PROJECT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
GEF COUNCIL WORK PROGRAM SUBMISSION

AGENCY'S PROJECT ID:
GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 2796
COUNTRY: GLOBAL
PROJECT TITLE: Building the partnership to track progress at the global level in achieving the 2010 biodiversity target
GEF AGENCY: UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING AGENCY(IES): UNEP-WCMC and a range of collaborating organizations (see Annex G)
DURATION: Phased approach over 6 years with two phases each of three years
GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity
GEF OPERATIONAL PROGRAM: OP 1-4, OP 12 and 13
GEF STRATEGIC PRIORITY: BD-4 Generation and dissemination of best practices for addressing current and emerging biodiversity issues
PIPELINE ENTRY DATE: June 2005
ESTIMATED STARTING DATE: Sep 2006

FINANCING PLAN (US$)	
GEF ALLOCATION	
Project Phase 1	3,639,000
PDF A	--
PDF B	306,000
PDF C	--
Sub-Total GEF	*3,945,000*
CO-FINANCING*	
GEF Agency UNEP	401,000
National Contribution (UK)	315,000
Others	9,664,801
Sub-Total Co-financing:	*10,380,801*
Total Project Financing:	**14,325,801**

Financing For Associated Activities If Any: N/A
Leveraged Resources If Any: N/A

Contribution to Key Indicators of the Business Plan:
This project will contribute substantially to the capacity to monitor changes in the global coverage and management effectiveness of protected areas, and in the state of and pressures upon biodiversity. The project will thereby inform decision making to facilitate the improved conservation of species, habitats, and ecosystems, and improved protection of globally significant genetic material for agriculture. The project will contribute to catalyzing sustainability of protected areas by aggregating measurement of management effectiveness and highlighting trends globally. The project will also contribute to monitoring of global trends in the sustainable use of biodiversity, assisting in efforts to promote mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in production systems.

Record of endorsement on behalf of the Government(s)
[Name(s) and title(s) of Operational Focal Point(s)]

_____ Date: _____
This proposal has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the standards of the GEF Project Review Criteria for approval.

Mr. Olivier Deleuze
Officer-in-Charge
UNEP Division of GEF Coordination
PO Box 30552
Nairobi 00100, Kenya
Olivier.Deleuze@unep.org

Project Contact Person:
Dr. Nigel Sizer, Senior Programme Officer
UNEP-DGEF
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 207 623265
Nigel.Sizer@unep.org

Date:

Contents

1. PROJECT SUMMARY

a) Project Rationale, Objectives, Outputs, and Activities.

The world community has adopted a global target for reducing the rate of loss of biodiversity by 2010, and needs to be able to track progress in achieving this target. This project aims to ensure that the wide range of agencies and organizations already working in this area can collaborate more effectively to deliver a suite of global indicators that will be used for tracking and communicating progress towards this target. The agreed global indicators are at different stages of development and implementation, and are managed by a wide range of organizations and agencies. This project will support the regular delivery of a suite of 2010 indicators at the global level, in a way that is meaningful to a range of audiences in supporting both policy intervention and communicating the degree of success in achieving the 2010 target. This requires cost-effective partnership of the organizations and agencies working on the individual indicators. The indicators will be meaningful at a global level, but clearly linked to related indicators at national and regional levels, to targets and indicators used within the context of a range of international conventions and programmes, and to targets and indicators relevant to other initiatives and sectors (in particular the Millennium Development Goals).

The development objective of this project is a reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss at the global level, through improved decisions for the conservation of global biodiversity. Success in achieving the development objective will be measured by the following objectively verifiable indicator: that the suite of available global 2010 indicators identified by the CBD shows progress, by 2010, in reduction of the rate of loss of biodiversity at the global level.

The immediate objective of this project is that decisions made by governments and other stakeholders are better informed to improve the conservation status of species, habitats, and ecosystems at the global level. Success in achieving the immediate objective of the project will be measured using the following indicators:

- Increased availability and use of the 2010 biodiversity indicators by decision-makers in policy fora including MEA COPs, UNGA meetings, and GEF Council, between 2009 and 2012, compared to 2002 to 2006.

- The implemented 2010 biodiversity indicators are incorporated, by 2010, into products that are used in at least three Convention processes, and at least twenty international programmes and mechanisms, national governments, and agencies (such as UN agencies, IUCN, various national governments and regional processes such as the European Union).

The full project is proposed as a phased project, of two 3-year phases (see below). The first phase will deliver three major outcomes, and six associated outputs, described below.

Outcome 1: 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership generating information useful to decision-makers

A key outcome of the project is the generation of new and updated relevant information on trends in global biodiversity, based on the 2010 biodiversity indicators. This outcome will be achieved through two outputs: the establishment and maintenance of a working partnership on 2010 indicators, and the preparation and implementation of a communications strategy that meets user needs. The activities associated with these outputs are identified below. Success in achieving Outcome 1 will be measured through the following indicator:

- At least 70% of the headline biodiversity indicators identified by the CBD in the context of the 2010 target are implemented and available from organisations within the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership by 2009.

This target relates to the current and expected development plans for the individual indicators as presented in Annexes F and G. It is expected that measures for at least 15 of the 22 headline indicators will be implemented during the course of this project.

Output 1.1: Working partnership on 2010 indicators established and maintained

The output will involve the further establishment and maintenance of the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (2010BIP), and the identification of other stakeholders and their contribution to the activities of the 2010BIP. Success in achieving output 1.1 will be identified through several indicators:

- Four full meetings are held of the Partnership and 2010BIP Steering Committee during the course of the project, 2006-2009.
- At least 20 other biodiversity indicator stakeholder organizations are engaged in the Partnership through involvement in its activities between 2006-2009.
- The 2010BIP project is efficiently and effectively managed and coordinated, with project activities delivered to budget and on schedule.

Activities associated with this output include:

1.1.1 Development of the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, based on organizations and agencies delivering the various agreed 2010 indicators.
1.1.2 Implementation of processes to share ideas, standards, guidelines, methodologies, and data in support of indicator development amongst the Partnership and more widely.
1.1.3 Four full Partnership meetings, and four meetings of the 2010BIP Steering Committee to be held during the course of the project.
1.1.4 Identification of other stakeholders and opportunities for their contribution to the activities and objectives of the Partnership.
1.1.5 Coordination and management of the full suite of activities of the 2010BIP, including the maintenance of documentation of on-going lessons learned from the implementation of the project.

Output 1.2: Communication strategy meeting user needs prepared and implemented
This output will ensure that the information generated by the Partnership is communicated in the most effective way to a wide range of decision-makers in international decision-making bodies and at national and regional scales. Further and periodic review of user needs for the 2010 indicators, combined with the review and refinement of the 2010BIP communications strategy (see Annex K) will ensure that the communications strategy delivers the most up-to-date information on trends in global biodiversity available. Success in achieving output 1.2 will be identified through the following indicators:

- Communications strategy is finalised and in place for the 2010 indicators by the end of the first year, responding to the needs of users.

- User surveys are performed to measure the success of the communications strategy for meeting user needs by the end of the third year of the project as a basis for adaptive management of the project.

- Project website used and maintained throughout the project.

- Indicator products tailored to meet specific user needs developed annually, building on available indicators, and disseminated to major international initiatives, meetings and decision-making fora.

Activities outlined in the 2010BIP communication strategy include coordination among BIP Partners' communications officers, side events and plenary presentations at major international meetings, liaison with national-level stakeholders, and use of the 2010BIP website (www.twentyten.net) and email alerts to provide periodic updates about the project. This component will benefit significantly from lessons learned from other global processes, particularly the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, where the need to ensure legitimate, credible and relevant processes and information was recognized, coupled with extensive communications and outreach in order to ensure policy impacts at multiple scales (see below, and the full communications strategy in Annex K). The communication strategy will make use of the large number of stakeholders already engaged in the Partnership to ensure the most efficient use of resources.

Activities associated with output 1.2 include:
1.2.1   Undertaking an annual review of potential users of the 2010 indicators, and their needs.
1.2.2   Review and refinement of the communications and outreach strategy.
1.2.3   Development of promotional and outreach materials for the use of Partnership members and others, including presentation material, graphics, leaflets, brochures, reports, web material, scientific articles, and material for inclusion in the reports of other processes, as appropriate.
1.2.4   Further identification and implementation of means to relate the 2010 indicators to other international conventions and programmes.
1.2.5   Establishment and maintenance of the Partnership website.
1.2.6   Analysis of the links between the each of 2010 biodiversity indicators.
1.2.7   Further identification and implementation of linkages of the 2010 indicators to the MDGs, targets, and indicators.
1.2.8   Further identification of the relationship of the indicators arising from other relevant conventions and programmes to the suite of 2010 indicators.
1.2.9   Delivery of appropriate analysis of 2010 indicators for use in products developed and delivered by other processes and initiatives, including MEAs and other assessment processes.
1.2.10   Development of a range of suitable products based on outputs and analysis of the 2010 biodiversity indicators.
1.2.11   Establishment and implementation of a process for peer review of the products delivered from the Partnership.
1.2.12   Translation, publication, and wide dissemination of the Partnership products.

Outcome 2: Improved global indicators implemented and available

The two outputs relating to this second outcome are: standards, guidelines, and methods for indicator development, peer review, and information sharing (output 2.1), and the strengthening and delivery of individual indicators (output 2.2). The activities associated with the successful production of each of these outputs, and therefore the overall outcome, are identified below. Success in achieving Outcome 2 will be measured using the following indicator:

- At least 70% of the headline biodiversity indicators identified by the CBD in the context of the 2010 target are improved by 2009 through increased data input, greater time-series coverage, or capacity to demonstrate trends in rates of change.

Output 2.1: Standards, guidelines, and methods for indicator development, peer review, and information sharing

This output will involve the sharing of ideas, standards, guidelines, methodologies, and data amongst the Partnership and more widely, as well as the peer review of individual 2010 indicators. Success in achieving output 2.1 will be identified through the following indicators:

- Indicator development plans and information management strategies in place by the end of the first year of the project, and implemented by 2009.

- Peer review procedures in place and implemented for each indicator by 2009.

Activities associated with this output include:

2.1.1   Review of needs for the further development and implementation of individual indicators.
2.1.2   Establishment of basic standards for each indicator, including quality assurance processes and documentation.
2.1.3   Implementation of peer review strategies for all indicators developed within the 2010BIP.
2.1.4   Updating and maintenance of indicator methodologies, metadata, and completed indicator time series in Partnership information sharing facilities.

Output 2.2: Individual indicators strengthened and delivered

This output involves the further development and delivery of the individual 2010 indicators, in support of the CBD headline indicators and focal areas. Success in achieving output 2.2 will be identified through the following indicators:

- At least 70% of the global 2010 biodiversity indicators delivered by 2009, incorporating data and expertise from a wider range of national and other sources than before 2007.

- Individual indicators delivered and used in products of the 2010 Biodiversity Indicator Partnership by 2009.

This output has one associated activity:

2.2.1   Further development of identified indicators in support of the CBD headline indicators, including development and implementation of short- and long-term plans for data collection, management, and use.

Outcome 3: National governments and regional organizations using and contributing to improved delivery of global indicators

The two outputs relating to Outcome 3 are: enhanced capacity of national governments and regional organizations to contribute to global indicator delivery (output 3.1), i.e. an increased flow of data and methodological information from national and regional levels to the global level, and guidelines and other tools to be made available to governments and regional organizations for the use of global indicators and their methodologies (output 3.2), i.e. an increased use of global indicators and indicator methodology at the national and regional level. The activities associated with the successful production of each of these outputs, and therefore the overall outcome, are identified below. Success in achieving Outcome 3 will be measured using the following indicators:

- At least 50% of the biodiversity indicators identified by the CBD in the context of the 2010 target are further developed based on increased contribution of local, national, and regional data by the end of the third year of the project.

- At least 30 national governments and regional organizations are using a broader set of 2010 biodiversity indicators to report on progress towards the 2010 target, by 2010.

Outcome 3 and its outputs 3.1 and 3.2 involve the development of guidelines (a) to facilitate the use of global 2010 indicator methodologies and development processes at national and regional levels, (b) to facilitate increased local, national, and regional contributions to the development of global 2010 indicators, and (c) on the options for use of global 2010 indicators in national and regional level policy and decision-making. These guidelines will be developed by the 2010BIP and disseminated at regional capacity building workshops that are being held by other bodies, including the CBD, and that are fully-funded by other mechanisms and national governments, including several European governments that have shown considerable interest in this process. Members of the 2010BIP Secretariat and Partners will attend these workshops to present the guidelines to representatives of governments and national and regional organisations, and facilitate their use. The use of existing planned and funded workshops through other processes will be used to communicate the 2010BIP guidelines, and ensures that the BIP project will be able to disseminate information in a highly cost-effective manner. In addition, the Partnership will make use of the range of stakeholders involved to ensure the guidelines are disseminated and used as widely as possible.

Output 3.1: Enhanced capacity of national governments and regional organizations to contribute to global indicator delivery
Success in achieving output 3.1 will be identified through the following indicators:
- Guidelines available, by the end of the first year of the project, on enhancing the use of local, national, and regional data and methodologies in global indicator processes.
- At least 30 national governments and regional organizations are actively involved in global indicator delivery.

Activities associated with Output 3.1 include:
3.1.1   Development of guidelines to facilitate increased contribution of local, national, and regional data from governments and other organizations to the development of global 2010 indicators.
3.1.2   Contribution to regional capacity building workshops (organised by CBD Secretariat and others) and other appropriate fora to disseminate and facilitate the use of the guidelines.

Output 3.2 Guidelines and other tools available to governments and regional organizations for the use of global indicators and their methodologies in national and regional decision-making.
Success in achieving output 3.2 will be identified through the following indicators:

- Guidelines are made available, by the end of the third year of the project, on the appropriate application of global indicator methodologies and lessons learned for regional and national processes.

- Guidelines are made available, by the end of the first year of the project, on the use of global indicators in national and regional policy.

Activities associated with Output 3.2 include:
3.2.1   Development of guidelines to facilitate the use of global 2010 indicator methodologies for the development of indicators at national and regional levels by governments, projects (including those of the GEF) and other organisations.
3.2.2   Development of guidelines on the options for use of global 2010 indicators in national and regional level policy and decision-making by governments and regional decision-making bodies.

3.2.3   Contribution to regional capacity building workshops and other appropriate fora to disseminate and facilitate the use of the guidelines

Phased approach:

The three project outcomes and six project outputs will be executed in an integrated manner with strong linkages between them. In addition, given the complexity of this project and the manner in which it is likely to develop over the coming years, a 2-phased approach is proposed. The 2nd full phase builds heavily on the success of the first phase. In the first phase ("2010 Indicator Development and Delivery", 2006-2009), work will focus substantially on development and delivery of indicators, on their integration with other programmes at national and international levels, and on means for ensuring their effective delivery. During the 2nd phase ("2010 Reporting", 2009-2012), work will substantially focus on reporting on progress in achieving the 2010 target, and ensuring the continued development and sustainability of the full suite of 2010 indicators. It is also conceivable that the project may continue beyond 2012 to focus on biodiversity indicators in connection with reporting on achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and biodiveristy-related targets in 2015. This project proposal focuses on the 1st on these phases, and it is anticipated that a 2nd phase would result from an additional proposal to GEF at the appropriate time.

Project budget

The project phase one budget is given in Table 1, below. Full budget information can be found in Annex E.

Table 1. Component Financing in US$

Outcomes & Outputs	Total Component Budget	Co-Funding			Requested from GEF
		Cash	In kind	Total co-funding	
Outcome 1: 2010 biodiversity indicators partnership generating information useful to decision makers	**2,072,000**	**626,000**	**0**	**626,000**	**1,446,000**
Output 1.1. Working partnership on 2010 indicators established and maintained	1,222,000	_226,000_	_0_	226,000	996,000
Output 1.2 Communication strategy meeting user needs prepared and implemented	850,000	_400,000_	_0_	400,000	450,000
Outcome 2: Improved global indicators implemented and available	**11,479,801**	_**5,011,248**_	_**4,398,553**_	**9,409,801**	**2,070,000**
Output 2.1: Standards, guidelines and methods for indicator development, peer review and information sharing	135,000	_0_	_0_	0	135,000
Output 2.2: Individual indicators strengthened and delivered	11,344,801	_5,011,248_	_4,398,553_	9,409,801	1,935,000
Outcome 3: National governments and regional organizations using and contributing to improved delivery of global indicators	**198,000**	_**75,000**_	_**0**_	**75,000**	**123,000**
Output 3.1: Enhanced capacity of national governments and regional organizations to contribute to global indicator delivery	104,000	_75,000_	_0_	75,000	29,000
Output 3.2: Guidelines and other tools available to governments and regional	94,000	_0_	_0_	0	94,000

organizations for the use of global indicators and their methodologies.					
TOTAL	**13,749,801**	**5,712,248**	**4,398,553**	**10,110,801**	**3,639,000**

b) Key assumptions and risks

The project carries with it a number of assumptions and associated risks. The main assumptions are that there is willingness of all stakeholders to work together to develop the full suite of indicators, that methodologies can be implemented to deliver the indicators, and that the suite of indicators will be relevant to the intended user groups.

The key assumption associated with the development objective of the project is that the improved information delivered from this project will be used to help make better decisions on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The key assumptions associated with the immediate objective of the 2010BIP project are (a) the availability of sufficient data to ensure full development of the databases underlying the global indicators; and (b) the relevance of the suite of 2010 indicators identified by the CBD to particular policy agendas. Further assumptions associated with each of the three outcomes of the 2010BIP project are summarised below.

For Outcome 1 (2010 Biodiversity Indicator Partnership generating information useful to decision-makers), assumptions include:

- Organisations working on indicators will continue to cooperate and contribute to the project;
- Partners are willing to work together to develop the full suite of indicators;
- Partnership members are available for meetings of the Partnership;
- Sufficient resources are available in Partnership organisations to fully implement a decentralised communications strategy;
- Products can be developed that meet users' needs.

For Outcome 2 (Improved global indicators implemented and available), assumptions include:

- Data are available to collate for use in indicators;
- Appropriate methodological advances are possible within the time-frame of the project;
- Agreement can be reached on a process for individual indicator implementation;
- Technical solutions to indicators exist and can be agreed on;
- Peer review and information management strategies are implemented by 2010BIP Partners involved in indicator development.

For Outcome 3 (National governments and regional organizations using and contributing to improved delivery of global indicators), assumptions include:

- Governments and regional organizations are willing to contribute relevant data for incorporation into the global indicators;
- Governments and regional organizations recognize the value of the 2010 biodiversity indicators for tracking change in biodiversity at the national and regional level;
- 2010BIP products are used and disseminated at regional workshops and other events held independently of the BIP project;
- Global data and indicator methodologies are useful at sub-global scales;
- Capacity and resources for data collection, collation, and analysis exist, or can be built, at national and regional levels to contribute to global indicator development.

A risk for the 2010BIP project is that the scientific capabilities for each indicator do not reach the necessary standards to supply a global indicator suite for biodiversity. Lack of data availability, lack of appropriate methodologies to collate, analyse, interpret the data in the context of global biodiversity loss, or the lack of adequate standardization in data, methods or classification are all such risks. These risks are coupled with the availability of adequate resources to ensure full development of the technical aspects and the underlying datasets. The project has attempted to minimise those risks by focusing on those indicators that are most likely to be delivered by 2010, and that have access to co-financing to increase the likelihood of the development costs being met and through an information management plan that will support harmonization of base data sets.

A second risk is that the indicators fail to provide useful information to the policy agenda they intend to address. However, this risk is mitigated by the fact that the project is responding directly to user needs expressed through the CBD process and because the project will ensure that user needs are accounted for during the further development, and implementation of the project. This will be achieved through continuous dialogue with user groups, in particular user partners from Governments, MEAs and other entities. A strong communication strategy (see Annex K for full details) will also ensure the project objectives are in line with user needs, and that products developed by the Partnership reach the relevant entities.

Key elements of the project communication strategy include coordination of BIP Partners' communications officers, side events and plenary presentations at major international meetings, liaison with IUCN's Countdown 2010 project to seek input from national-level stakeholders, the 2010BIP website (www.twentyten.net) and email notification to provide a wide user community with project and indicator updates. Communication products will be generated by the BIP secretariat and will be designed to support partner outreach to international conventions, UN agencies and other international organizations, civil society organizations, business and industry, and the mass media. Implementation of the communications strategy will enable BIP to be positioned as the best and most reliable source for global biodiversity indicator information. It will result in a demand from end users for the information generated by BIP, the use of BIP information in documents, publications, and news reports, formal recognition of the BIP process and products by international conventions and organizations, and a growing number of entities actively engaged with BIP's work, both in the production of information and its dissemination. The project gains much in the communications strategy from lessons learned from communication and outreach of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (see below).

There is a risk of inadequate 'buy-in' from an important sector or stakeholder group, in particular national governments. Addressing the challenge of developing involvement of these sectors is part of the purpose of the project and has commenced in the PDF-B phase by heavily involving staff from several ministries and convention representatives in project activities. This will be continued in the full project through the introduction of 2010BIP to regional and subregional environmental fora, such as the Forum of Ministers of Environment of Latin America and the Caribbean and the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment, to the project and ensuring buy-in by national representatives thereby increasing the appeal of the Partnership to potential stakeholders.

Another, minimal, risk is in failure to create a working partnership between all the stakeholders to deliver the 2010 indicators. The project coordination unit (PCU) will endeavour to maintain a strong and positive relationship with all partners and ensure that the needs of all collaborating entities are dealt with in a satisfactory and constructive way. Letters of agreement between UNEP-WCMC and Partners will provide the working arrangements in terms of the expectations and requirements. The willingness of all stakeholders to work together is an integral part of this project and every effort has been, and will continue to be made to ensure all partners feel adequately represented and involved in all aspects of the project. The PDFB phase has demonstrated a high level of involvement and commitment by partners.

A final but important risk is that decision-makers may not necessarily use the best available information provided to them. Several steps will be taken to minimise this risk. Forming close and strong relationships and communication channels between Partners, the Partnership and end users will make sure that the end user needs are understood and met. Furthermore, ongoing evaluation of progress and delivery of outputs will ensure that these are relevant to end users, and that any necessary changes can be made accordingly throughout the project. Finally, information products and reports will be specifically targeted for policy makers and will explicitly state the importance the indicators and ways in which the information can be used in policy decisions, not only globally, bu also at national and regional scale.

2. COUNTRY OWNERSHIP

a) Country Eligibility

This project is global in nature, and as such, country eligibility is not applicable. Major activities will not be carried out in specific countries, although many of the outputs of the Partnership will be of use at the national level.

b) Country Drivenness

At their sixth meeting, the 188 Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (Netherlands, April 2002) adopted by consensus a strategic plan for the convention within which Parties commit themselves to "achieve by 2010 a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national levels as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on Earth" (Decision VI/26). Subsequently, world leaders meeting at WSSD in Johannesburg agreed in September 2002 a Plan of Implementation for achieving sustainable development, building on past agreements and achievements. Within this plan, the 2010 target is implicitly endorsed in the statement that "achievement by 2010 of a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological diversity will require the provision of new and additional financial and technical resources" and by a range of further actions (A/CONF.199/20). The global mandate for the 2010 target is therefore a strong one.

The seventh meeting of the CBD Conference of Parties (Malaysia, 2004) adopted a framework for evaluating progress in achievement of the 2010 target (Decision VII/30 – see Annex P), and agreed on a limited number of trial global indicators. They agreed that the indicators should, wherever possible, be built on existing data and processes, be useful at a range of levels, and relate to the CBD programmes of work, and also agreed on the Global Biodiversity Outlook as a key reporting mechanism for communicating the 2010 target indicators. The decision explicitly invites the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre to play a role in "facilitating the compilation of information necessary for reporting on achievement of the 2010 target".

Following expert review, the tenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice made further recommendations on the set of indicators, including identification of coordinators to help ensure their delivery (Recommendation X/5 – see Annex Q). SBSTTA also recommended further characterization of the methods, technical limitations and the availability of data sources for calculation of the indicators and the validity of making global estimates, and requested development of an information strategy for delivery of the indicators now and in future years.

3. PROGRAM & POLICY CONFORMITY

a) Project Design

The proposal addresses several key areas in the GEF Operational Strategy. One of the strategic considerations within the policy framework is "increased awareness of global environmental issues

and improved environmental information" to assist in effective decision making and actions, where it is also noted that "funding the collection and synthesis of usable information, and ensuring its dissemination among decision makers, scientists, and the general public are important parts of the GEF's operational strategy". This describes what this project aims to deliver at the global level for biodiversity. This project responds directly to CBD COP Decision VII/30 and to SBSTTA Recommendation X/5 which is in response to that decision.

The proposal provides strong support to various components of the biodiversity strategy as identified in the Strategic Business Planning: Priorities and Targets, which provides focal area-specific details to support the GEF Business Plan FY04-06. Specifically the project addresses GEF biodiversity SP4, "generation and dissemination of best practices for addressing current and emerging biodiversity issues." It will: improve understanding of the extent to which biodiversity targets are being met; provide information that will support prioritization and other aspects of decision making; cross-relate indicators relevant to different focal areas and other sectors, and; promote and facilitate development of complementary indicators at other levels.

This project provides useful information, and tools such as data and indicators, to all of the Operational Programs, and the indicators will provide information of value to all five of the ecosystem-focused operational programs. COP Decision VII/30 recommends that as far as is feasible the indicators should be developed in such a way that they relate to one or more of the various Programmes of Work of the Convention.

b) Sustainability (including financial sustainability)

There is a clear global mandate for delivering a suite of indicators on a regular basis for assessing progress in achieving the global 2010 biodiversity target. Both the target and the associated indicators have generated considerable interest in such issues, and based on ongoing discussions within the context of the CBD, it is anticipated that such interest will remain at the current level through to 2010, and thereafter to future targets. That interest is demonstrated by multilateral processes at both global and regional levels, and by intergovernmental organizations, individual governments, non-governmental organizations, and a wide range of individuals.

The 2010BIP sustainability strategy involves promotion of the wide usage of the 2010 indicators and products developed using them. Opportunities will be sought for streamlining data compilation and indicator development, and careful documentation of indicator development, quality control, and delivery will increase confidence in the indicators. Efforts will be made to ensure that indicators increasingly underpin policy intervention and outreach in biodiversity-related intergovernmental processes, and focus on the 2010 indicators will be increased in a wide range of international conventions and programmes, including those in other sectors. Funding proposals will be developed for (a) extending the 2010BIP into the second phase, with a focus on communication and establishing the use of biodiversity indicators in policy making, and (b) increased indicator development and capacity building components of the project. Maintaining an accessible permanent archive of reviewed 2010 indicator time-series data. Other opportunities for ensuring the sustainability of the project through collaboration with Partners and other agencies and initiatives will be explored and reviewed.

A major threat to the sustainability of the full suite of indicators beyond the end of the project is ensuring the necessary finance to collect and manage the data that underpin the individual indicators, and in particular to ensure continued data quality in terms of both accuracy and updating. The project will seek to address this through two related approaches.

First, process approaches that lead to strengthening of partnerships and collaborations in development and delivery of the indicators, identification of ways to automate and streamline key data capture thereby ensuring efficiency in indicator development, management and use processes, and by increasing the user-base both for individual indicators and the full suite. The increased use of individual indicators within the 2010 Partnership and processes making use of the 2010 indicators

will contribute incentives for the allocation of additional resources for individual indicators from their traditional donors.

Second, product approaches that ensure users, and in particular the intergovernmental processes which have endorsed the 2010 target, receive the information in ways that can support their work and therefore clearly perceive the value of the indicators and wish to see their delivery and use continue in the future to support their decision making and communication. The increased use of indicators within intergovernmental processes (such as the CBD and MDGs), resulting from their delivery in approppriate and tailored products, will also provide incentives for incorporation of indicator financing into the budgets of these mechanisms.

Insufficient engagement of national and regional bodies in the project could also pose a threat to the sustainability of the project. The third outcome of the project, relating to the use by national governments and regional organizations of global indicators, and their contributions to improving the delivery of the indicators, is therefore critical for its long-term sustainability. Similarly, communicating the process, outputs, and outcomes of the project to national and regional audiences will be an important element in ensuring sustainability and, more importantly, replicability of the indicator development at different scales from local to regional.

The profile of the 2010 target, the expected extensive use of the relevant indicators and their relevance to the work of a wide range of stakeholders will inevitably result in increased interest in future work on the indicators and therefore the potential to generate additional resources (some of which could be internal in form of annual budgetary allocations) to support this work, thereby contributing to the sustainability of the programme well beyond the end of the GEF-funded project. In this regard it is worth noting that indicators relating to the 2010 target are being developed by the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and that this is likely to extend to other international conventions and programmes.

The indicator and partnership sustainability strategy includes the following elements:

(a) Funding:
- Build commitment of Partner groups to the Partnership, ensuring ongoing fundraising activities with a wide range of donors are continued. The potential for success in such fundraising activities is demonstrated by the substantial co-financing commitment for the indicators and Partnership to date.
- The increased use of individual indicators within the 2010 Partnership and processes making use of the 2010 indicators will contribute incentives for the allocation of additional resources for individual indicators from their traditional donors.
- The increased use of indicators within intergovernmental processes will provide incentives for incorporation of indicator financing into the budgets of these mechanisms.
- Seek resources from foundations and other philanthropic sources for individual indicators and the full suite, building on the international profile of the project and its support from GEF.

(b) Capacity:
- Build and maintain an accessible permanent archive of reviewed 2010 indicator time-series data.

(c) Relevance:
- Increase confidence in the indicators through careful documentation of the processes by which they are developed, quality controlled and delivered.
- Promote wide usage of the 2010 indicators and products developed from using them.
- Ensure that the indicators increasingly underpin policy intervention and outreach in biodiversity-related intergovernmental processes.

- Increase focus on 2010 indicators in a wide range of international conventions and programmes, including in other sectors.

(d) Streamlining:

- Seek opportunities for streamlining processes for both compiling data for individual indicators, and for delivering the indicators.

c) Replicability

The primary purpose of the project is to deliver indicators that are valid from one point in time to another, and in this sense replicability is an essential component of project implementation. Replicability of the indicators will be assured through ensuring documented processes for their delivery; rigorous testing by those technically responsible for them, and through peer review both for individual indicators and for the full suite of indicators. A second concern in replicability is to work towards ensuring: (a) the capacity of indicators to be used at different scales from global to sub-national levels; and (b) the availability of national and regional datasets for developing global indicators (relating to Outcome 3). While the project is not explicitly concerned with indicators other than at the global level, steps will be taken to build the necessary links, including reviewing existing experience, and developing and disseminating guidance on the links between global and national indicator processes, and the links between global indicators and national and regional policy.

d) Stakeholder Involvement

Given that the suite of indicators has been adopted by the CBD COP based on mandates arising from several intergovernmental processes, the primary stakeholders are clearly Governments, and especially Parties to the CBD. These stakeholders have been involved in discussions about the 2010BIP project at well-attended side-events during the CBD 8th Conferences of the Parties in 2006 and SBSTTA XI in 2005. These side-events were an opportunity for these stakeholders to obtain information about the project, and to provide feedback to the process.

In view of the increasingly high profile that the 2010 target has assumed at the global level, it is inevitable that the indicators will be of interest and relevance to a far wider group of stakeholders and beneficiaries including the private sector and local communities. The project will implement means for ensuring broad and effective communication of the 2010 indicators to a wide variety of stakeholders.

A key group of stakeholders is the wide range of agencies and organizations that are involved in developing and delivering the indicators that have been identified. These include UN agencies and programmes, intergovernmental organizations, non-government organizations, and research/ academic institutions. These stakeholders have been involved in the PDFB phase of the 2010BIP project through, variously, attendance of two Partnership meetings, discussions at international meetings, the submission of information regarding the status of particular indicators, drafting of components of this proposal including the communications and information management strategies, and the review of this proposal document. Partners have also been engaged through the formation of an electronic mailing list that the BIP secretariat and Partners can use to contact the BIP.

The project will also develop a peer review process that involves stakeholders from a wide range of institutions and countries.

e) Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken at three levels: monitoring project implementation and performance, delivery of project outputs, and monitoring project outcomes. Project monitoring, including incorporation of lessons learned, mid-term evaluation of the project, and regular project reporting, has been designated under the activities associated with Outcome 1 of the project. The

monitoring and evaluation strategies of the project will additionally assist all project participants to assess progress in the development of individual indicators and of the Partnership as a whole, and will include the following elements:

- UNEP will receive from the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) half-yearly and yearly progress and financial reports. UNEP DGEF will also serve as a member of the Steering Committee (SC), and organise independent evaluators for mid-term and final evaluations. The UNEP Task Manager will track the project progress, outputs and impacts, and arrange the mid-term review by an external consultant to assess project status and deliver at the User level, the PCU level and the Indicator level.

- The PCU will develop a reporting structure for all project partners and ensure that reporting is timely and complete. It will develop all reports for UNEP and will receive all reports from Indicator Lead Organisations on progress of each indicator to ensure the project workplan is being upheld.

- The Steering Committee will monitor progress through reviewing all reports, advising the PCU on resolving difficulties, and ensuring efficiency.

- The Indicator Partners will develop individual indicator progress reports for the PCU and provide early warning of anticipated problems relating to the workplan, financial or other issues.

- The Collaborating Partners will deliver regular reports as necessary to the PCU on the progress of their work in relevant areas, provide guidance and recommendations on improvements and project progress in their area of expertise, and provide early warnings of anticipated problems.

4. FINANCING MODALITY AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS

The total cost of the first full phase and PDF-B phase of the project is $14,325,801 with a GEF grant of $3,639,000 for the first full phase, $306,000 PDF-B allocation, and a total of $10,380,801 in co-financing from a wide range of organisations, including UN agencies, international organisations, NGOs, national governments, and other international donors. It is expected that this level of co-financing will increase by the start of the project's second phase as awareness and ownership of the process strengthen. This considerable co-financing, and the large number of organizations, agencies, and donors providing it in support of the 2010BIP, provides a strong baseline for the 2010BIP project. Furthermore, 2010BIP builds on an existing baseline of work focusing on the implementation and communication of 2010 indicators, at an estimated value of US$90.5 million. For an incremental cost (see Annex A) of just over US$13.7 million the 2010BIP project will contribute important outcomes in a highly cost-effective way, bringing together the numerous organizations and agencies working on the indicators to coordinate the further development and timely delivery of the indicators, and will fill many of the gaps in the indicator development and outreach process.

No other organization is at present considering to undertake the initiative for the monitoring of biodiversity at the global scale, and the initiative would not take place without GEF intervention. Atlhough there will be additional benefits at the national scale, the benefits of the 2010BIP project will accrue largely at a global or regional scale. Indeed the project will contribute enormously to the GEF itself, serving to provide information that will allow the callibration of impacts arising from national and regional level projects against global trends in a range of attributes of biodiversity, thereby providing a tool for assessing effectiveness of future GEF funding.

5. INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION & SUPPORT

a) Core commitments & Linkages

Commitments by governments:

The commitment by governments to this process is indicated in the CBD COP decisions VI/26 and VII/30 and SBSTTA Recommendation X/5 (see Annexes P and Q) and by the resources already committed by several governments to supporting expert discussion on this issue. COP has already invited UNEP-WCMC to collaborate with the CBD Secretariat in facilitating compilation of the indicators, and Recommendation X/5 invites identified agencies and organizations to contribute the data and analysis required for the delivery of the indicators. The commitment by governments to the process described in this proposal is therefore clear.

In addition, as detailed in the Note by the Executive Secretary in preparation for the 8th meeting of the CBD COP (UNEP/CBD/COP/8/17, 19th Jan 2006), the CBD Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) plans the "development of a database on indicators related to the 2010 target". It is therefore an early priority to make the appropriate technical and organisational connection to establish the CHM as a complementary point of access and distribution of 2010 indicator results and information products.

Project linkage to Implementing Agency programme:

UNEP has a primary role in the GEF in catalysing the development of scientific and technical analysis and in advancing environmental management in GEF-financed activities. UNEP also provides guidance on relating the GEF-financed activities to global, regional and national environmental assessments, policy frameworks and plans, and to international environmental agreements. UNEP has a clear mandate from both the Nairobi Declaration (1997) and the decisions of its Governing Council for carrying out environmental assessment and early warning as a basis for policy advice. This project will contribute directly to UNEP's existing work on monitoring the state of the environment and analysing global environmental trends through the Global Environmental Outlook (GEO) programme, and to building links between the GEO process and the work of the CBD in developing its *Global Biodiversity Outlook*. UNEP is contributing significant financial and in-kind resources to this project both through the considerable staff time engaging in the project (including chairing the Steering Committee), and also through indicator development for specific indicators, including on Protected Areas, and sustainable use.

Project linkage to the Executing Agency programme:

The UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) has a clear role in both biodiversity assessment and the use of information to support implementation of international agreements and programmes. UNEP-WCMC has a clear mandate from the UNEP Governing Council in decision GC/22/1/III to support the CBD through the provision of information and helping to monitor progress towards meeting biodiversity-related objectives set by Convention and by the WSSD Plan of Implementation.

UNEP-WCMC will build on experience of other GEF-funded projects, including the project on Biodiversity Indicators for National Use (BINU), and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA), in both of which UNEP-WCMC played a key coordination role. In addition there will be opportunities for linking this project to the development of the Inter-America Biodiversity Information Network, a GEF-funded project being implemented by the World Bank and the Organization of American States with substantial national involvement in the region.

Lessons learned from BINU include those that relate indicator methodologies between scales, and of processes for data collation at the national level. A recently compiled user impact survey of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment has shown considerable impact of the MA process at multiple scales, and across a number of sectors, including within governments, industry, the scientific community, donors, NGOs, and in education. The products of the MA have recently become available, and the 2010BIP will continue to learn from ongoing experiences in the communication and uptake of the MA products. Lessons learned from the MA process include the importance of early and regular engagement with stakeholders, the importance of targeted communication efforts,

and the critical importance of building on relevant, legitimate and credible processes for the generation of information. This will be done in the 2010BIP through ensuring the close adherence to user needs, as identified through formal surveys and ongoing collaboration with user stakeholders, including through the 2010BIP Steering Committee, through ensuring the scientific rigour of the indicators as they are further developed including through peer review processes, and through responding to the requests made of the scientific community from the CBD.

Examples of building on the experience of other inter-governmental activities:

The 2010BIP will be able to build on the experience of a number of other activities. This includes Streamlining European 2010 Biodiversity Indicators (SEBI2010), a pan-European process to develop and test regional indicators (based on the CBD suite of indicators) based on nationally-submitted data. The 2010BIP project will help to apply the lessons learnt in Europe elsewhere. In addition, three other conventions are actively developing indicators which relate to the CBD suite of 2010 indicators: the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar Convention), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Convention on Migratory Species (Bonn Convention). In all cases there is collaboration with UNEP-WCMC, and a clearly stated willingness to contribute to the implementation of the 2010BIP project. It is likely that this will extend to other international agreements and programmes as the project develops.

For at least two of the proposed 2010 indicators, data are already collected and managed under the auspices of partnerships and consortia, including both the IUCN Red List, and the World Database on Protected Areas Consortium between UNEP-WCMC, the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, and a number of internationally active NGOs. Consortia and current partnerships are significant within the project as they are already promoting collaboration of direct relevance to delivery of 2010 indicators upon which this project aims to build.

b) Consultation, Coordination and Collaboration between IAs, and IAs and EAs

Given the nature of the project in delivering a suite of global indicators for assessing progress in achieving a target adopted by both the CBD processes and endorsed by WSSD, it would seem appropriate that all three GEF Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat are in a position to make significant input to project implementation, and in particular to provision of advice on means for review of the agreed indicators, and for their delivery. The input and advice of the GEF Secretariat, the World Bank and UNDP (in addition to UNEP's relevant divisions) in implementation of the project will be actively sought. UNEP will work closely with UNEP-WCMC throughout the implementation of the project, including through oversight on the Steering Committee, and through regular reporting, monitoring and evaluation.

ANNEX A: 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership

Incremental Cost Analysis

1. BROAD DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Decision-makers whose actions affect biodiversity do not have the information available to fully weigh the trade-offs involved in the management of biodiversity or to develop appropriate response strategies to address problems of diminishing productivity of biodiversity. Moreover, the capacity needed to undertake such an integrated assessment of biodiversity is limited in most countries and regions. The development objective of the 2010BIP project is to achieve a reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss at the global level, through improved decisions for the conservation of global biodiversity. The immediate objective of this project is that decisions made by governments and other stakeholders are better informed to improve the conservation status of species, habitats, and ecosystems at the global level. The project will build capacity at the global scale to undertake monitoring of biodiversity and act on the findings of these processes, and will have benefits for capacity building at other scales for biodiversity monitoring.

2. BASELINE

The global scope of the 2010BIP project presents methodological difficulties in assessing the baseline and incremental costs of the project, which are normally calculated in a national context. This incremental cost analysis follows the procedure used in previous global assessments supported by the GEF such as the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and the Global International Waters Assessment. In the case of the 2010BIP project, no other organization is at present considering to undertake such an initiative for the monitoring of biodiversity at the global scale, and the initiative would not take place without GEF intervention. Moreover, the benefits of the 2010BIP project will accrue largely at a global or regional scale.

A combination of the following factors will severely hamper attempts to track progress in achieving the 2010 target at the global level in a reliable and consistent manner. The 2010BIP project will address these factors to enable successful monitoring of biodiversity at the global level to take place.

- *Inconsistency between indicators:* Without effective coordination, and additional support for particular indicators based on assessment of need, different indicators will continue to develop at different rates and on different geographical scales, and the databases on which they are based will continue to vary widely in their quality and long-term security.

- *Lack of a single indicator "package":* Without effective coordination of the indicator programme, it is going to be difficult to communicate and use the indicators as a single suite of 2010 indicators to the full range of potential users and stakeholders.

- *Lack of a single focus:* The absence of a single coordinated programme for development and implementation of the full suite of 2010 indicators is likely to result in a reduction of the interaction made with other indicators and targets, particularly those in other sectors. This will inevitably reduce the overall impact of the individual 2010 indicators.

- *Inadequate links between global and national efforts:* Without a single coordinated approach, opportunities will be reduced to demonstrate potential linkages between national and global 2010 indicators, to promote improved use of national datasets in development of global indicators, and to share lessons from the development of global indicators at the national and regional level.

An illustration of the baseline costs of past and ongoing global activities on which the 2010BIP project is dependent is provided in the following examples:

(a) Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) activities leading to the compilation of an agreed list of 2010 biodiversity indicators, including regional workshops and an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Working Group meeting: in the order of US$10 million.

(b) Contribution of a wide range of organisations to the development and refinement of the indicators identified by the CBD: in the order of US$40 million.

(c) Contributions of other organisations and Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) to the development of CBD indicators and other indicator frameworks: in the order of US$50 million.

These activities total in the order of $100 million. Given the range of international assessments not included in the above list but that contribute to the 2010 biodiversity indicators, (including the FAO Forest Resources Assessment (in the order of US$30 million), the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (in the order of US$20 million), and the Global Amphibian Assessment ($1.6 million)), the total costs of international assessment activities on which the 2010BIP project will draw would be conservatively estimated to be twice the above total, or in the order of $200 million.

The 2010BIP project will also draw on research activities and national assessments that greatly exceed this total, including for example the satellite mapping of ecosystems and habitats. Conservatively, some $3 billion or more is spent annually on research or assessment work related to ecosystems that would form the basis of the 2010BIP.

3. GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTIVE

This project will provide benefits globally, nationally, and locally through better informing decisions made by governments and other stakeholders to improve the conservation status of species, habitats, and ecosystems.

4. GEF ALTERNATIVE

The support of the GEF will allow the project to address all of the issues identified above. The necessary activities for addressing these issues are included in the project proposal. In addressing these issues, the project also deals with the concerns identified if GEF resources were not available. GEF support will therefore result in the following:

- A coordinated approach to delivering the full suite of 2010 indicators, based on the contributions of a wide range of agencies and organizations;

- Development and implementation of the full suite of 2010 indicators in a coordinated and consistent manner;

- Clear identification of user needs in a range of stakeholder groups, and the delivery of products that meet these needs;

- Established links to indicators relevant to other biodiversity-related conventions and programmes, and to other sectors, mechanisms and initiatives;

- Clear identification of linkages between global and national datasets and indicators, and the provision of tools to facilitate national efforts to develop and use 2010 indicators; and

- Leverage of additional technical resources to ensure delivery and use of the indicators.

5. INCREMENTAL COST MATRIX

The incremental costs and benefits of the proposed project are summarized in the following incremental cost matrix (see Table 1.) The incremental cost of the project, $12,828,701, is required to achieve the project's global environmental objectives. Of this amount, $3,459,000 (or $6,765,500 including the PDF-B and second phase of the project) is requested for GEF support with the remainder coming from other donors.

Component	Baseline	Alternative	Increment
Outcome 1: 2010 biodiversity indicators partnership generating information useful to decision-makers	There is no process underway to coordinate the monitoring of biodiversity at a global scale to assess progress towards meeting the 2010 target. Decision-makers among the biodiversity-related conventions, private sector, and civil society do largely not have ready access to "state of the art" scientific findings related to progress towards achieving the 2010 target. Production of the second edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook is underway and will go some way towards addressing questions relating to 2010. Cost = $500,000	A robust and well-managed partnership for coordinating the monitoring of biodiversity at a global scale to assess progress towards meeting the 2010 target, drawing on global expertise and experience. Through reports and the Internet, decision-makers are aware of and readily able to consult policy-relevant information regarding biodiversity at the global scale, and progress towards achieving the 2010 target. Cost = $2,572,000	Establishment and maintenance of partnership and coordination of indicator processes. Production of reports and dissemination of findings through reports and the internet. Increment = $2,072,000 (GEF = $1,446,000) (Other = $626,000)
Outcome 2: Improved global indicators implemented and available	Series of discrete indicators measuring changes in biodiversity, assigned to CBD focal areas, and at varying stages of development and implementation. Cost = $90,000,000	Development and implementation of a coordinated, global suite of indicators monitoring progress towards achieving the 2010 target. Cost = $101,479,801	Global suite of indicators monitoring progress towards achieving the 2010 target. Increment = $11,479,801 (GEF = $2,070,000) (Other = $9,409,801)

Outcome 3: National governments and regional organisations using and contributing to improved delivery of global indicators	There is no specific process underway to link global and sub-global indicators and policy relating to the 2010 target. Cost = $0	The Partnership will enable national and regional initiatives to feed into the global biodiversity monitoring process assessing progress towards achieving the 2010 target. Cost = $198,000	Activities enabling national and regional initiatives to feed into global biodiversity monitoring processes. Increment = $198,000 (GEF = $123,000) (Other = $75,000)
Total	**Baseline:** **$90,500,000**	**Alternative:** **$104,249,801**	**Total Incremental Cost = $13,749,801** **Costs to be funded by GEF = $3,639,000** (In addition to PDF-B funding of 306,000)

4

ANNEX B: 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership

Logframe Matrix

Project title: Building a Partnership to Track Progress Towards the 2010 Biodiversity Target

Country: Global

Project period: Phase 1: September 2006-August 2009.

Objectives and Outcomes	Objectively verifiable indicators	Means of verification	Key Assumptions
Development objective			
Reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss at the global level, through improved decisions for the conservation of global biodiversity.	The suite of available global 2010 indicators identified by the CBD show progress, by 2010, in reducing the rate of loss of biodiversity at the global level.	Available indicators by 2010 demonstrating changes in the rate of biodiversity loss (See Annex F).	The improved information delivered from this project is used to help make better decisions on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.
Immediate objective			
Decisions made by governments and other stakeholders are better informed to improve the conservation status of species, habitats and ecosystems at the global level.	• Increased availability and use of the 2010 biodiversity indicators by decision-makers in policy fora including MEA COPs, meetings of international scientific bodies, UNGA meetings, and GEF Council, between 2009 and 2012, compared to 2002 to 2006. • The implemented 2010 biodiversity indicators are incorporated, by 2010, into products that are used in at least three Convention processes, and at least twenty international programmes and mechanisms, by national governments and international agencies.	• Implemented 2010 indicators are available for use in print and electronic media. • Products of the Partnership containing the implemented indicators, and tailored to meet user needs, are available and disseminated. • Outputs and decisions by a range of MEAs, Governments, and other users incorporating or referring to the implemented 2010 indicators.	• The availability of sufficient data to ensure full development of the databases underlying the global indicators. • The relevance of the suite of 2010 indicators identified by the CBD to particular policy agendas.

Outcome 1: 2010 biodiversity indicators partnership generating information useful to decision makers	• At least 70% of the headline biodiversity indicators identified by the CBD in the context of the 2010 target are implemented and available from organisations within the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership by 2009.	• Outputs of the Partnership, including website and products disseminated to Conventions and other users.	Organisations working on indicators continue to cooperate and contribute to the project.
Output 1.1. Working partnership on 2010 indicators established and maintained	• Four full meetings are held of the Partnership and 2010BIP Steering Committee during the course of the project, 2006-2009. • At least 20 other biodiversity indicator stakeholder organisations are engaged in the Partnership through involvement in its activities between 2006-2009. • The 2010 BIP project is efficiently and effectively managed and coordinated, with project activities delivered to budget and on schedule.	• MoUs and other agreed working arrangements are in place between 2010 BIP Indicator Partners. • Project meeting reports, progress and financial reports.	• The willingness of Partners to work together to develop the full suite of indicators. • The availability of Partnership members for meetings of the Partnership
Output 1.2 Communication strategy meeting user needs prepared and implemented	• Communications strategy is finalised and in place for the 2010 indicators by the end of the first year, responding to the needs of users. • User surveys performed to measure the success of the communications strategy for meeting user needs by the end of the third year of the project. • Project website used and maintained throughout project. • Indicator products tailored to meet specific user needs developed annually, building on available indicators, and disseminated to major international initiatives, meetings and decision-making fora.	• Project communication strategy. • User surveys. • Regularly updated web presence for the 2010 BIP. • Website use statistics. • Products available for identified users. • Documented analysis of the dissemination and use of products. • Outputs and decisions by a range of MEAs, Governments, and other users incorporate or refer to the implemented 2010 indicators.	• Sufficient resources are available in Partner organisations to fully implement a decentralised communications strategy. • Products can be developed that meet users' needs.
Outcome 2: Improved global indicators implemented and available	• At least 70% of the headline biodiversity indicators identified by CBD in the context of the 2010 target are improved by 2009 through increased data input, greater time-series coverage, or capacity to demonstrate trends in rates of change.	• Products of the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership compared with products containing the same indicators prior to establishment of this partnership. • Indicator analysis in first and third years of the project.	• Data are available to collate for use in indicators. • Appropriate methodological advances are possible within the time-frame of the project.
Output 2.1: Standards, guidelines and methods for indicator development, peer review and information sharing	• Indicator Development plans and information management strategies in place by the end of the first year of the project, and implemented by 2009. • Peer review procedures in place and implemented for each indicator by 2009.	• Documented archive of all developed indicators and accepted methodologies maintained and available. • Documentation of individual indicator methodologies and datasets. • Documented response to indicator peer reviews	• Peer review and information management strategies are implemented by 2010BIP Partners involved in indicator development.
Output 2.2: Individual indicators strengthened and delivered	• At least 70% of the global 2010 biodiversity indicators delivered by 2009, incorporating data and expertise from a wider range of national and other sources than before 2007. • Individual indicators delivered and used in products of the 2010 Biodiversity Indicator Partnership by 2009.	• Plans, strategies and activity reports of the individual indicator development process. • Products of the 2010 BIP.	• Agreement can be reached on a process for individual indicator implementation. • Technical solutions to indicators exist and can be agreed on.

Outcome 3: National governments and regional organizations using and contributing to improved delivery of global indicators	• At least 50% of the biodiversity indicators identified by CBD in the context of the 2010 target are further developed based on increased contribution of local, national, and regional data by the end of the third year of the project. •At least 30 national governments and regional organizations are using a broader set of 2010 biodiversity indicators to report on progress towards the 2010 target, by 2010.	• Reports and analysis on individual indicator development. • National reports of governments to the CBD, and outputs of regional organisations relating to biodiversity trends, and the 2010 target.	• Governments and regional organizations are willing to contribute relevant data for incorporation into the global indicators. •Governments and regional organizations recognize the value of the 2010 biodiversity indicators for tracking change in biodiversity at the national and regional level.
Output 3.1: Enhanced capacity of national governments and regional organizations to contribute to global indicator delivery	• Guidelines available, by the end of the first year of the project, on enhancing the use of local, national and regional data and methodologies in global indicator processes. • At least 30 national governments and regional organizations are actively involved in global indicator delivery.	• Documented guidelines produced and disseminated to regional workshops and other fora, including via the project website. Global indicator datasets contained increased data from local, national and regional sources assessed by comparison of government and regional organization involvement in indicator delivery in 2006 and in 2010 using meeting reports and information from partners.	• Capacity and resources for data collection, collation, and analysis exist, or can be built, at national and regional levels to contribute to global indicator development. • 2010BIP products are used and disseminated at regional workshops and other events held independently of the 2010BIP project.
Output 3.2: Guidelines available to governments and regional organizations for the use of global indicators and their methodologies in national and regional decision making.	• Guidelines are made available, by the end of the third year of the project, on the appropriate application of global indicator methodologies and lessons learned for regional and national processes. • Guidelines are made available, by the end of the first year of the project, on the use of global indicators in national and regional policy.	• Documented guidelines produced and disseminated to regional workshops and other fora, including via the project web site. • National and regional reports to conventions and other processes showing increased use of 2010 biodiversity indicators at the national and regional level.	• Global data and indicator methodologies are useful at sub-global scales. • 2010BIP products are used and disseminated at regional workshops and other events held independently of the 2010BIP project.

COMPONENTS AND ACTIVITIES	2006			2007												2008												2009								
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep

Outcomes and Outputs

Outcome 1: 2010 biodiversity indicators partnership generating information useful to decision makers

Output 1.1. Working partnership on 2010 indicators established and maintained

1.1.1 Develop a 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, based on organizations and agencies delivering the various agreed 2010 indicators.

1.1.2 Implement processes to share ideas, standards, guidelines, methodologies and data amongst the Partnership and more widely.

1.1.3 Hold four full Partnership meetings and four meetings of the 2010 BIP Steering Committee during the course of the project.   [markers * in Nov 2006, May 2007, Apr 2008, Jun 2009]

1.1.4 Identify other stakeholders and encourage their contribution to the activities of the Partnership.

1.1.5 Coordinate and manage the full suite of activities of the 2010 BIP, including maintaining documentation of on-going lessons learned from the implementation of the project.

Output 1.2 Communication strategy meeting user needs prepared and implemented

1.2.1 Undertake periodic review of potential users of the 2010 indicators and their needs.

1.2.2 Review and refine communications and outreach strategy.

1.2.3 Develop promotional and outreach materials for use of Partnership members and others.

1.2.4 Further identify and implement means to relate the 2010 indicators to other international conventions and programmes.

1.2.5 Establish and maintain Partnership web site.

1.2.6 Conduct analysis on the links between the full suite of 2010 biodiversity indicators.

1.2.7 Further identify and implement means to relate the 2010 indicators to the MDGs, targets and indicators.

1.2.8 Further identify the relationship of the indicators arising from other relevant conventions and programmes to the suite of 2010 indicators.

1.2.9 Deliver appropriate analysis of 2010 indicators for use in products developed and delivered by other processes and initiatives, including MEAs and other assessment processes.

1.2.10 Develop a range of suitable products based on outputs and analysis of the 2010 biodiversity indicators

1.2.11 Establish and implement a process for peer review of the products delivered from the Partnership.

1.2.12 Translate, publish and disseminate Partnership products widely

Outcome 2: Improved global indicators implemented and available

Output 2.1: Standards, guidelines and methods for indicator development, peer review and information sharing

2.1.1 Review needs for further development and implementation of individual indicators.

2.1.2 Establish basic standards for each indicator, including quality assurance processes and documentation.

2.1.3 Implement peer review strategies for all indicators developed within the 2010 BIP.

2.1.4 Update and maintain indicator methodologies, metadata, and completed indicator time series in Partnership information sharing facilities.

Output 2.2: Individual indicators strengthened and delivered

2.2.1 Further develop identified indicators in support of the CBD headline indicators, including developing and implementing short and long term plans for data collection, management and use.

Outcome 3: National governments and regional organizations using and contributing to improved delivery of global indicators

Output 3.1: Enhanced capacity of national governments and regional organizations to contribute to global indicators

3.1.1 Develop guidelines to facilitate increased contribution of local, national, and regional data to the development of global 2010 indicators.

3.1.2 Contribute to regional capacity building workshops and other appropriate fora to disseminate and facilitate the use of such tools.

Output 3.2: Guidelines and other tools available to governments and regional organizations for the use of global indicators at the national and regional level

3.2.1 Develop guidelines to facilitate use of global 2010 indicator methodologies and development processes at national and regional level.

3.2.2 Develop guidelines on the options for use of global 2010 indicators in national and regional level policy and decision-making.

3.2.3 Contribute to regional capacity building workshops and other appropriate fora to disseminate and facilitate the use of such tools.

COMPONENTS AND ACTIVITIES	2006			2007												2008												2009								
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep

BUILDING A 2010 BIODIVERSITY INDICATORS PARTNERSHIP

Develop a 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, based on organizations and agencies delivering the various agreed 2010 indicators
Implement process to share ideas, methodologies, and data amongst the Partnership and more widely
Identify other stakeholders and encourage their contribution to the activities of the Partnership
Coordinate and manage the full suite of activities of the 2010BIP
Incorporate management adjustments based on ongoing analysis of lessons learned and the mid-term evaluation
Ensure project accounts are regularly audited

Compile and submit regular progress and financial reports to the IA — * (Jan 2007), * (Apr 2007), * (Jul 2007), * (Oct 2007), * (Jan 2008), * (Apr 2008), * (Jul 2008), * (Oct 2008), * (Jan 2009), * (Apr 2009), * (Jul 2009), * (Aug 2009), * (Sep 2009)

Hold four full Partnership meetings and four meetings of the 2010 BIP Steering Committee through the duration of the project — * (Nov 2006), * (Jun 2007), * (May 2008), * (Jun 2009)

Maintain documentation of ongoing lessons learned from the implementation of the project
Conduct a mid-term evaluation of the implementation and progress in the project's outputs and activities
Ensure sufficient documentation and processes are in place for the conduct of the terminal evaluation

2. IMPLEMENTATION OF 2010 BIODIVERSITY INDICATORS

Review needs for further development and implementation of individual indicators
Further develop identified indicators in support of the CBD headline indicators, including developing and implementing short and long-term plans for data collection, management, and use
Further develop additional indicators where relevant, to fill gaps in current suite of indicators
Contribute indicator methodologies, metadata, and completed indicator time series to partnership information sharing facilities

Establish as necessary basic standards for each indicator, including quality assurance processes and documentation
Implement peer review strategies for all indicators being developed within the 2010BIP

3. COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH

Further, and periodic, review of potential users of the 2010 indicators and their needs

Review and refine communications and outreach strategy
Develop promotional and outreach materials for use byPartnership members and others

Further identify and implement means to relate the 2010 indicators to other international Conventions and programmes
Further identify and implement means to relate the 2010 indictors to the MDGs, targets, and indicators
Deliver appropriate analysis of 2010 indicators for use in products developed and delivered by other processes and initiatives, including MEAs and other assessment processes

Establish and maintain Partnership website
Conduct analysis on the links between the full suite of 2010 indicators
Develop a range of suitable products based on outputs and analysis of the 2010 biodiversity indicators
Translate, publish, and disseminate Partnership products widely

Establish and implement a process for peer review of the products delivered from the Partnership

4. INCREASED LINKAGES BETWEEN GLOBAL 2010 INDICATORS AND NATIONAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL POLICY AND INDICATOR DEVELOPMENT

Develop guidelines and other tools to facilitate use of global 2010 indicator methodologies at national and regional levels
Develop guidelines and other tools to facilitate increased local, national, and regional contributions to the development of global 2010 indicators
Develop guidelines and other tools on the options for use of global 2010 indicators in national and regional level policy and decision-making
Contribute to regional capacity building workshops and other appropriate fora to disseminate and facilitate the use of such tools

5. PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY

Develop funding proposals for extending this project into Phase 2, with a focus on communication and establishing the use of biodiversity indicators in policy making
Develop further funding proposals for increased indicator development and capacity-building components of this project
Review other opportunities for ensuring the sustainability of the project through collaboration with Partners and other agencies and initiatives

ANNEX C: 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership

STAP Expert Review and Response

STAP Review

STAP Reviewer: Julian Caldecott

Final report, 5 May 2006

Contents

1 OVERVIEW

Credible reporting on progress towards the 2010 target is necessary to the whole international process of biodiversity conservation, and this project represents a plausible means to achieve it. The approach proposed by UNEP-WCMC is based upon the further development and operation of an established partnership among institutions that have been tasked with gathering information relating to some 33 agreed indicators of biodiversity status and trend, and emphasises the management of knowledge resulting from this. The international mandate to do so and the credibility of the partners individually and collectively, means that an unprecedentedly large and trustworthy body of organised knowledge will be assembled on the condition of the natural world around the year 2010. This will represent a huge resource for all those wishing to communicate to the public, opinion-formers and leaders, including media editors and journalists, advocacy groups, political parties and educators. If aggressively marketed and creatively used, the knowledge resource would help sustain changes in global society in favour of biodiversity friendliness, which will make it easier to address all aspects of biodiversity loss. The project is judged to be scientifically and technically sound, likely to yield significant global environmental benefits, and scores highly on replicability and sustainability criteria. It also complements other international initiatives. There has been strong involvement of

stakeholders, and the capacity of key participants is likely to be strengthened through implementation of the project. It is recommended that this important project, with its great potential for generating global environmental benefits, should proceed swiftly to the next phase of its development and implementation.

2 OBSERVATIONS IN RELATION TO KEY GEF ISSUES

2.1 Scientific and technical soundness

The context of the project is that the international community has committed itself to achieving a reduction of the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010 (i.e. in 176 weeks from now), and has made a start both in defining proxy measures by which attainment of this target might be measured, and in assigning responsibilities for reporting on progress, but without allocating adequate funds with which to do so. UNEP-WCMC has been identified as having a key role in reporting on this issue, and this role is widely accepted by other stakeholders. The institution, however, is significantly under-resourced relative to the expectations of the international community, a weakness that this project is designed to correct. This reviewer considers that credible reporting on global progress in relation to the 2010 target is essential to the whole process of biodiversity conservation, that UNEP-WCMC is the only available, plausible institution to provide a meta-analysis on the necessary scale, and hence that the project is worthy of GEF investment. The approach proposed by UNEP-WCMC is based around the following three project outcomes and six project outputs, which will be executed in an integrated manner with strong linkages between them.

Outcome 1: 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership generating information useful to decision-makers.

This outcome will be achieved through two outputs: (a) the establishment and maintenance of a working partnership on 2010 indicators; and (b) the preparation and implementation of a communications strategy that meets user needs.

Output 1.1. It is proposed to assign the equivalent of two full-time UNEP-WCMC staff members to undertake the three roles of project management, coordination and communication among partners, and information management. This Project Coordination Unit (PCU) will service a partnership and liaise with a Steering Committee that were established in the PDF-B financed development phase, through routine dialogue and both virtual and physical meetings. It will be possible for additional partners to join this system at all times. A working group will be established early in the project to encourage common standards in information management. Finally, the PCU will have primary responsibility (overseen by the Steering Committee and responsive to the partnership) and for adaptive learning, record keeping, and reporting, and there will be both a mid-term and an end-of-project evaluation by independent consultants.

Output 1.2. There will be an ongoing review of potential users of the 2010 indicators and their needs for information. The focus of the communications strategy will be on direct outreach from the partnership and on communication by partners to information users. In addition to facilitating this communication, the PCU will reach out through a significant web presence, through presentations and events at intergovernmental meetings, direct interaction with country representatives, through provision of access to the indicator information and products, and by dissemination and contact with the media on key occasions. The approach will be supported by a range of analyses, for example on the links among the various indicators and their relationship to other conventions, programmes and mechanisms, and through the development of knowledge-based products for media, policy and publication use.

Outcome 2: Improved global indicators implemented and available.

The two outputs relating to this outcome are: (a) standards, guidelines, and methods for indicator development, peer review, and information sharing; and (b) the strengthening and delivery of individual indicators.

Output 2.1. This will involve the sharing of ideas, standards, guidelines, methodologies, and data amongst the partnership and more widely, as well as the peer review of individual 2010 indicators and reports. This will build on work carried out during the PDF-B phase of the project, which included the completion of 'development templates' for each indicator (i.e. current status, required development and communication strategies specific to each), and also the definition of a plan for data collection, management and use in each case. Quality standards for data sources and methods will be established for all indicators, supported by peer review. The project will also support cross-cutting analyses using the results of the individual indicators, and the synthesis and publication of these as appropriate.

Output 2.2. This will involve the further development and delivery of the individual 2010 indicators, in support of the CBD headline indicators and focal areas. Needs for further development and implementation of individual indicators will be reviewed and acted upon, including the identification of new indicators where gaps exist (e.g. on the status of access and benefit sharing, and on the health and well-being of communities who depend directly on local ecosystem goods and services).

Outcome 3: National governments and regional organizations using and contributing to improved delivery of global indicators.

The two outputs relating to this outcome are: (a) enhanced capacity of national governments and regional organizations to contribute to global indicator delivery; and (b) guidelines and other tools to be made available to governments and regional organizations for the use of global indicators and their methodologies.

Output 3.1. The aim is an increased flow of data and methodological information from national and regional levels to the global level. Activities will include: (a) the development of guidelines to facilitate increased contribution of local, national, and regional data from governments and other organizations to the development of global 2010 indicators; and (b) contributions to regional capacity building workshops (organised by the CBD Secretariat and others) and other appropriate forums to disseminate and facilitate the use of the guidelines.

Output 3.2. The aim is an increased use of global indicators and indicator methodology at the national and regional level. Activities will include: (a) the development of guidelines to facilitate the use of global 2010 indicator methodologies for the development of indicators at national and regional levels by governments, projects (including those of the GEF) and other organisations; (b) the development of guidelines on the options for use of global 2010 indicators in national and regional level policy and decision-making by governments and regional decision-making bodies; and (c) contributions to regional capacity-building workshops and other appropriate forums to spread and teach the use of the guidelines.

2.2 Global environmental benefits

The 2010 target is an educational and motivational tool designed to stimulate and validate conservation efforts by drawing attention to the high and increasing rate of global biodiversity loss. The latter is of international concern partly because it is associated with the destruction of genetic diversity, species and ecosystems that are required to sustain human economies and livelihoods, and partly because of strong public interest in preserving the natural world for its own sake. By improving mechanisms for tracking progress in reducing the rate of biodiversity loss, not only will opportunities arise for adaptive learning but also information will be generated to support two key activities that promote biodiversity conservation. These are: (a) better-informed policy intervention by national and international decision-making bodies; and (b) increased public awareness and

communication, which will tend to increase the engagement of civil society in, and political support for, biodiversity conservation.

The project partners will gather and organise information pertaining to many different indicators of biodiversity status and trend. This, combined with the international mandate to do so and the credibility of the partners individually and collectively, means that an unprecedentedly large and trustworthy body of organised knowledge will be assembled on the condition of the natural world around the year 2010. This will represent a huge resource for all those wishing to communicate to the public, opinion-formers and leaders, including media editors and journalists, advocacy groups, political parties and educators. If aggressively marketed and creatively used, the knowledge resource would help sustain changes in global society in favour of biodiversity friendliness, which will make it easier to address all aspects of the challenge of biodiversity loss. The project document acknowledges several communication challenges that need to be overcome, including: (a) that biodiversity information is complex; (b) that it is hard to understand; (c) that it is difficult to relate to concrete policy decisions and needs; and (d) that the 2010 biodiversity commitments are unknown beyond certain narrow circles. Success in overcoming these challenges would make the global environmental benefits of this project potentially very extensive.

2.3   GEF context

The project is fully consistent with various components of the biodiversity annex to the GEF's *Strategic Business Planning: Priorities and Targets*, which provides details to support the GEF Business Plan FY04-06. In particular, the project will address the fourth strategic priority concerning the generation and dissemination of best practices for addressing current and emerging biodiversity issues, in that it will: (a) improve understanding of the extent to which biodiversity targets are being met; (b) provide information to support prioritisation and other aspects of decision making; (c) cross-relate indicators relevant to different focal areas and other sectors; and (d) promote and facilitate development of complementary indicators at other levels. The project is also compliant with GEF Operational Programme 1 (Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems), OP2 (Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems), OP3 (Forest Ecosystems), OP4 (Mountain Ecosystems), OP 12 (Integrated Ecosystem Management), and OP13 (Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture). It is judged to be scientifically and technically sound, likely to yield highly-significant global environmental benefits, and scores highly on replicability and sustainability criteria. It also complements other international initiatives. There has been strong involvement of stakeholders, and the capacity of key participants is likely to be strengthened through implementation of the project.

2.4   Replicability

The project is by definition a one-off, time-bound process project, so cannot itself be replicated. The approach, however, can be, in at least three important ways: (a) in terms of the process of organising expert institutions to collaborate in assessing progress against specified indicators in fields other than biodiversity (e.g. international waters, climate change, public health); (b) in terms of undertaking sub-national, national or multinational/regional assessment and reporting exercises in the field of biodiversity or any other; and (c) in terms of a repetition of the project in future years, which would create time series of increasing value in documenting the state of global biodiversity during the rest of this century and potentially beyond. Because of this, the project is considered to be highly replicable.

2.5   Sustainability

There is a clear global mandate for delivering organised knowledge derived from the use of biodiversity indicators on a regular basis, at least up to a likely Earth Summit in 2012. The project will promote the wide use of the indicators and products developed using them, thus increasing their credibility, influence and utility, and developing a market for their continued use. An accessible archive of time-series data for each indicator will be maintained for reference and use. Proposals will also be developed by which to seek funding for the project's continuation in 2009-2012, and for the further development of individual indicators. Both the 2010 target and the associated indicators have

generated an unprecedented level of interest, and it is reasonable to assume that such interest will remain at least at current levels for the foreseeable future. All the available evidence suggests that public concern about mass extinctions and other manifestations of environmental degradation is rapidly growing, and governments are gradually responding to this (most recently in the UK, with the adoption of a strongly 'green' agenda by all the leading political parties). Hence, there are good grounds to expect that the indicators and the partnership will continue to be relevant and supported beyond 2010. The project document makes the additional valid points that the 2010 indicators were chosen to build on existing knowledge resources, which hence represent the efforts of existing communities of interest in academic, charitable, national and international institutions. This suggests that there is a potentially wide user-base, numerous engaged organizations and agencies, many with their own technical and financial resources, and a breadth of potential donors associated with the different indicator and database projects. All of these factors militate in favour of a high level of sustainability.

3 OBSERVATIONS IN RELATION TO SECONDARY GEF ISSUES

3.1 Linkages to other Focal Areas

Climate Change. The intimate links between biodiversity loss and climate change are steadily becoming more apparent, as increasing numbers of species are extending or contracting their ranges in response to shifts in climatic regime, and recent models indicate that many nature reserves may soon be unable to preserve the biota for which they were originally intended. Events in these two overlapping focal areas amount to an emerging global catastrophe requiring coherent and sustained international response.

International Waters. Nitrogen deposition is a headline 2010 biodiversity indicator, since nitrogen run-off contributes to eutrophication, anoxia and dead zones in marine environments, thus providing a linkage to the Focal Area on International Waters.

3.2 Linkages to other programmes and action plans

UNEP-WCMC has the role of UNEP's specialist biodiversity information and assessment centre, with a clear mandate from the UNEP Governing Council to support the CBD by providing information, and helping to monitor progress towards meeting biodiversity-related objectives set by the CBD and the *WSSD Plan of Implementation*. UNEP meanwhile has a clear mandate from both the Nairobi Declaration (1997) and the decisions of its Governing Council for carrying out environmental assessment and early warning as a basis for policy advice. This project will contribute directly to UNEP's existing work on monitoring the state of the environment and analysing global environmental trends through the *Global Environmental Outlook* (GEO) programme, and will also contribute to building links between the GEO process and the work of the CBD in developing its *Global Biodiversity Outlook*.

The project document summarises other linkages, including with three GEF-funded initiatives: (a) the Biodiversity Indicators for National Use (BINU) project; (b) the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA); and (c) the Inter-America Biodiversity Information Network (IABIN). It also draws attention to links with other indicator processes, including those of three biodiversity-related conventions (CITES, CMS and Ramsar), which are actively developing relevant indicators and are willing to cooperate with the project. Also relevant are other development-related mechanisms, such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), targets, and indicators, and in particular those of MDG 7, Target 9 ("Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources"). There are also direct linkages with the Commission on Sustainable Development's environmental indicators, which contribute to reviewing progress in the implementation of *Agenda 21*, and to regional initiatives such as the indicator

processes of the Streamlining European Biodiversity Indicators project, the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Programme, and the Ark 2010 project.

3.3   Other environmental effects

The overall environmental impact of the project should be strongly favourable if its key outputs are obtained, with a significant potential for beneficial replication and influence.

3.4   Involvement of stakeholders

Arrangements for project co-ordination and implementation were developed during the meetings of the Steering Committee[1] and the full partnership during the PDF-B phase of the project. The partners comprise representatives of all the organizations involved in delivery of the 2010 indicators, and otherwise contributing to the project through communication and information management, or by representing various user groups. The effective implementation of the project will depend heavily on close working relationships between the UNEP-WCMC and stakeholders involved in the development and implementation of each indicator. Relationships will be regularly reviewed during project implementation to ensure that they are effective for the delivery of project outputs.

3.5   Capacity-building aspects

The project's capacity-building strategy is based on the sharing of expertise and experience in developing and using indicators. This is incorporated into its activities to achieve the outputs of Outcome 3, and especially output 3.1 ('Enhanced capacity of national governments and regional organizations to contribute to global indicator delivery'). This will combine the experience of the global 2010 indicator partnership and existing national and regional processes requiring the use of biodiversity indicators, to produce guidelines and examples on: (a) methodologies and capacity required for producing 2010 indicators at various scales; (b) location and adaptation of datasets at local, national and global scales for producing 2010 indicators; and (c) use of the global 2010 indicators in policy making at the regional and national scales. More specifically in addition, the CBD Secretariat is developing funding proposals for regional capacity-building workshops on the development and identification of national biodiversity targets and indicators in view of countries' commitments to the 2010 biodiversity target. The project's members will co-ordinate with the CBD Secretariat in seeking to fund and organise these workshops, and will make available to them their own experience and findings. Guidelines for collecting and managing knowledge relevant to 2010 indicators will be made available on a web-site within six months of the start of the project, will be updated regularly, and will be published in 2009. Although this appears to be rather a passive strategy, it should nevertheless result in a significant degree of capacity building.

3.6   Innovativeness

The project represents a central element in the international community's unique response to an unprecedented challenge, and never before will such a range of government and non-governmental institutions have collaborated in such a way and with such a common purpose. On the other hand, the project is strongly adapted to the technobureaucratic nature of the intergovernmental biodiversity process, which is characteristically slow, unimaginative and limited by the lowest common denominator of national policies (albeit leavened somewhat by occasional leadership from individuals and governments). It is not hard to think of ways that the project could have incorporated more innovative approaches – for example, the greater involvement of mass-input 'citizen science', the more overt use of revolutionary new information and communication technologies, and the more

---

[1] Members of the Steering Committee are: UNEP-WCMC, CBD Secretariat, European Environment Agency, Government of Cuba, Government of Thailand, Government of Grenada, IUCN (SSC), Nature Kenya, UNEP Division of Global Environment Facility (UNEP-DGEF), and United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO).

explicit marketing of biodiversity knowledge with the specific aim of mobilising global public opinion and targetting particular political constituencies. In the absence of these and other such measures, the project has to be described (rather paradoxically) as unique and unprecedented, but not particularly innovative.

3.7   Incremental cost analysis

a) Baseline scenario

A combination of factors will severely hamper attempts to track progress in achieving the 2010 target at the global level in a reliable and consistent manner, thus undermining the public messaging and policy impact of the whole process. These include: (a) **inconsistency between indicators**, which will continue to develop at different rates and on different geographical scales, while the databases on which they are based will continue to vary widely in their quality and long-term security; (b) **lack of a single indicator package**, without which effective coordination of the indicator programme and its communication to users will continue to be difficult; (c) **lack of a single focus**, which will continue to inhibit interaction and synergy with other indicators and targets; and (d) **inadequate links between global and national efforts**, without which it will continue to be hard to demonstrate potential linkages between national and global 2010 indicators, to promote improved use of national datasets in development of global indicators, and to share lessons from the development of global indicators at the national and regional level. Judging by past experience, in the absence of sufficient public demand there will also be a continuing lack of adequate investment in the management of knowledge relating to the loss of biodiversity.

b) GEF Alternative

GEF support will result in the following variance from the baseline scenario: (a) there will be a coordinated approach to delivering the full suite of 2010 indicators, based on the contributions of a wide range of agencies and organizations; (b) the full suite of 2010 indicators will be developed and implemented in a coordinated and consistent manner; (c) there will be clear identification of user needs in a range of stakeholder groups, and products will be delivered that meet these needs; (d) links will be established to indicators relevant to other biodiversity-related conventions and programmes, and to other sectors, mechanisms and initiatives; (e) there will be clear identification of linkages between global and national datasets and indicators, and the provision of tools to facilitate national efforts to develop and use 2010 indicators; and (f) additional financial and technical resources will be leveraged to ensure delivery and use of the indicators. The cumulative effect of this investment will be to provide humanity with greater motivation and better tools with which to neutralise the causative factors in biodiversity loss.

3.8   Monitoring and evaluation arrangements

The monitoring and evaluation plan of the project follows UNEP guidelines and incorporates UNEP monitoring activities. There are five main entities with roles to play in this process: (a) UNEP will receive from the PCU half-yearly and yearly progress and financial reports; (b) the PCU will develop a reporting structure for all project partners and ensure that reporting is timely and complete; (c) the Steering Committee will review all reports, advise the PCU on resolving difficulties and increasing efficiency and monitor progress on the capacity building activities; (d) partners responsible for particular indicators will develop progress reports for the PCU and provide early warning of anticipated problems relating to the workplan, financial or other issues; and (e) other partners will deliver regular reports as necessary to the PCU on the progress of their work in relevant areas, provide guidance and recommendations on improvements and project progress in their area of expertise, and provide early warnings of anticipated problems. Monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken at the three levels of monitoring project implementation and performance, delivery of project outputs, and monitoring project impacts. The monitoring and evaluation system will build as much as possible upon existing mechanisms and systems among key stakeholders.

4   CONCLUSIONS

This is an excellent project document, and it is noted that considerable further improvements in clarity and rigour were achieved by the proponents in revised documents dated 2 May 2006. What is being described is an important initiative that is likely to have profound benefits for the future of global biodiversity. This reviewer has only the following minor reservations and suggestions for further improvement:

- For clarity, the title might be changed to "Building a partnership to use indicators in documenting progress towards the global 2010 biodiversity target".

- For clarity, the first sentence of the Project Document Summary might be changed to "The outcome of this project will be confirmation of whether or not progress has been made towards achieving a significant reduction in the rate of global biodiversity loss, in the process establishing a long-term biodiversity monitoring mechanism, and acquiring lessons learned as a contribution to adaptive learning".

- For clarity, the development objective (paragraph 32) might be uncoupled from the achievement of the 2010 target, such that "The development objective to which the project pertains is the achievement of a significant reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss...".

- Further ideas would be welcome to define ways both to market and use the knowledge resources generated by the project, to help sustain changes in global society towards greater biodiversity friendliness.

- Further attention would also be encouraged towards the adoption of more technologically-innovative and publicly-inclusive knowledge management strategies.

This reviewer considers that the project is important, scientifically and technically sound, and has been thoroughly and properly formulated. It has great potential for generating global environmental benefits, and it is recommended that it proceed swiftly to the next phase of its development and implementation.

Response to STAP Expert Review:

The comments of the STAP Expert Reviewer on the proposal are welcomed, and it is agreed that this project has great potential for generating global environmental benefits, and will provide credible reporting on progress towards the 2010 target.

The reviewer's comments on lack of currently available resources are noted, but also that there is considerable co-financing already in place for the execution of this project, and it is expected that additional resources will be generated for further activities that add to the current proposal, and that will extend the operation of the Partnership and use of indicators at the global level. These are built into the sustainability strategy for the project. The reviewer's comments on the strong replicability and sustainability strategy are particularly welcomed.

The project aims to overcome the communication challenges highlighted by the reviewer, including a) that biodiversity information is complex, b) that it is hard to understand, c) that it is difficult to relate to concrete policy decisions and needs, and d) that the 2010 biodiversity target is unknown beyond certain narrow circles. This will be done through the extensive communication strategy that has been developed (see Annex K), which, through learning lessons from the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and elsewhere, will be based on strong channels of communication with stakeholders, and on the appropriate analysis and presentation of complex information in a way that is relevant and salient to the intended audiences. The Partnership will work closely with ongoing and additional initiatives that work in support of communication these issues, including the Countdown 2010 initiative that aims to expand in scope from European scale to a global initiative.

The reviewer notes the broad stakeholder involvement to date, and there is certainly considerable scope for the further engagement of a wide range of stakeholders. Indeed wider engagement of Partners and other stakeholders is planned in the early stages of the project. This is particularly the case for users of the information to be generated by the Partnership, including the guidelines to be produced as a component of the capacity building component (linking global and sub-global indicators and policy). The review highlights the current capacity building component as being relatively passive, and indeed is relatively under-resourced compared to other aspects of the project. These limited allocated resources, however, will add considerable value to ongoing and additional future plans of the CBD Secretariat and others, including a number of European Governments, for funding capacity building workshops and other initiatives on 2010, particularly as relates to the development and use of biodiversity indicators for tracking progress towards the 2010 target at various scales. The guidelines being produced will be widely disseminated through the large number of stakeholders already involved in the project, and will also serve to strengthen the incorporation of data and methodological advances from the national level into the global indicators.

The Partnership certainly aims to meet the needs of intergovernmental processes operating at the international and global scale, but is also making considerable efforts to link to non-governmental processes, both in terms of users, and contributors to the Partnership. For example, the Partnership will draw on the very best of the scientific community to develop rigorous indicators based on the best available data and methodologies. In terms of innovation, the incorporation of "mass-input 'citizen science'" is already a key component of some of the indicators, for example on bird population trends, and coral reefs. There are plans within the information management strategy for the Partnership to link to new information and communication technologies, including web-based and other media being developed through current and potential Partners of 2010BIP.

The reviewer's conclusions and suggestions for improvement are welcomed, and have been considered and taken on board as follows:

- The title proposed by the reviewer adds specificity, but is considered rather wordy, and not necessary to capture the essence of the Partnership. The current title has been retained.

- The first sentence of the project document summary is completely consistent with the logframe and development objective. The wording proposed by the reviewer is considered to be captured in the current logframe analysis.
- The revised development objective is decoupled from the 2010 target, although the 2010 is used as an objectively verifiable indicator, to provide a time-bound measure of progress towards the development objective.
- Ideas for ways to market and use the information generated by the project are further elaborated in Annex K, on the project's communication strategy.
- Further attention will be given towards the use of more technologically-innovative and publicly-inclusive knowledge management strategies, noting that these are often inversely correlated. The information management strategy for the project is elaborated in Annex L.

The reviewer's concluding remarks that the project is important, scientifically and technically sound, and has been thoroughly and properly formulated, and that it has great potential for generating global environmental benefits are particularly welcomed.