



UNEP WCMC

BIODIVERSITY MAINSTREAMING

Integrating biodiversity, development and poverty reduction



A rapid
diagnostic
tool

This Rapid Diagnostic Tool is an output of the project *NBSAPs 2.0: Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Development*. This is a three-year (2012-2015) project which is intended to build resilient and effective national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) that influence development decisions and improve outcomes for biodiversity and poverty. The project is implemented by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) in collaboration with the CBD Secretariat, UNEP, UNDP and the Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI). Working with four African countries – Botswana, Namibia, Seychelles and Uganda – the project is encouraging leadership in biodiversity and development mainstreaming and highlighting the experience of these four focal countries to influence a whole new generation of NBSAPs.

This Rapid Diagnostic Tool is based on the Environmental Mainstreaming Diagnostic developed by Barry Dalal-Clayton and Steve Bass of IIED, available at www.environmental-mainstreaming.org/documents/EM%20Diagnostic.pdf.

WHAT IS BIODIVERSITY MAINSTREAMING?

Biodiversity and poverty reduction are intrinsically linked and demand an integrated approach. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) has long emphasised the need for integrating, or ‘mainstreaming’, biodiversity into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies, most recently in its new Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (2011-2020).

Mainstreaming biodiversity is about more than applying “safeguards” to ensure that poverty reduction and development processes do no harm to biodiversity, but also recognising the potential of biodiversity for achieving desirable development outcomes. It is thus as much a political issue — requiring a process of institutional change — as it is a technical one. Although there has been limited experience in biodiversity mainstreaming to date, many lessons can be learned from environmental mainstreaming efforts.¹

This extensive experience shows that:

- It requires **collaboration** — a two-way exchange between biodiversity and development interests rather than a one-way push by just one. ‘Integration’ or ‘reciprocal biodiversity-development mainstreaming’ may be more accurate, if less well-known terms.
- It is as much a process of **political and institutional change** as one of procedural or technical change.
- **Cross-sector coordination** is essential. Often environmental mainstreaming is led by the environment sector, at times the politically ‘weakest’ sector. Yet environment, including biodiversity, cuts across key sectors (for example, agriculture, mining, forestry). Therefore it requires cross-sector coordination to strengthen links and actions between sectors and associated public and private sector institutions that affect and/or benefit from biodiversity.

¹ See www.environmental-mainstreaming.org and Dalal-Clayton, B., Bass, S. 2009. *The Challenges of Environmental Mainstreaming*. IIED, London.

- Proponents need to present compelling **information, analysis and recommendations** in a form that is decipherable and understandable by the economists and planners leading on development planning. This can involve economic valuation of biodiversity services (for example, cost-benefit analysis).
- It depends upon **leadership and catalytic organisations** to forge the necessary links and processes. Part of leadership is the element of 'champions' — that is, individuals who identify with and subscribe to the objectives of biodiversity mainstreaming and who have political traction or status to become effective supporters, ambassadors and or champions of the case. It is a continuing and **long term process** rather than a one-off project.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS TOOL?

For biodiversity mainstreaming to be effective, understanding the political context and development objectives are as important as making the case for biodiversity. This rapid diagnostic tool is intended to address this issue, helping policy makers — and other stakeholders — understand the extent to which biodiversity and development objectives are already integrated at the national level and the obstacles and constraints that need to be overcome to promote further, and more effective, integration.

The Tool sets out a framework of issues and questions that can be used to:

- Understand what **progress** has been made to mainstream biodiversity to date;
- Map and analyse the **mainstreaming approaches** that have been adopted;
- Assess how **institutional structures and procedures** support or inhibit biodiversity mainstreaming;
- Examine **performance** — internally (within the institution) and 'on-the-ground' (in terms of outcomes and impacts); and
- Identify areas for **change and improvement**.

The 10th Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) urged Parties to revise and update their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) in line with the new *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020*² and to "...use the revised and updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans as effective instruments for the integration of biodiversity targets into national development and poverty reduction policies and strategies..." (Decision X/2). This tool can be used by countries to inform the stocktaking and assessment and stakeholder engagement stages of their NBSAP revision process, and more broadly to review progress in policy change.

² Available at www.cbd.int/decision/cop/?id=12268

HOW DO I USE THIS TOOL?

Diagnosis can be undertaken as a self-assessment or externally by independent review. Identification and analysis of relevant policy documents is a useful starting point but documents alone are unlikely to provide a sufficient basis for reviewing how well biodiversity issues are currently being addressed in development decisions and vice versa. Document review needs to be complemented by engagement with a wide range of involved or affected stakeholders from government departments, NGOs, communities, private sector organisations and so on. Each question includes some suggestions of the kinds of issues to explore at each stage of the diagnosis. The questions can be explored in as much or as little detail as time and resources allow, and updated as new developments and insights occur. Writing up the results of the assessment as a summary paper, short policy brief, bullet points or graphic will provide a useful situation analysis that can act as a basis for discussion and validation with relevant stakeholders and for assessing and debating priorities.

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

Vision: What is the ultimate vision for biodiversity mainstreaming in your country?	06
Institutions: What is the political and institutional context for biodiversity mainstreaming in your country?	08
Knowledge: What is the current state of knowledge about the interactions between biodiversity and poverty in your country, and where are the main gaps?	09
Initiatives: What attempts have been made to integrate biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation in your country?	10
Mainstreaming progress: How successful have these initiatives been? What are the impacts achieved?	12
Constraints: What constraints still stand in the way of biodiversity being more fully integrated into key decisions and institutions?	13
Opportunities: Where are the opportunities to build a business case for biodiversity as a key development asset? What are the process-based opportunities where the necessary conditions can be institutionalised? Who are the champions that can carry the case forward?	14

2

INSTITUTIONS

What is the political and institutional context for biodiversity mainstreaming in your country?

Describe the key institutional structures for decision making in development and in biodiversity, the associated political climate, socioeconomic and ecological situation. Identify what relevant national (and subnational) strategies, plans and processes have been put in place for poverty reduction, national development and biodiversity conservation and what international commitments have been made. This can also be expanded to cover sector plans (for example, agriculture and biodiversity, wildlife/protected areas/tourism sector planning).

What internal or external influences/factors are changing the level of attention afforded to biodiversity in your country?

3

KNOWLEDGE

What is the current state of knowledge about the interactions between biodiversity and poverty in your country, and where are the main gaps?

For example, what information exists concerning the interaction of specific poor groups and poverty-creating processes with biodiversity, conservation, protected area management, and so on?

Compile a list of key documents, research initiatives and data sources, and use this to identify key gaps where more information is needed.

4

INITIATIVES

What attempts have been made to integrate biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation in your country?

Examples might include protected area benefit sharing schemes, sustainable use initiatives, biotrade.

Describe the range of activities such as:

Government processes: for example, development planning for economy growth and poverty reduction, sector strategies and planning (e.g. agriculture), forest management planning (including for REDD), state of environment reports, reports to the CBD, ratification of international agreements

Community-based processes: for example, achievements of: collaborative management of protected areas, community conservation and livelihood activities, involvement in wildlife tourism

Civil society: for example, achievements of: watchdog roles and other provisions for transparency; the different ways in which local issues surrounding land rights, social impacts of protected areas etc. have been dealt with

Media: for example, how the different media have investigated and promoted biodiversity-development interactions

Business activities: for example, ways to access and develop biodiversity markets such as tourism, forest products; promotion of environmental standards

Development assistance: in support of the above or other initiatives

5

MAINSTREAMING PROGRESS³

How successful have these initiatives been? What are the impacts achieved?

Is there any evidence of progress towards some of the outcomes identified in Table 1? For example:

- Governance
- Policy, politics, law, strategy
- Planning
- Budget
- Institutional and capacity strengthening to address biodiversity-poverty issues, including improved information base on biodiversity-poverty issues
- Investment
- Behavioral change
- Pro-poor biodiversity management
- Ultimate biodiversity and developmental impacts

What impact (positive and negative) are these outcomes having and on who?

³This question can potentially be asked before question 4 if this seems appropriate – i.e. identify where there have been improvements (question 5) explore what initiatives (question 4) might have led up to this. Explored in this way there is no presumption that the initiatives tried have been successful.

CONSTRAINTS

What constraints still stand in the way of biodiversity being more fully integrated into key decisions and institutions?

Some constraints will be long-standing obstacles — for example, entrenched ideologies, limited capacity, the challenge of connecting biological sciences with the social and economic discourse used by development planners. Others will emerge with new development opportunities — for example the opportunity for NBSAPs to connect with the economic growth and poverty reduction objectives of national and subnational development plans, trade-offs between biodiversity benefits and carbon benefits within emerging REDD+ schemes, or identification of oil or mineral reserves in high biodiversity areas.

Review these challenges using the categories above. Who benefits from a lack of integration and how?

6

7

OPPORTUNITIES

Where are the opportunities to build a business case for biodiversity as a key development asset? What are the process-based opportunities where the necessary conditions can be institutionalised? Who are the champions that can carry the case forward?

Opportunities can help make a 'business case' for biodiversity, for example through:

- Ecotourism
- Trade in biodiversity-based products and services
- Improved genetic diversity for agriculture
- Green economy, green investment and green jobs opportunities in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, energy, tourism, etc.

Another type of 'opportunity' is understanding at that point in time the national development planning process and how to engage. National development plans are normally five year plans, with annual progress reporting processes against national indicators, which are part of the plan. Years three and four of a five year cycle are an ideal time to start informing and influencing evaluation of the plans performance towards biodiversity mainstreaming and informing the planning of the next five year plan. This can also be similar with subnational plans (that is, district/provincial development plans) or national sector plans.

Where is your country in the relevant development planning cycles?

Furthermore, we know that successful mainstreaming often relies on 'champions' or those who have the necessary recognition and status to make their voices heard with those who need to be influenced.

Who are the potential champions for the mainstreaming business case?

WHAT NEXT?

Through this process you will have scoped the political economy and governance issues that affect biodiversity and poverty, identified the relevant stakeholders who need to be involved in mainstreaming, and looked at successfully mainstreamed outcomes and the initiatives behind them. Successful mainstreaming requires leadership, political acumen and good information. This analysis will allow the identification of appropriate entry points for promoting and/or further enhancing mainstreaming.

Project implementers



Project partners



Funders



This Rapid Diagnostic Tool is an output of the project *NBSAPs 2.0: Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Development*. This project is coordinated by IIED and UNEP-WCMC and funded by the UK Government's Darwin Initiative and UK aid from the UK Government, however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of the UK Government.

The tool was initially released in draft via the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (www.povertyandconservation.info) and improved through feedback from project partners and users.