policy to Practice
Project Leader Details	
Name	Dilys Roe
Role within Darwin Project	Project Leader and Project Principal Researcher
Address	International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) 80-86 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8NH
Phone	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 1	
Name	John Tayleur
Organisation	UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEPWCMC),
Role within Darwin Project	Project Principal Researcher
Address	Ecosystem Assessment Programme UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre 219 Huntingdon Road Cambridge, CB3 0DL, UK
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 2	
Name	Khulekani Mpofo
Organisation	Botswana: Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism (MEWT)
Role within Darwin Project	In Country Coordination
Address	Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 3	
Name	Eric Okoree
Organisation	Ghana: Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI).
Role within Darwin Project	In Country Coordination
Address	Post Office Box WY. 2287 Kwabanya, Accra Ghana

Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 4	

Name	Monipher Musasa
Organisation	Malawi: Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining (MNREM).
Role within Darwin Project	In Country Coordination
Address	Private Bag 394 Lilongwe Malawi
Fax/Skype	
Email	

Partner 5	
Name	Kauna Schroder
Organisation	Namibia: Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET).
Role within Darwin Project	In Country Coordination
Address	Private Bag 13306 Windhoek, Namibia
Fax/Skype	
Email	

Partner 6	
Name	Eddy Denis Matatiken
Organisation	Seychelles: Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change (MEECC).
Role within Darwin Project	In Country Coordination
Address	Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change P.O Box 445 Victoria Mahe, Seychelles
Fax/Skype	
Email	

Partner 7	
Name	Francis Ogwal
Organisation	Uganda: The National Environment Management Authority (NEMA).
Role within Darwin Project	In Country Coordination
Address	NEMA House ,2nd Floor Plot 17/19/21 Jinja Road P.O.Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda

Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 8	
Name	Ephraim Mwepya Shitima
Organisation	Zambia: Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MLNREP)
Role within Darwin Project	In Country Coordination
Address	Department of a Environment and Natural Resources Management Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Box 50694 Ridgeway Lusaka
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 9	
Name	Abraham Zivayi Matiza
Organisation	Zimbabwe: Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate (MEWC).
Role within Darwin Project	In Country Coordination
Address	Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate. P.O Box CY 7767 Causeway, HARARE
Fax/Skype	
Email	