

A. PROJECT BRIEF

1. Identifiers:

Project Number:	2796 (GEFSEC)
Project Name:	Building the partnership to track progress at the global level in achieving the 2010 biodiversity target
Duration:	Three years (with an anticipated second phase also of three years)
Implementing Agency:	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Executing Agency:	UNEP-WCMC
Requesting Country:	Global
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity
GEF Prog. Framework:	OP #1 Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems OP #2 Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems OP #3 Forest Ecosystems OP #4 Mountain Ecosystems OP #12 Integrated Ecosystem Management OP #13 Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture
GEF Biodiv. Strat. Priority:	BD #4 – Generation and dissemination of best practices for addressing current and emerging biodiversity issues

2. Summary:

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. The immediate objective is that decisions made by governments and other stakeholders are better informed to improve the conservation status of biodiversity at the global level. The 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (2010BIP) project aims to achieve these objectives through the delivery of three outcomes:

1. A 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership generating information useful to decision-makers;
2. Improved global indicators implemented and available;
3. National governments and regional organizations using and contributing to the improved delivery of global indicators.

The project will ensure the coordinated delivery of the full suite of selected global biodiversity indicators that are being developed by a wide range of organisations. The project will deliver products and analyses based on these indicators to a range of users, including Parties to the biodiversity-related conventions and others, in order to support policy intervention and assess progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target. The suite of 2010 indicators, and analyses based on them highlighting the rate of loss of biodiversity and consequences for poverty and human well-being, will be communicated to a wide audience. Guidelines will be developed to promote and facilitate the development of 2010 biodiversity indicators at the national and regional level, and to enable stronger links between global and national and regional indicator development processes. Guidelines will also be developed to enhance the use of global biodiversity indicators in support of national and regional policy.

3. Costs and Financing:

GEF:	Project (phase 1):	3,639,000
	Project (phase2):	3,000,000
	PDF-B:	306,000
Subtotal GEF:		6,945,000

Co-financing:	Project	10,110,801
	PDF-B:	270,000
Sub-total Co-financing:		10,380,801

Total Project Cost (\$US): 17,325,801

4. Associated Financing (\$US):

N/A

5. Operational Focal Point Endorsement:

6. IA Contact:

Nigel Sizer
UNEP DGEF
Nairobi, Kenya
Email: nigel.sizer@unep.org

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



TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. PROJECT BRIEF	1
List of Annexes	4
List of Acronyms & Abbreviations	5
B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	7
Background And Context	7
Background	7
Programming Context.....	8
International Strategic and Policy Context	9
Related Initiatives.....	10
Objectives and Rationale	14
Global benefits of successful implementation	15
Project Outcomes, Outputs, and Activities	16
Output 1.1: A working partnership on 2010 indicators is established and maintained.	16
Output 1.2: A communication strategy meeting user needs is prepared and implemented.	18
Output 2.1: Standards, guidelines and methods for indicator development, peer review, and information sharing.	20
Output 2.2: Individual indicators strengthened and delivered.....	21
Output 3.1: Enhanced capacity of national governments and regional organizations to contribute to global indicator delivery.	22
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.....	23
Phased Approach	23
Risks And Sustainability	24
Risks And Assumptions	24
Sustainability and Replicability.....	26
Implementation Arrangements & stakeholder participation	29
Implementation Arrangements.....	29
Stakeholder Participation	32
Incremental Costs and Project Financing	34
Monitoring and Evaluation	35
Monitoring project progress and performance.....	36
Delivery of project outputs	37
Monitoring project outcomes and outputs.....	37

LIST OF ANNEXES

- Annex A Incremental Cost Analysis
- Annex B Logical Framework and Work Plan
- Annex C STAP Roster Technical Review and Response to Review
- Annex D Letters of Endorsement and Co-financing Support
- Annex E Budget and Co-financing Commitment
- Annex F Indicator Development Summaries
- Annex G Indicator Status Analysis
- Annex H Review of advice received on the full suite of 2010 Biodiversity Indicators
- Annex I Partnership Working Arrangements
- Annex J Relationship between the 2010 indicators and other indicators and targets
- Annex J1 Indicator Initiatives Matrix
- Annex K Communications Strategy
- Annex L Information Management Strategy
- Annex M Capacity Building Strategy – linking global and sub-global indicators and policy
- Annex N Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
- Annex O CBD COP Decision VII/30
- Annex P SBSTTA Recommendation X/5
- Annex Q CBD COP 8 Information Document on 2010 BIP
- Annex R Response to GEF and IA Review Comments

LIST OF ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

2010BIP	2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership
ACAP	Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
ACCOBAMS	Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea, and Contiguous Atlantic Area
AEWA	African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement
AHTEG	Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group
APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
ASCOBANS	Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas
BINU	Biodiversity Indicators for National Use
BOD	Biochemical Oxygen Demand
CABS	Center for Applied Biodiversity Science
CAFF	Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna
CAFF	Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna Working Group of the Arctic Council
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBMP	Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Programme
CEPA	Communication, Education and Public Awareness (of CBD)
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CI	Conservation International
CITES	Convention on International Trade on Endangered Species
CMS	Convention on Migratory Species
COP	Conference of the Parties
CSD	Commission on Sustainable Development
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (of OECD)
DAD-IS	Domestic Animal Diversity Information System
EA	Executing Agency
ECLAC	Economic Commission For Latin America And The Caribbean
EUROBATS	Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization
FRA	Forest Resource Assessments (of FAO)
GAW	Global Atmospheric Watch (of WMO)
GBO	Global Biodiversity Outlook
GCRMN	Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network
GEF SEC	Global Environment Facility Secretariat
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEMS Water	Global Environmental Monitoring System (of UNEP)
GEO	Global Environmental Outlook
GIS	Geographical Information System
GISIN	Global Invasive Species Information Network
GISP	Global Invasive Species Programme
GNI	Global Nitrogen Initiative
GPA	Global Plan of Action for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
GSPC	Global Strategy for Plant Conservation
HANNP	Human Appropriation of Net Primary Products
IA	Implementing Agency
IABIN	Inter-American Biodiversity Information Network
IAS	Invasive Alien Species
ICO	Indicator Contributing Organisation
IIASA	International Institute for Applied System Analysis
ILO	Indicator Lead Organisation
INBAR	International Network for Bamboo and Rattan
IoZ	Institute of Zoology (Zoological Society of London)
IPA	Important Plant Areas
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPGRI	International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (of CGIAR)
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organisation

IUCN	World Conservation Union
LPI	Living Planet Index (of WWF)
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTI	Marine Trophic Index
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association
NTFP	Non-Timber Forest Product
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OP	Operational Programme (of GEF)
PA	Protected Area
PBF-B	Project Development Facility, Block B (GEF project development grant)
PCU	Project Coordination Unit
PEBLDS	Council of the Pan-European Biological Diversity and Landscape Strategy
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PSR	Pressure-State-Response
QA	Quality Analysis
QC	Quality Control
Ramsar	Convention on Wetlands
RFMO	Regional Fisheries Management Organisations
RLI	Red List Index (of IUCN)
SAUP	Sea Around Us Project
SBSTTA	Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (of the CBD)
SC	Steering Committee
SCBD	Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
SEBI2010	Streamlining European 2010 Biodiversity Indicators
SINGER	System-wide Information Network for Genetic Resources
SRLI	Sampled Red List Index (of IUCN)
SSC	Species Survival Commission (of IUCN)
STAP	Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (of GEF)
STR	Significant Trade Review Process
SUSG	Sustainable Use Specialist Group (of IUCN)
Tbd	To be determined
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNCSD	United Nations Commission for Sustainable Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WAICENT	World Agricultural Information Centre (of FAO)
WBI	Wild Bird Index
WCPA	World Commission on Protected Areas (of IUCN)
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre (of UNEP)
WHC	World Heritage Centre
WHO	World Health Organisation
WIEWS	World Information and Early Warning System
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WPDA	World Database on Protected Areas
WQ	Water Quality
WRI	World Resources Institute
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WWF	World Wildlife Fund for Nature
ZSL	Zoological Society of London

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Background

1. 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 will enable the wide range of agencies and organizations already working individually on indicator development to collaborate more effectively to deliver a suite of global indicators that will be used for tracking and communicating progress.
2. The 2010 target, “to achieve a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at global, regional and national levels as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on earth”, was adopted by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Conference of Parties at its meeting in April 2002 (Decision VII/26), endorsed by Ministers responsible for CBD implementation during a Ministerial Roundtable discussion in April 2002 (Hague Ministerial Declaration), and further endorsed by world leaders during the World Summit on Sustainable Development in September 2002 (WSSD Plan of Implementation).
3. Subsequent fora have discussed this target in more depth, and considered ways to assess and report on its achievement. Particularly significant amongst these have been the definition of focal areas and indicators by the CBD Conference of Parties in February 2004 (Decision VII/30 – see Annex O of this document) and the subsequent advice of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) Recommendation X/5 – see Annex P of this document) based on the input of a wide range of experts and institutions.
4. The global indicators identified are at different stages of development and implementation. In some cases the indicators need little additional work to develop and use them, in other cases there is significant work to do in further developing the indicator methodology and/or the underlying datasets. In some cases the global indicators are the result of ongoing programmes that are already well resourced, in other cases the work is severely under-resourced and ways need to be found to better ensure the availability of these indicators into the future. There is also a need to demonstrate that the suite of indicators are fit for the purpose of assessing progress towards the 2010 target and contributing to its achievement, and to develop programmes to ensure their coordinated delivery into the future. The current status of the agreed indicators is summarized in Annex F of this document.
5. The proposed suite of indicators and the associated datasets are not owned or managed by any one organization, but by a wide range of organizations and agencies identified in Annex I. SBSTTA Recommendation X/5 identifies many of these organizations and agencies, and solicits their input, but there is, as yet, no mechanism in place for coordinating this input, nor for ensuring delivery of the 2010 indicators in the medium term leading up to the 2010 and beyond. While the current focus of the ongoing and proposed work is on global biodiversity indicators and datasets, there is also a need to broaden this focus, and specifically to identify the interlinkages between global and national development strategies and use of global indicators, and how the global biodiversity indicators relate to (a) national databases and nationally reported data, and (b) indicators developed and used at the national level.
6. The Project Development Facility Block B (PDF-B) phase of this project has allowed a working partnership to be developed between the organizations involved in delivering the agreed indicators, and the identification of the means for their further development and delivery. The relationship of these indicators to those in other international processes has been initially reviewed, and actions necessary to ensure the delivery of 2010 indicators in a coordinated manner in subsequent years have been clearly defined. Gaps in the current development plans for indicators have been highlighted, and

where possible, mechanisms put into place to fill these gaps during the course of this project, in advance of 2010.

Programming Context

GEF Programming Context

7. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) has increased focus in recent years on evaluation of its impact, and in improving knowledge management and dissemination to increase the effectiveness of its projects and programmes. Given the broad international mandate for the 2010 target and indicators, these indicators are clearly directly relevant to the GEF's interests in both assessment of progress in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, and in identification of key future priorities.

8. The proposal is consistent with the GEF Operational Strategy in a number of key areas. 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 summarises exactly this project's aims at the global level for biodiversity. Further, the GEF Operational Strategy chapter on biological diversity emphasizes that "all GEF-funded activities in biodiversity will be in full conformity with the guidance provided by the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the CBD". This project responds directly to CBD COP Decision VII/30 and to SBSTTA Recommendation X/5, which itself is in response to Decision VII/30.

9. The proposal is consistent with the GEF Biodiversity Strategy. The Partnership will contribute directly to achieving the biodiversity focal area strategic priorities number 4 (BD-4 Generation and Dissemination of Best Practices for Addressing Current and Emerging Biodiversity Issues). In relation to BD-4 the Partnership will provide opportunity for the analysis and dissemination of good practice in addressing biodiversity loss, including the multisectoral and ecosystem approaches. The Partnership also explicitly promotes information exchange through national, regional and global knowledge networks. Specifically the project will:

- (a) improve understanding of the extent to which biodiversity targets are being met;
- (b) provide information that will 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.

10. This project is not targeted at any specific Operational Program, but the indicators will provide information of value to all five of the ecosystem-focused operational programs, and those programmes focussed on the sustainable use and management of biodiversity. 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, and this recommendation has been built into the indicator development plans as part of this project.

11. Several indicators being developed under the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (2010BIP) will contribute information towards tracking biodiversity mainstreaming in production landscapes and sectors in Priority II. These include the indicators for sustainable use and management, indicators of genetic resources, and indicators of ecosystem goods and services in particular. The development of these, and other 2010 indicators, will be directly relevant to other GEF projects and will enable a significant contribution to the tracking tool improvement process. A unique benefit of the global context of this suite of indicators is their potential to provide perspective on the contribution of the achievements and trends at regional and national levels.

UNEP Programming Context

12. The United Nations Environment 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 will also contribute to building links between the GEO process and the work of the CBD in developing its Global Biodiversity Outlook.

13. Since June 2000, the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) has been integrated into UNEP as a specialist biodiversity information and assessment centre, with a clear role in both biodiversity assessment and the use of information to support implementation of international agreements and programmes. The UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (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 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) Plan of Implementation, while noting no specific budget is provided for this, and that Centre derives the majority of its revenue from non-UNEP sources. CBD Decision VII/30 explicitly invites the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre to play a role in supporting the CBD through "facilitating the compilation of information necessary for reporting on achievement of the 2010 target".

International Strategic and Policy Context

14. 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).

15. 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).

16. The global mandate for the 2010 target is therefore a strong one, and there is, in Europe at least, an even stronger regional mandate within both the European Union (Göteborg European Council: Presidency Conclusions, 2001) and the Pan-European region (Kyiv Resolution on Biodiversity, 2003). The strength of this mandate has led to substantial discussion on how to assess and report on progress in achieving this target, which is complementary to and will contribute to implementation of this project.

17. 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 O), and agreed on a limited number of global indicators for testing. They agreed that the indicators should, wherever possible, be built on existing data and processes, be useful at a range of scales, and relate to the CBD programmes of work. They also agreed on the Global Biodiversity Outlook as a key reporting mechanism for communicating the 2010 target indicators to Parties to the CBD.

18. Following expert review, including review by an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) convened by the CBD Executive Secretary, the tenth meeting of SBSTTA made further

recommendations on the set of indicators, including identification of coordinators to help ensure their delivery (Recommendation X/5 – see Annex P). 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.

19. In line with CBD COP Decision VII/30, the first point for official delivery of the indicators has been through the development and delivery to the eighth meeting of the CBD Conference of Parties in March 2006, as a contribution to the second Global Biodiversity Outlook. This process has highlighted many gaps and inconsistencies in the delivery of individual 2010 indicators within the framework of the Strategic Plan. It is anticipated that a more comprehensive suite of indicators will be delivered in a wide range of products of different formats between now and 2010 and beyond, including any future editions of the Global Biodiversity Outlook.

20. The commitment by governments to this process is already indicated in the CBD COP decisions VI/26 and VII/30, and SBSTTA Recommendation X/5, and by the resources already committed by several governments (including the governments of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States of America), to supporting expert discussion on this issue at the AHTEG meeting and elsewhere. COP has already invited UNEP-WCMC to collaborate with the CBD Secretariat in facilitating compilation of the indicators, and SBSTTA recommendation X/5 invites agencies and organizations involved in the identified indicators 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.

Related Initiatives

GEF-funded projects

21. A number of ongoing and recently completed GEF-funded projects are closely related to the 2010BIP. These include the project on Biodiversity Indicators for National Use (BINU), the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA), and the Inter-American Biodiversity Information Network (IABIN).

22. The BINU project has generated experience in developing indicators at the national level in four countries (Ecuador, Kenya, Philippines, Ukraine) that will provide valuable input to the 2010BIP activities, and in particular on how the global 2010 indicators might relate to indicators and datasets at the national level. The BINU project found that many of the indicators to meet national needs also matched the indicators subsequently identified for the 2010 target, showing that the 2010 indicators are policy relevant and feasible for use at the national level. The BINU project showed that national-level biodiversity indicators and data sets can be compiled with limited resources, but some guidance in the calculation and use of indicators significantly increases their impact. Guidelines and examples on the methodologies and applications of biodiversity indicators were an effective means to increase capacity. International workshops and opportunities to exchange experience were an effective means to encourage and strengthen the organisations responsible for indicator development. The 2010BIP Executing Agency, UNEP-WCMC, has ascertained that the experts involved in each of the countries would be happy to contribute to implementation of the 2010BIP project through sharing experience and lessons learnt from the national perspective.

23. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) carried out extensive review of the datasets available for assessing status and trends in a range of attributes of biodiversity, including of species, ecosystems, and ecosystem services. The project was explicitly based on existing methods and knowledge, and as such will provide information that will be valuable in further development of a range of 2010 indicators. UNEP-WCMC was specifically responsible for the coordination of the assessment of current trends in the MA. Lessons learned from the MA assessments at all scales have been incorporated into this project design, and will be incorporated into its implementation. These

include the importance of early and significant efforts in engagement and communication, and the importance of providing a credible, legitimate and relevant process for the intended user audience.

24. The IABIN project is being implemented by the World Bank and Organization of American States, with substantial national involvement in the region. The project has been given a mandate by the Summit of the Americas to provide a forum for technical and scientific cooperation that promotes greater coordination among Western Hemisphere countries in the collection, sharing, and use of biodiversity information and indicators relevant to decision-making and education. It is expected that IABIN will contribute to the 2010BIP project through (a) mobilizing and improving the quality, accessibility, and interoperability of primary data for populating the 2010 indicators; (b) better understanding and identifying needs and opportunities for developing indicators at the regional level, following a bottom-up approach; and (c) engaging the regional stakeholders in the process. The 2010 BIP project will in addition be able to provide a framework for developing key indicators for monitoring status and trends of regional biodiversity in the Americas.

Other Mechanisms

25. Several other indicator processes, including those of biodiversity-related conventions, development-related mechanisms, and regional and national initiatives, are closely related to the activities of the 2010BIP project.

26. Three additional biodiversity-related conventions are actively developing indicators that relate to the CBD suite of 2010 indicators. In each of these cases there is a clearly stated willingness to contribute to the implementation of the 2010BIP project, and the Secretariat of each of these conventions is represented in the Partnership. In-kind contributions on behalf of these Conventions are included in the co-financing for the 2010BIP project, covering the time spent by the Secretariats of the Conventions on 2010BIP activities and meetings. It is anticipated that collaborations such as these will extend to other international agreements and programmes as the project further develops.

- (a) The Convention on International Trade on Endangered Species (CITES) envisages the delivery of indicators at the global level that relate to the CBD focal area on the promotion of sustainable use and consumption of biodiversity, in particular to sub-target 4.3, 'No species of wild fauna or flora endangered by international trade', and that are meaningful to CITES Parties, can support future policy interventions and communicate the degree of success in achieving the 2010 target and beyond. CITES will consider relevant indicators focusing on international trade in wild fauna and flora, including the indicator on proportion of products derived from sustainable sources.
- (b) The Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) is identifying and developing indicators that maintain strong links to other related conventions and processes, and considers the development of 2010 indicators within the context of a broader assessment of achievement of the CMS strategic objectives and targets. The recently adopted CMS Strategic Plan 2006-2011 includes specific targets directly relevant to the development of indicators for measuring the status and trends of migratory species at global, regional, and national levels. Specific targets laid out in the Strategic Plan which are directly relevant to the development of indicators include 1.3 - *Indices for measuring the status and trends of migratory species at global, regional and national level developed* and 1.5 – *Criteria, indicators and guidelines for assessing the success of conservation actions for priority migratory species developed*. Convention processes that have the potential to generate data for Migratory Species Indicators include national reporting, the CMS Information Management System currently under development and the Global Register of Migratory Species (GROMS).

In specific relation to 2010 indicators, the Living Planet Index (LPI) and the Red List Indices (RLIs and Sampled RLIs) are considered of particular relevance to CMS. In particular, the 8th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 2005 has requested that a Migratory Species

Index within the context of the LPI be developed in collaboration with the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), BirdLife International, the World Conservation Union (IUCN), UNEP-WCMC and other relevant institutions (Resolution 8.7). While the RLIs and SRLI have not been explicitly mentioned in this resolution, they are still regarded as potentially useful indicators for CMS and some of its Agreements, and testing of its applicability to subsets of migratory species is at an advanced stage. In addition to the above-mentioned indices, evaluation is underway about the feasibility and sensitivity of an index on changes over time in the distribution and range of migratory species.

Several of the Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) concluded under CMS have their own data gathering and assessment systems and processes for certain groups of migratory species in given geographic areas. These provide potential for the assessment of progress in achieving the 2010 target for each Agreement/MoU separately – thus for specific taxonomic groups and regions – as well as for the Convention overall – thus global

- (c) The indicator process of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands has clear linkages with the 2010BIP process, including the use of the same or very similar measures, the use of disaggregations of global indicators according to habitat type to give indicators relevant to wetlands, and the contribution of additional perspectives by considering the Ramsar-specific indicators in the context of the 2010BIP project.

Examples of where the 2010 process and Ramsar effectiveness process aim to use the same measures, and are seeking to unify the approach taken to these, include a cut of the Red List Index relating to wetland-dependent birds and wetland-dependent amphibians; and assessment of trends in selected biomes, ecosystems and habitats in respect of wetland habitat types such as mangroves, coral reefs, seagrasses, and inland wetlands (peatlands)). In addition there are other 2010 indicators which, with a wetland-related analysis and disaggregation as appropriate, will add supplementary perspectives to the picture of Ramsar effectiveness produced by the core set of Ramsar indicators (eg: Living Planet Index; Marine Trophic Index). Furthermore, some of the Ramsar indicators will offer additional perspectives to the 2010 assessment process (eg: qualitative assessment of trends in wetland conservation status may generate information on river fragmentation), and they may also contribute additional insights into the drivers of change to wetland ecosystems. This work is also related to the development of a joint reporting framework on the biological diversity of inland waters by Ramsar/CBD, for which CBD SBSTTA11 Recommendation XI/9 requested the CBD Executive Secretary to invite the Ramsar Convention to take the lead.

27. Other related mechanisms include 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”. In general terms it has been recognized that the conservation of biodiversity and its sustainable and equitable use are key components of environmental management and sustainability. MDG 7 can be seen to underpin the achievement of all the other seven MDGs, especially MDG 1 on reducing hunger and extreme poverty. MDG 7 has three Targets (9, 10 and 11) and eight indicators for reporting on progress to meet these Targets. For three of these indicators there are similar or relevant indicators for the 2010 biodiversity target:

- Proportion of land area covered by forests (Target 9, Indicator 25);
- Ratio of area protected to maintain biological diversity to surface area (Target 9, Indicator 26);
- Proportion of population with sustainable access to an improved water source, urban and rural (Target 10, Indicator 30).

28. These indicators are closely related to the 2010 indicators of trends in extent of selected biomes, ecosystems, and habitats; coverage of protected areas; and water quality in aquatic ecosystems, respectively.

29. Indeed, the linkages between the 2010 indicators and the MDGs may become considerably stronger if, as proposed by the Poverty-Environment Partnership, the CBD's 2010 indicators are adopted as the indicators for the biodiversity component of MDG 7. Such integration would result in a strengthening of the linkages between biodiversity and environmental sustainability and development, and the biodiversity indicators would reach a much wider audience. Institutional and financial resources for calculating the 2010 biodiversity target indicators at the national level would also be increased. More direct linkages with the MDGs and their indicators will be a considerable focus of the 2010BIP project.

30. There are also direct linkages with the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD)'s environmental indicators, which contribute to reviewing progress in the implementation of Agenda 21, and include indicators relating to trends in selected key ecosystems, protected areas, desertification, urbanisation, and the intensity of agriculture and resource extraction.

31. At the regional level, the 2010BIP project is establishing a close working relationship with the indicator processes of Streamlining European Biodiversity Indicators (SEBI2010) project, the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Programme (CBMP), and the Ark 2010 project. This relationship will involve representation of these initiatives in the Partnership, and the sharing of methodologies and ideas.

- (a) SEBI2010 is a project that aims to develop and streamline 2010 biodiversity indicators at the European level, as agreed by the European Union and the Council of the Pan-European Biological Diversity and Landscape Strategy (PEBLDS), to assess and inform about progress towards the European 2010 targets. This requires effective coordination within Europe to ensure consistency and avoid duplication of effort on achieving the 2010 target to halt biodiversity loss. Since the SEBI2010 indicators are based on those agreed by the CBD Conference of the Parties, there are clear linkages between these indicators and those of the 2010 BIP project.
- (b) The Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program has been developed by the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna Working Group of the Arctic Council (CAFF), in response to directives by the Arctic Council Ministers, and numerous international agreements and conventions. Its aim is to develop effective policies that protect Arctic flora and fauna from extinction, but also allow for the sustainable use of the Arctic's living resources, socio-cultural stability, and successful regional and economic development. The CBMP will serve as a coordinating entity for currently existing biodiversity monitoring programmes in the Arctic, and will implement indicators that reflect changes and shifts in the status, trends, abundance, and distribution of Arctic species, habitats, and ecosystems. The CBMP indicators will be consistent with the CBD 2010 global indicators.
- (c) The Ark 2010 programme is aimed at developing a new generation of computational tools for discovering, integrating, analyzing and sharing biodiversity information. Ark 2010 seeks to provide new technologies for developing indicators, building scenarios and, in general, evaluating status and trends of global biodiversity. Two regional pilots have been selected to guide the Ark 2010 development in its first phase, covering the Arctic and Neotropical regions. The first pilot is linked to the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program. One of the main expected results from this initiative is a comprehensive biodiversity report to be delivered in the context of the 2010 Biodiversity Target. This report will be mostly based on the analysis of a set of indicators, including:
 - Extent of terrestrial, coastal, freshwater and marine biomes;
 - Extent and frequency of natural disturbances (i.e. fire, insects);
 - Arctic Living Planet Index (trends in vertebrate populations);

- Red List Index (trends in species at risk);
- Extent of human footprint (roads, seismic lines, etc); and;
- Trends in Arctic phenology (i.e. timing of Arctic green-up).

The second pilot will evaluate status, trends and values of cloud forest biodiversity in Mexico, Costa Rica and Colombia. It will also test new technologies to better understand cloud forest services, threats and conservation opportunities. Results from this pilot will be primarily intended to support the reporting and decision making bodies of the 2010 Biodiversity Target at national level. Main regional partners in this pilot are the Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad (CONABIO, Mexico), Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad (INBio, Costa Rica) and the Humboldt Institute (Colombia).

32. Further details, and an analysis, of the relationship between the 2010 indicators and the indicator processes of other mechanisms are given in Annex J.

OBJECTIVES AND RATIONALE

33. 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.

34. The immediate objective of the 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.

35. The project has three key outcomes:

- (1) A 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership generating information useful to decision-makers;
- (2) Improved global indicators are implemented and available;
- (3) National governments and regional organizations using and contributing to the improved delivery of global indicators.

36. Through the CBD governance and advisory bodies, the global biodiversity community has identified a preliminary suite of indicators to be used in assessing progress in achieving the 2010 target for significant reduction in the current rate of biodiversity loss. However, a number of important issues in the development of this suite of indicators have yet to be addressed:

- The proposed suite of indicators and the associated datasets are not owned or managed by any one organization, but by a wide range of organizations and agencies, and there is, as yet, no mechanism in place for coordinating this input, nor for ensuring delivery of the 2010 indicators in appropriate and meaningful formats for a range of users over the years to come. The 2010BIP project will overcome this obstacle by acting as a mechanism for coordinating the input from the organizations and agencies involved in indicator development, for ensuring the timely delivery of the 2010 indicators, and for communicating the results of the indicators in ways that meet the needs of the wide range of users.
- The indicators identified are at a range of different stages of development and implementation, in some cases needing little additional development before they are ready for use, and in other cases needing significant work to further develop both the indicators and underlying datasets. The indicators are identified and their status assessed in Annex G. The 2010BIP project will help to ensure that indicators are developed further by monitoring the status and development of each of the indicators and encouraging collaboration between Partners to strengthen indicator and dataset development.

- The extent to which the necessary funds are available for development and delivery of the indicators varies. In some cases the indicators are the result of ongoing programmes that are already reasonably well resourced, while in other cases the work is severely under-resourced. The 2010BIP project will help to overcome this obstacle by providing funding to support the development and delivery of specific indicators. In addition the 2010BIP will facilitate the further financing of indicator development plans through the provision of co-financing and support to coordinated approaches for fundraising.
- The means for effective delivery of the indicators require further consideration, and there is a need to more thoroughly review the potential needs of different user groups and how those needs can be met using the identified suite of indicators. The 2010BIP project will implement a comprehensive review of user needs at the onset of the project, and maintain and update the review throughout the project. The information gathered by this review will be used to shape the outputs of the 2010BIP to ensure that they meet the needs of the full range of users.
- In order to ensure efficient development and use of indicators, and in particular their use in other sectors, the relationship needs to be further explored between the proposed 2010 indicators at global level, and other global indicators and targets. The 2010BIP will investigate the relationship between the 2010 indicators and explore the linkages between the 2010 indicators and indicators being used and developed by other international conventions and programmes, including the Millennium Development Goals.
- In order to promote and facilitate the use of 2010 indicators at national and regional levels, and to ensure the adequacy and accuracy of national data used in global and regional indicators, it is necessary to more clearly understand and specify the relationship between global indicators and the availability of data and potential use of indicators at national and regional levels. The 2010BIP will address this by promoting increased linkages between global 2010 indicators and national and regional level policy and indicator development. This will involve the development of guidelines and other tools where appropriate (i) to facilitate the use of global 2010 indicator methodologies at national and regional levels, (ii) to facilitate increased local, national, and regional data and other contributions to the development of global 2010 indicators, and (iii) to facilitate the use of global 2010 indicators in national and regional-level policy and decision-making.

Global benefits of successful implementation

37. The purpose of the 2010 target is to bring sharper focus to the urgent need to significantly reduce the rate of biodiversity loss at all levels, global, regional, national and local. This follows from an increased understanding that reduction of biodiversity loss, whether it results from genetic erosion, loss of species, or disruption of habitats, is an essential step in achieving sustainable development and eliminating poverty.

38. Setting in place improved mechanisms for tracking progress in reducing the rate of loss of biodiversity, and achieving the 2010 target, provides information that is essential for two key activities that themselves then promote improved achievement of the target:

- 1) Policy intervention: Meaningful indicators delivered to appropriate timescales will allow decision-making bodies such as intergovernmental meetings to debate and agree policy and to set priorities taking the best available information on trends in various attributes of global biodiversity into account. This will allow for more informed decision-making, and better targeted action. The indicators will also facilitate assessment of the impact of these policies, priorities and actions, providing the necessary feedback from monitoring and evaluation processes to further improve policy intervention.
- 2) Public awareness and communication: The effective use of a suite of 2010 biodiversity indicators to communicate progress in achieving the target and to raise public awareness will increase public interest in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. This will provide a focus for increasing understanding of the trends and importance of biodiversity, and as a result, it will

increase the engagement of civil society in appropriate action to reduce the rate of loss of biodiversity.

39. This project will contribute to more informed decision-making at global and other levels, improved monitoring of global biodiversity, and increased appreciation of the value and trends in global biodiversity. This will in turn help to ensure better action to secure the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

PROJECT OUTCOMES, OUTPUTS, AND ACTIVITIES

The 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership project has three key outcomes, each of which will be achieved through the delivery of two outputs and associated activities. Details of the outcomes, outputs, and activities, as well as the objectively verifiable indicators, means of verification, and key assumptions, can also be found in the logical framework and project work plan (Annex B).

40. The three key outcomes of the 2010BIP project are:

- (1) A 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership generating information useful to decision-makers;
- (2) Improved global indicators are implemented and available; and
- (3) National governments and regional organizations using and contributing to the improved delivery of global indicators.

41. Successful achievement of these outcomes will enable the 2010BIP project to meet its immediate objective: 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. This in turn will help the development objective of the project, a reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss at the global level through improved decisions for the conservation of global biodiversity, to be met.

42. The 2010BIP project's three key outcomes will be achieved through the delivery of six key outputs. Details of these outputs and the activities associated with them are given below. Details of the ways in which success in achieving the outcomes and outputs will be measured, including objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification, are given in the section on Monitoring and Evaluation (sub-section 'Monitoring project outcomes and outputs'), below.

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

Output 1.1: A working partnership on 2010 indicators is established and maintained.

43. The Partnership that operates during the full phase of the 2010BIP project will be based on the Partnership established during the PDF-B phase of the project, with existing Partners continuing to be involved in the project and new Partners being added as appropriate (further details regarding the engagement of new stakeholders are given below). Efforts will continue to be made to ensure an appropriate geographic representation and participation, both in the BIP as a whole and in the project Steering Committee.

44. The establishment and management of the Partnership will be coordinated by the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), based at the Executing Agency (EA), UNEP-WCMC. The PCU will consist of 2 full-time equivalent staff members. Staff roles and responsibilities will include project management (one full-time equivalent staff member), coordination of communication activities (two-

thirds full-time equivalent staff member), and information management and indicator coordination (one-third full-time equivalent staff member).

45. Four Partnership meetings will take place during the course of the project, attended by representatives from each of the Indicator Lead Organisations (ILOs) and other Indicator Partners, User Partners, including representatives from Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEA) Secretariats and national governments, and other stakeholders as appropriate. The aim of these Partnership meetings will be to present and review progress in the project, identify and develop adaptive actions to be taken, and to promote discussion and collaboration between Partners. The 2010BIP Steering Committee (SC) will also meet annually, in connection with the Partnership meetings, to provide direction and guidance to the PCU, and to monitor and evaluate project progress. Further details of the content of the SC meetings are given in the Terms of Reference for the SC in the Partnership Working Agreements (Annex I).

46. Processes will be implemented that facilitate the sharing of ideas, standards, guidelines, methodologies and data amongst the Partnership and more widely. Partners will be encouraged to communicate and share information and methodologies with one another. A central register of indicator information and related standards and guidelines will be maintained by the PCU to facilitate information management and increase consistency and comparability of indicators.

47. An information management working group, with the terms of reference to address and share information management practices, standards, and geographic reference bases, will be established within the first six months of the full project, and will continue throughout the project. The working group will facilitate communication and interaction between Partners' information management practitioners. Appropriate contacts for information management issues will be identified in each of the Indicator Lead Organisations and other key participating organisations and agencies. The working group will consider issues such as consistent reference bases, useful standards and practices, and means of data harmonisation. This will considerably strengthen the information management capacity of the Partnership as a whole.

48. Additional stakeholders will be identified and their contribution to the activities of the Partnership will be encouraged. The Partnership will throughout the project be open to engaging new stakeholders, including the addition of new Partners and Affiliates where appropriate. New Indicator Partners will be those additional organisations and agencies developing and contributing data to specific indicators, as well as organisations, agencies, and MEA or government representatives with relevant experience or work in the indicators field. New Partners will be closely involved in the development and implementation of the 2010BIP, including attendance at Partnership meetings where appropriate. New 2010BIP Affiliates may come from a broader background, and include any interested parties. Affiliates will be informed of progress in the project through regular communication from the PCU, and will be invited to contribute to online discussions, but it is not expected that Affiliates will be invited to attend 2010BIP meetings. Further details about the roles of 2010BIP Partners and Affiliates are given in the Partnership Working Arrangements (Annex I).

49. Documentation of ongoing lessons learned from the implementation of the project will be maintained, and management adjustments will be incorporated based on an analysis of these lessons learned.

50. Activities to be implemented in order to deliver Output 1.1 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: A communication strategy meeting user needs is prepared and implemented.

51. Further, and periodic, review of potential users of the 2010 indicators and their needs will be carried out to ensure that the 2010 BIP and its outputs are of utmost relevance to the full range of users of the 2010 indicators.

52. Review and refinement of the communications and outreach strategy will be carried out to ensure that the strategy is updated in line with user needs reviews, and to ensure that the 2010BIP project has the best possible mechanism in place for producing and disseminating results to all relevant users. The focus of the communications strategy is on both direct outreach from the Partnership, facilitated by the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), and on assisting communication by Partners to end-users. Particularly close links will be made with the communication initiatives of 2010BIP Partners, including the Countdown 2010 initiative of IUCN and others. The communication products generated by 2010BIP will be designed to support Partner outreach to international conventions, UN agencies and other international organisations, civil society organisations, business and industry, and mass media sectors. The BIP Secretariat will reach out directly to end users through the significant web presence of the project, 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.

53. The communication strategy aims to position the 2010BIP as the best source of information on global biodiversity trends, and create a reputation as a legitimate and credible source of global biodiversity information in the eyes of the target audience. In the long-term, the communication strategy will result in changes in discourse, policy and development trends that lead to a significant reduction in biodiversity loss at the global level, in line with the 2010 target. In the short-term, the communication strategy for 2010BIP information and products is expected to result in demand from end users for such information, use in publications by international conventions and other organisations and initiatives, and increased numbers of entities actively engaged with the work of the Partnership.

54. The 2010BIP communications strategy involves two key aspects: firstly communicating the high standards and rationale of the Partnership, and secondly communicating the products and information from the indicators themselves. Clear rules will be established for the use of 2010BIP information, to ensure the Partners can freely use 2010BIP products in their outreach activities without affecting the credibility and legitimacy of 2010BIP as a source.

55. Communication within the Partnership will be facilitated by the use of email listservs, and a forum on the 2010BIP website where reports and results can be posted and Partners can discuss aspects of the project with each other and the PCU.

56. Analysis on the links between the full suite of 2010 biodiversity indicators will be performed to help deliver further information on biodiversity trends and impacts. Such an analysis will help to identify areas of overlap between indicators, and thus will ensure that sufficient linkages between indicators are presented in the 2010 BIP publications.

57. Means to relate the 2010 indicators to other international conventions and programmes, and the relationship of the indicators arising from other relevant conventions and programmes to the suite of 2010 indicators, will be further identified and implemented. This will also involve further

identification and implementation of means to relate the 2010 indicators to the MDGs, targets and indicators, including through support to revisions of MDG target 9, and the incorporation of the 2010 target and selected associated indicators into MDG7. This activity will result in the 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. Further details of relationships between the 2010 BIP project and other mechanisms are given in Annex J.

58. A range of suitable products based on results and analysis of the 2010 biodiversity indicators will be developed, including the establishment and maintenance of the Partnership web site. The user needs review, described above, will be used to determine the type of products that will be suitable and necessary for communicating the results and analysis of the 2010 biodiversity indicators. These products will likely include regular newsletters throughout the first phase of the full project, with a publication at the end of this phase, and further results and analysis being published during the second phase of the full project. Products of the 2010BIP will include analysis of the full suite of indicators to deliver further information on biodiversity trends and impacts. This will also include close collaboration with the CBD Secretariat in delivering some components of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO) and associated products, and delivering 2010 biodiversity information to other organisations and initiatives for use in additional products and processes. Updates will be regularly published on the 2010 BIP website (www.twentyten.net), which will be one of the key mechanisms for disseminating 2010 BIP outputs, as well as a key communication tool for the Partnership itself. The 2010BIP communications and outreach strategy is presented in further detail in Annex K.

59. All key Partnership products will be translated where appropriate (initially into French and Spanish) to facilitate ease of use and increase the impact of the products around the world. Products will be actively disseminated as widely as possible, including using Partners to reach their stakeholders.

60. Promotional and outreach materials for use of Partnership members and others will be developed. The 2010BIP Secretariat is in a strong position to organize, synthesize and package information from multiple sources to be used by 2010BIP members in their direct interactions with users. The impetus of the 2010BIP communication strategy will therefore be to maximise opportunities for the Partnership to be represented at, and benefit from, activities and events being held by conventions and other initiatives. This would significantly add value to the engagement of 2010BIP. The Communications strategy for 2010BIP will build on lessons learned from the MA, and in particular recognizing the importance of relevance, legitimacy and credibility of the process and products being communicated. Early, regular and frequent communication efforts will be implemented in order to communicate the messages delivered by the range of indicators implemented within the context of the 2010BIP.

61. A process for peer review of the products delivered from the Partnership will be established and implemented. This component includes the implementation of a thorough peer review of the full suite of 2010 indicators and Partnership products, to ensure their validity and credibility. Three principles governing the 2010BIP peer review process will be considered, building on the peer review processes already in place for many of the individual indicators. Firstly, the best scientific and technical information should be included so that the 2010BIP products represent the latest scientific and technical findings and are as comprehensive as possible. Secondly, a wide circulation process, including ensuring representation of independent experts from developing countries and countries with economies in transition, will involve as many experts as possible in the 2010BIP process. Thirdly, the review process will be objective, open, and transparent, with all comments and responses to comments fully documented. The process of peer review will be heavily based on that used recently in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, and will include both scientific and government review. In addition, several of the products into which the 2010BIP outputs will feed, such as the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, will undergo additional and substantial government review.

62. Activities to be implemented in order to deliver 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 are implemented and available

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

63. Basic standards for each indicator, including quality assurance processes and documentation, will be established as necessary. Peer review strategies for all indicators being developed within the 2010BIP will be implemented, and quality standards will be established at the outset of the project for all indicator data and methodologies in order to be included in products of the 2010BIP. The Indicator Lead Organisations will coordinate peer review of individual indicators, while peer review of the full suite of indicators and the Partnership's outputs will be coordinated by the 2010BIP.

64. Indicator methodologies, metadata, and completed indicator time series will be contributed to Partnership information sharing facilities. In principle the Partnership encourages the sharing of data in an unrestricted manner to encourage free flow of information between data providers, data processors, and data users, in line with the conservation commons. However, it is recognised that access to source datasets and detail level indicator data may sometimes be restricted. Authority to control access to the datasets lies with the identified responsible custodian. ILOs and ICOs and other organisations authorised by the custodians are fully free, and encouraged, to publish the results of the indicators independently of the 2010BIP. The 2010BIP will include resulting approved 2010 indicators in BIP outputs, including, *inter alia*, publications, brochures, and on the website. Where appropriate, specific agreements relating to this will be determined on an individual basis with organisations. The 2010BIP will also perform cross-cutting analyses using the results of the individual indicators, and to synthesise and publish these as appropriate. Further details on data and information management principles and practices are provided in the 2010BIP Information Management Strategy (Annex L).

65. Activities to be implemented in order to deliver Output 2.1 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.

66. Further development of identified indicators in support of the CBD headline indicators will be carried out, including development and implementation of short and long term plans for data collection, management and use. The responsibility for the implementation and delivery of individual 2010 indicators will be that of the 2010BIP Partners identified as Indicator Lead Organisations (ILOs), with considerable support from the Indicator Contributing Organisations. The ILOs will be responsible for coordinating the collation of available data and information, and development of methodologies to produce individual indicators. The Indicator Contributing Organisations (ICOs) will contribute to these responsibilities as appropriate. The assignment of ILOs to individual indicators is shown in the table below. For a full list of 2010BIP Partners, please refer to the Partnership Working Arrangements (Annex I).

67. Table 1: 2010 BIP Indicators and Indicator Lead Organisations (N.B. many other organisations also involved in indicator development and delivery):

Focal Area and Indicators	Indicator Lead Organization(s)
Status and trends of the components of biodiversity	
Extent of selected biomes, ecosystems and habitats	Various
Living Planet Index and associated indices	IoZ & WWF International
Global Wild Bird indicator	Birdlife International
Protected Areas, overlays with biodiversity, and management effectiveness	UNEP-WCMC and WCPA
Red List Index (and Sampled RLI)	IUCN
<i>Ex-situ</i> crop collections	FAO
Genetic diversity of terrestrial domesticated animals	FAO
Sustainable Use	
Area of Forest under sustainable management	UNEP-WCMC and FAO
Area of agricultural ecosystems under sustainable management	FAO
Proportion of fish stocks in safe biological limits	FAO
Status of species in trade	CITES
Other indicator of sustainable use	IUCN
Ecological Footprint	Global Footprint Network
Threats to biodiversity	
Nitrogen Deposition	International Nitrogen Initiative
Invasive Alien Species	Global Invasive Species Programme
Ecosystem Integrity and ecosystem goods and services	
Marine Trophic Index	Fisheries Centre, UBC
Water Quality	UNEP GEMS Water
Forest fragmentation	UNEP-WCMC and FAO
River Fragmentation and flow regulation	TNC
Health and well being of communities dependent on biodiversity	WHO
Nutritional status of biodiversity	FAO
Biodiversity in diet and healthcare	IUCN
Status of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices	
Status and trends of linguistic diversity and number of speakers of indigenous languages	UNESCO
Status of Access and Benefit Sharing	
Indicator tbd	
Status of resource transfers	
ODA in support of the objectives of the CBD	OECD

68. Implementation of the individual indicators will build on ongoing development work, and specifically that carried out during the PDF-B phase of the BIP project, which included the completion of ‘indicator development templates’ for each indicator. These templates contained the following information, which is summarised in Annex F to this report, and analysed in Annex G:

- Current status of the indicator. Data and methodology, scale and disaggregation, trends, relationship of the indicator to biodiversity and the 2010 target, relationship of the indicator to other processes and targets, peer review processes, indicator stakeholders, current weaknesses, technical information on indicator development, system and database documentation, examples of the use of the indicator in other processes and initiatives, budgets and workplans for current indicator development, proposals developed or submitted, and supporting documentation.
- Required development. Methodologies, data collection and management strategies, scope, scale and disaggregation of the proposed development, future capacity to detect trends, collaborators, schedule, and budget requirements including potential sources of funding for further indicator development;
- Communication strategies. Specific to the individual indicators.

69. In addition, short- and long-term plans for data collection, management, and use will be developed and implemented during the early stages of the project. The current status of information management and practices for each indicator development effort is summarised in Annex L.

70. Activities to be implemented in order to deliver Output 2.2 include:

- 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 the improved delivery of global indicators.

Output 3.1: Enhanced capacity of national governments and regional organizations to contribute to global indicator delivery.

71. This component of the 2010BIP project will facilitate increased incorporation of local, national and regional datasets and other information into global indicators, and develop a set of guidelines on enhancing the use of local, national, and regional data and methodologies in global indicator processes.

72. In addition, 2010BIP Partners and the BIP Secretariat will participate in and contribute knowledge to regional capacity building workshops and other appropriate fora, to disseminate and facilitate the use of such guidelines.

73. Activities to be implemented in order to deliver 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.

74. This aspect of the project will result in the production of guidelines to facilitate the sharing of experiences and expertise among global and national and regional biodiversity indicator processes in support of the 2010 target. Two sets of guidelines will be produced, on the appropriate application of global indicator methodologies and lessons learned for regional and national indicator development processes, and on the use of global indicators in national and regional policy. These guidelines will enable the 2010BIP project to support the efforts of international organizations and the CBD relating to capacity-building for national and regional indicator development and use.

75. In addition, 2010BIP Partners and the BIP secretariat will participate in and contribute knowledge to regional capacity building workshops and other appropriate fora, to disseminate and facilitate the use of such guidelines.

76. This aspect of the 2010BIP project will build on experience gained from the GEF-funded project "Biodiversity Indicators for National Use". Guidelines will include case studies from the experience of 2010BIP Partners, emphasising regional and national applications, and will be made available through the 2010BIP website and the CBD Clearing House Mechanism (CHM), amongst other avenues for dissemination. Such guidance will be incorporated into regional mechanisms of the CBD to build capacity relating to the 2010 target, and use of biodiversity indicators.

77. A strategy for increasing linkages between global 2010 indicators and national and regional level policy and indicator development, to be implemented during the FSP of the 2010BIP project, is included as Annex M.

78. Activities to be implemented in order to deliver 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

79. The three outcomes and six outputs of the 2010BIP project will be executed in an integrated manner with strong linkages between each output and outcome. In addition, given the complexity of this project and the manner in which it is likely to develop over the coming years, a phased approach is proposed. The full project has been divided into two phases. Each is fully self-contained, but the 2nd full phase builds heavily on the success of the first phase.

80. Full Project First phase - 2010 Indicator Development and Delivery (2006-2009): Work during this phase 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. The three outcomes, six outputs, and the related activities of this first phase are described above. This phase will *inter alia* result in the following, based on implementation of the activities described above:

- An effective working partnership of the organisations working on the delivery of the individual 2010 indicators, and other appropriate stakeholders;
- Well defined user needs and a strategy for meeting those needs;

- Agreed and implemented processes for regular delivery of the full suite of 2010 indicators;
- Improvements in the availability of individual indicators and underlying datasets;
- A range of products using the agreed 2010 indicators;
- Interim reports using the 2010 indicators available in appropriate fora;
- Relevant 2010 biodiversity indicators used in a range of conventions and other mechanisms;
- Clarity on the relationship of 2010 biodiversity indicators to other global targets and indicators;
- Peer review processes in place for key products of the Partnership;
- Guidance on the incorporation of local, national and regional scale data into global 2010 indicators; and
- Guidance on national use of global indicators and their relation to national needs.;

81. Full Project Second phase - 2010 Reporting (2009-2012). Work during the second phase will substantially focus on reporting on progress in achieving the 2010 target at CBD meetings in 2010 and beyond, to the Earth Summit likely to take place in 2012 ten years after WSSD, and in other appropriate fora, and on ensuring the uptake and use of the 2010 biodiversity indicators beyond 2010. This will *inter alia* result in the following outputs:

- Further improvement in availability of individual indicators and underlying datasets;
- Substantive report(s) to the CBD on progress made in achieving the 2010 target;
- Substantive report(s) to UN and potential Earth Summit;
- Substantive report(s) to other global and regional fora;
- Extensive review and peer review process(es) underpinning this reporting;
- Further improvements in linkage between national, regional and global indicator development and reporting;
- Full incorporation of 2010 indicators into other global and regional processes;
- Identified process for contributing 2010 indicators to reporting on the MDGs; and
- Sustainability of the programme following project completion.

82. It is expected that the project may continue beyond 2012 to focus on biodiversity indicators in connection with reporting on achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and targets in 2015, and any future biodiversity targets of the CBD or other mechanisms.

RISKS AND SUSTAINABILITY

Risks And Assumptions

83. The project carries with it a number of assumptions (detailed in the logical framework, Annex B) and associated risks. The main assumptions of project delivery 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 are deemed to be relevant to the intended user groups.

84. 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.

85. 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.

86. 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.

87. 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.

88. A considerable 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.

89. 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) will also ensure the project objectives are in line with user needs, and that products developed by the Partnership reach the relevant entities.

90. 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 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.

91. 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 the EA 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.

92. A final but important risk is that decision-makers may not necessarily use the best available information provided to them. Although this risk is partly beyond the control of the Partnership, 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 and 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.

Sustainability and Replicability

93. The aim of the 2010BIP sustainability strategy is to ensure that the suite of 2010 biodiversity indicators are incorporated into policy planning and programmes of work, and that continued investment is provided for their delivery. A strategy for continuing the 2010BIP beyond the end of 2009, into a second phase (2009-2012) is also a key component. Ensuring that the outputs of 2010BIP are of relevance and use to national and regional bodies will be vital to the sustainability of the project, alongside ensuring that the necessary resources are in place to update and manage the data that underpin the individual indicators.

94. The sustainability strategy will involve promoting the wide use of the 2010 indicators and products developed using them. Opportunities will be sought for streamlining processes relating to compiling data for individual indicators and delivering the indicators. Processes by which the indicators are developed, quality controlled, and delivered will be carefully documented, thus increasing confidence in the indicators and therefore their eventual impacts relating to their use for tracking the rate of loss of biodiversity and advising policy, for example. An accessible archive of completed reviewed indicator time-series data will be maintained for reference and use.

Ensuring Sustainability

95. There is a clear global mandate for delivering a suite of indicators on a regular basis for assessing progress in achieving the global biodiversity target. Both the target and the associated indicators have

generated an unprecedented level of interest in such issues, and it seems reasonable to assume that such interest will remain at the current level through to 2010, to 2015 within the context of ensuring environmental sustainability in the MDGs, and beyond to any future targets of the biodiversity-related MEAs. Interest is demonstrated by multilateral processes at both global and regional levels, intergovernmental organizations, individual governments, non-governmental organizations, and a wide range of individuals and scientific organisations. Furthermore, the project has already achieved a substantial amount of co-finance support from its various stakeholders (approximately \$10 million overall, see Annex E). This is compelling evidence to suggest that efforts in continuation of the indicators and the Partnership will be sustained beyond 2010.

96. Outcome 2 and its associated activities relate to the implementation and availability of improved global indicators. The focus of the proposed activities is largely not on developing new indicators from scratch, but on building on existing indicators and indicator programmes. In other words there are already constituencies for many of the indicators and their associated databases. This does not necessarily mean that there are already sufficient resources, but it does indicate that there is (a) a potentially wide user-base, wider than that from the 2010 indicators alone; (b) a significant number of organizations and agencies involved, many of which potentially have access to their own technical and financial resources; and (c) a breadth of potential donors who have been associated with the different indicator and database projects. It is anticipated that inclusion of these indicators in a larger global programme will also provide an opportunity for each of the individual indicators to strengthen their user-base, to strengthen their own partnerships and collaboration, and to increase appeal to their existing donors.

97. The biggest single 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. The project will seek to address this through two related approaches:

1) *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 of indicators (further details can be found in Annex J). 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.

2) *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 appropriate and tailored products, will also provide incentives for incorporation of indicator financing into the budgets of these mechanisms..

98. Insufficient engagement of national and regional bodies in the project could also pose a threat to the sustainability of the partnership and the indicators. Outcome 3 and its associated activities relate to the use of and contribution to the improved delivery of global indicators by national governments and regional organizations. Successful achievement of Outcome 3 is therefore critical for the long-term sustainability of the project. Communicating the process, outputs and results of the project to national and regional audiences will be an important element in ensuring sustainability and, more important, replicability of the indicator development at different scales from local to regional.

99. The high 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 both the Convention on Wetlands and the Convention on Migratory Species, and that this is likely to extend to other international conventions and programmes. The sustainability strategy includes the following elements:

- (a) Promote wide usage of the 2010 indicators and products developed using them.
- (b) Seek opportunities for streamlining processes for both compiling data for individual indicators, and for delivering the indicators.
- (c) Increase confidence in the indicators through careful documentation of the processes by which they are developed, quality controlled and delivered.
- (d) Ensure that the indicators increasingly underpin policy intervention through enhancing the capacity to monitor the effectiveness of policies and outreach in biodiversity-related intergovernmental processes.
- (e) Increase focus on 2010 indicators in a wide range of international conventions and programmes, including in other sectors.
- (f) Seek additional resources for individual indicators from their traditional funders, building on their increased use within the 2010 suite of indicators.
- (g) Seek to incorporate budgets for the indicators and indicator programmes into the budgets of the intergovernmental processes using the indicators.
- (h) Seek resources from foundations and other philanthropic sources for individual indicators and the full suite, building on the international profile.

100. The project design encourages a collaborative framework and mechanisms that facilitate cooperative activities and coordination to add value to ongoing initiatives. Some recurrent government and institutional expenditure will be required however, if the outcomes are to be sustained. This will be addressed in three ways; 1) by developing the awareness of the value of the Partnership and the indicators, 2) by enhancing the reputation of the individual ILOs and the Partnership as a whole, and 3) by establishing the Partnership as the most informative source of information on biodiversity indicators for the global user community.

Replicability

101. In the delivery of Outcome 2 (Improved global indicators implemented and available), it is clearly necessary that the 2010BIP project delivers indicators that are valid from one point in time to another. 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 thorough peer review both for individual indicators and for products arising from analysis of the full suite of indicators.

102. A second concern in replicability is to work towards ensuring the ability of indicators to be used at different scales from global to regional to national and even sub-national levels (scalability), and the availability of national and regional datasets for developing global indicators. While the project is not explicitly concerned with indicators other than at the global level, the following steps will be taken to build the necessary links: the project will draw on: (a) existing experience with some of the indicators which already have clear national links or reviews of potential links; (b) current experience within the pan-European region in developing national to regional data-flows for biodiversity indicators (the “Streamlining European 2010 Biodiversity Indicators” project); and (c) the experience of other projects such as the GEF-funded “Biodiversity Indicators for National Use” project.

103. Based on this experience, which will be discussed further during appropriate regional meetings and other fora, the project will develop advice and guidance that aims to facilitate the links between

the global indicators and national and regional data and indicators. This will include: (a) guidelines on making national datasets available for use in global 2010 indicators; (b) guidelines on how the global indicators can be used at national and regional levels; (c) case study experiences on development of regional level 2010 indicators from national input; and (d) review of the potential scalability of the global 2010 indicators, and what this means for national indicator development. A strategy on linking global and national indicator activities is included in Annex M.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS & STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

Implementation Arrangements

104. Arrangements for project coordination and implementation were developed during the 2010BIP Steering Committee and full Partnership meetings held during the PDF-B phase of the project. Organisational structures for project implementation are shown in Annex I. UNEP is the implementing agency (IA), with UNEP-WCMC as the executing agency (EA). The EA will host the project coordination unit (PCU). The development of the indicators will be led by Indicator Lead Organisations (ILOs) with support from Indicator Contributing Organisations (ICOs).

105. The means for ensuring effective collaboration and delivery of project outputs include the following:

- i) *Steering Committee*: A project Steering Committee has been established to advise on the general direction of the project, and to review and provide advice on key outputs. The Steering Committee is composed of representatives from UN Organisations, National Governments, International Organisations, NGOs and Research Institutes.
- ii) *Partnership meetings*: Two project Partnership meetings have been held during the course of the PDF-B phase, and these will continue to be convened at key points during project implementation, in order to review and agree on key issues in connection with project working arrangements. Those involved are the representatives of all of the organizations involved in delivery of the 2010 indicators, and otherwise contributing to the project, including through communication, information management and representatives of various user groups.
- iii) *Indicator stakeholder collaboration*: Each indicator has its own approach to stakeholder collaboration, depending on the needs and practices already in place for each of the indicators. A peer review process will be implemented during the full project, to build on individual indicator peer review processes already underway.
- iv) *Peer review*: An external and independent peer review for the full suite of indicators will be built into the project as it develops. If CBD COP decisions call for peer review of the 2010 indicators following presentation of the indicators in the Global Biodiversity Outlook for COP 8, then the project peer review will incorporate whatever peer review process the Convention establishes.

106. The effective implementation of this project will depend very heavily on development of close working relationships between the EA, UNEP-WCMC, and the stakeholders (ILOs and ICOs) involved in the development and implementation of each of the individual indicators. Relationships will be regularly reviewed through the implementation of the full project to ensure that they are effective for the delivery of project outputs.

107. A number of the indicators and their underlying datasets already have clearly identified custodians, plus well understood responsibilities and an existing peer review process. It is not the intention within this project to in any way undermine or replace what already exists, nor to dictate to these organizations and agencies what they should do. Rather the aim of the project is to facilitate improvement in what already exists, as appropriate, and to facilitate development of an integrated

indicators “package” that draws on all these independent indicators and the experience of all of the organizations and agencies working on them. The project also aims to foster synergies, for example where data collected by one organization could be used to strengthen indicator developed by another Partner (see Annex L).

108. For some of the 2010 indicators, data are already collected and managed under the auspices of partnerships and consortia which have or are developing mechanisms for coordinating activities, defining roles, and collaborating on development of databases, indicators and resulting products. These include 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.

Implementing Agency

109. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) is the Implementing Agency (IA), with responsibility for project management, overview, monitoring, and liaison with, and reporting, to GEF.

110. UNEP's Division of Early Warning and Assessment (DEWA) provides governments and the international community with improved access to meaningful environmental data and information, and helps to strengthen the capacity of governments to use environmental information for decision making and planning for sustainable development. Through its offices such as Global Resources Information Database (GRID) Sioux Falls and UNEP-WCMC, DEWA undertakes projects to apply information technology tools such as remote sensing, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and web mapping to analyse environmental, ecosystem and biodiversity issues and provide policy guidance.

111. UNEP DEWA has been working on the generation of high quality data and indicators and addressing information gaps that still exist in priority areas for over twenty five years. UNEP DEWA also promotes harmonisation in the collection of data and indicators and facilitates access to information. DEWA's activities in this area include:

- The Global Environmental Outlook (GEO) is UNEP 's flagship environmental assessment publication and is recognized as one of the most respected environmental outlook publications currently available. Like the 2010 BIP GEO is based on partnership, involving universities, research centres, international institutes, and NGOs in 30 countries representing regions around the world, as well as governments through extensive review processes.
- The GEO Data Portal is the authoritative source for data sets used in the GEO report and other integrated environment assessments. Its online database holds more than 450 different variables, as national, subregional, regional and global statistics or as geospatial data sets (maps), covering themes like Freshwater, Population, Forests, Emissions, Climate, Disasters, Health and GDP. Like the 2010 it brings together existing data and indicator initiatives from a large number of partner organisations through one easy to use portal.
- The Global Resource Information Database (GRID) is a worldwide network of environmental data centres managed by UNEP DEWA. The GRID network, launched in 1985, provides and facilitates access to high-quality environmental data and information for decision making and policy setting, and supports UNEP's environmental assessment and reporting, networking and early warning activities.

112. 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 the UN Development Programme (UNDP) (in addition to UNEP's relevant divisions) in implementation of the project will be actively sought.

Executing Agency

113. The Executing Agency (EA), UNEP-WCMC, will host the Project Coordination Unit (PCU). The EA is responsible as lead agency for project implementation, administrative and financial management. The PCU will be headed by a Project Coordinator (PC), based at the EA, in Cambridge, UK. They will be responsible for liaising with the IA and the Steering Committee, coordinating activities across the Partnership, and for ensuring the Indicator Partners and other Stakeholders are provided with the necessary support for engaging with the Partnership.

114. UNEP-WCMC has considerable experience of successfully managing and implementing multi-stakeholder biodiversity projects at global, regional and national scales, including those related to biodiversity indicators, and will build on experience of other GEF-funded projects, including the project on Biodiversity Indicators for National Use and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.

115. The Biodiversity Indicators for National Use (BINU) project was carried out in collaboration with national agencies in four countries (Ecuador, Kenya, Philippines and Ukraine). The aim of the project was to facilitate development of indicators at the national level relevant to supporting policy development. Each of the countries focused on a specific theme, and worked with the support of UNEP-WCMC and the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency to develop indicators relevant to that theme. The experience of that project, which was coordinated by UNEP-WCMC, will provide valuable input to the activities proposed here, and in particular on how the global 2010 indicators might benefit from ongoing initiatives at the national level to develop biodiversity indicators, and how global indicators relate to indicators in use at the national and regional level.

116. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) carried out extensive review of the datasets available for assessing status and trends in number of ecosystems. The project was explicitly based on existing methods and knowledge, and as such will provide information that will be valuable in further development of a range of 2010 indicators, and in linking the indicators to deliver key messages. UNEP-WCMC was specifically responsible for the coordination of the assessment of current trends, and the distributed working group contributing to this assessment component.

117. The Biodiversity Trends and Threats in Europe (BTTE) project carried out by UNEP-WCMC working in collaboration with the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency was a review of the data available on species trends in Europe, and whether this data could be successfully aggregated across habitats and countries to deliver both headline messages for high-level decision-making and detailed information for in-depth analysis. The project used data from different sources, collected with different methods, and in total international non-governmental organizations working with UNEP-WCMC mobilized data on thousands of historical trends in national populations of birds, butterflies, mammals and marine species.

118. The various biodiversity atlas projects carried out by UNEP-WCMC over many years (tropical forests, coral reefs, mangroves, sea grasses, great apes) have given the Centre significant experience of coordinating information from multiple sources in delivering seminal products. Each of the atlas projects were carried out in collaboration with multiple authors, and with other organizations including, for example, the International Society of Mangrove Ecosystems, the World Fish Centre, UNESCO, and IUCN.

119. UNEP-WCMC also has significant experience of developing guidance for countries on improving biodiversity data management, and in the GEF-funded Biodiversity Data Management project not only developed a range of guidelines and training materials, but also carried out training courses in a range of countries and facilitate meetings which lead to the development of improved national information networks. More recently UNEP-WCMC provided the World Bank with a series

of reports which aimed to help the World Bank to implement a GEF-funded project supporting development of the Inter-American Biodiversity Information Network (IABIN).

Project Steering Committee

120. An interim Steering Committee (SC) was established during the PDF-B phase, with the terms of reference to provide overall guidance on project implementation, and monitor progress and performance of the 2010BIP (see Annex I for further information on the roles and responsibilities of the SC).

121. The Steering Committee composition ensures that the following groups are represented in the project oversight: international organizations, UN agencies, NGOs, government representatives including those of the CBD SBSTTA Bureau, and individuals involved in indicator processes within the context of the CBD.

122. The Steering Committee (SC) is comprised of representatives of the following organisations:

- UNEP-WCMC (Executing Agency)
- CBD Secretariat (links to CBD processes)
- European Environment Agency (links to Regional scale experience in biodiversity indicator development through SEBI 2010)
- Government of Cuba (links to CBD indicator development processes, and Ramsar Convention)
- Government of Thailand (SBSTTA Bureau regional representative)
- Government of Grenada (SBSTTA Bureau regional representative)
- IUCN (SSC) (links to data providers and scientific network)
- Nature Kenya (NGO representation, links to national indicator development, and CBD indicator development processes)
- UNEP Division of Global Environment Facility (UNEP-DGEF) (Implementing Agency)
- United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) (links to data provider, and indicator development)

123. The SC will convene annually through in-person meeting, plus one at the start of the project and one at project completion, and it is proposed that this interim SC continues operating as the SC into the full project, with additions to the membership where appropriate.

Stakeholder Participation

124. Given that several intergovernmental processes have endorsed the 2010 target, the primary user stakeholders for this project are clearly Governments, and especially Parties to the CBD and the other MEAs. Processes are already foreseen for review of the indicators by SBSTTA and the CBD COP.

125. A second key group of stakeholders is the wide range of agencies and organizations (Indicator Partners) that are involved in developing and delivering the indicators that have been identified. These include UN agencies and programmes, international organizations, non-government organizations, and research/academic institutions. These organizations include those that have been identified by SBSTTA as having particular expertise on specific indicators. These stakeholders are recognised in three categories of 2010BIP Partner: Indicator Partners, Collaborating Partners, and User Partners. Details and a list of Partners are given in the Partnership Working Arrangements (Annex I). The 2010BIP includes the following Partner organizations and agencies, current at the end of the PDFB phase:

BirdLife International
CasaTierra
Consultative Group on International Agriculture Research (CGIAR)
Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Secretariat

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) Secretariat
Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) Secretariat
Conservation International
Countdown 2010
Department of National Parks, Wildlife, and Plant Conservation, Government of Thailand
Division of Environment, Government of Tanzania
European Space Agency (ESA)
European Environment Agency
European Union Joint Research Centre
FAO Forestry Department: Forest Resources Division
FAO Fishery Department: Fishery Resources Division
FAO Agriculture Department:
 Animal Production and Health Division,
 Plant Production and Protection Division,
 Nutrition and Consumer Protection Division
Global Environment Facility (GEF)
Global Invasive Species Programme
Global Footprint Network
Institute of Social Ecology, IFF Vienna
International Nitrogen Initiative
International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI)
IUCN Species Survival Commission
IUCN Sustainable Use Specialist Group
IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas
Ministry of Finance and Planning, Government of Grenada
Ministry of Science, Technology, and the Environment, Government of Cuba
NASA-NGO Conservation Working Group
NatureKenya
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)
Orbis Institute
Ramsar Convention Secretariat
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)
Terralingua
The Nature Conservancy
UNEP DGEF
UNEP-GEMS Water Programme
UNEP-WCMC
UNESCO
University of British Columbia (UBC) Fisheries Centre
University of Queensland
Wetlands International
World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) Consortium
World Health Organization (WHO)
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)
Zoological Society of London, Institute of Zoology

126. In view of the increasingly high profile that the 2010 target has assumed at the global level, it is expected that the indicators being used to assess progress in achieving this target will be widely used in guiding policy intervention. They will also be used as a framework for communicating the state of the world's biodiversity, and the actions being taken to conserve and sustainably use it. As such, the indicators will be of interest and relevance to a far wider group of stakeholders and beneficiaries including the private sector and local communities, and considerable efforts will be made during the full project to further broaden the participation of other stakeholder groups in the Partnership.

127. The project will also develop a peer review process that involves stakeholders from a wide range of institutions and countries, and during which time key national institutions will be invited to make expert input.

128. Annual meetings of the full 2010BIP will provide a forum for organisations developing the various 2010 biodiversity indicators to share information and exchange ideas on the project. The progress of project activities and outputs will be presented to the full range of stakeholders for their comment and input.

129. A project web page has been established for disseminating information concerning the project and its activities. This will be maintained and updated during the course of the project implementation to include an online forum that will enable individuals and organisations from anywhere in the world to comment on the project and make recommendations as appropriate. This forum will also allow BIP Partners to post and review documents and information. The 2010BIP website is online at www.twentyten.net.

INCREMENTAL COSTS AND PROJECT FINANCING

130. Although funding is likely to be found for specific indicators from the suite for products targeted on specific meetings or user groups, and for the work of particular organizations, without GEF support there would not be a coordinated approach to the development and communication of the full suite of 2010 biodiversity indicators. Without GEF funding there would be the following potential weaknesses:

- Inconsistency between indicators.
- Lack of a single indicator “package”.
- Lack of a single focus for development and delivery of indicators.
- Inadequate links between global, regional and national efforts.

131. The combination of these factors will severely hamper attempts to track progress in achieving the 2010 target at the global level in a reliable and consistent manner. As a result it is likely that policy intervention by bodies such as the CBD Conference of Parties will not take adequate account of information on progress being made in achieving the 2010 target, and the impact of public awareness and communication concerning the target will be less effective than it might have been. Both may in turn impact on the effectiveness of action for achieving the 2010 target.

132. The support of the GEF will allow the project to address all of the issues identified above, and the necessary activities 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;
- Development and implementation of the full suite of 2010 indicators;
- 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 financial and technical resources to ensure delivery and use of the indicators.

133. Almost all of the indicators identified by the CBD Conference of Parties already have clear stakeholders who are contributing financially and technically to some aspect of the development, implementation and delivery of those indicators as independent entities. This will continue. GEF funds will build on this to achieve:

- Further development of the individual existing indicators in ways proposed by the CBD COP for use at the global level, but not currently in the budgeted workplans of the organizations who have developed these indicators.
- Development of new global indicators proposed by the CBD COP based on existing research and datasets, but not currently in the budgeted workplans of the organizations who manage these datasets.
- Development of a collaborative approach between all of the organizations working on 2010 indicators, in order to facilitate coordinated delivery of the full suite of indicators to meet the needs of the CBD and other potential target audiences at the global level.
- Establishment of approaches to ensure the wide acceptance and use of the full suite of 2010 indicators, including development of appropriate peer review processes and communication strategies.

134. The project will also address future resource needs after completion of the GEF project, through raising the profile of the 2010 indicators, and increasing interest in their continuance. It is intended that this will lead to regular coordinated delivery of the full suite of global indicators identified by the CBD COP to a range of stakeholders in appropriate and varied formats.

135. Further details of incremental cost and reasoning for this project are provided in Annex A.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

136. The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan maps the approach for measuring and verifying that activities and outcomes described in the project logframe and timeline are being met. The M&E Plan follows UNEP guidelines and incorporates UNEP monitoring activities, and can be found in Annex N.

137. There are five main entities with roles to play in the M&E process:

- 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 review all reports, advise the PCU on resolving difficulties and increasing efficiency and monitor progress on the capacity building component.
- 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.

138. Monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken at three levels: 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.

Monitoring project progress and performance

139. Monitoring project progress and performance will occur both at the overall Partnership project level, including monitoring of the Partnership itself and the full suite of indicators as a whole, and also with respect to progress in the implementation of individual indicators. Documentation of ongoing lessons learned from the implementation of the project will be maintained, and a mid-term evaluation of the implementation of and progress in the project's outputs and activities will be performed at the end of the first phase. Management adjustments will be incorporated into the 2010BIP project based on the mid-term evaluation and an analysis of the lessons learned. Regular progress and financial reports will be compiled and submitted to the Implementing Agency. Sufficient documentation and processes will be put in place for the conduct of the terminal evaluation at the end of the second phase in 2012.

140. The Indicator Lead Organizations (ILOs) will be responsible for working in collaboration with the Indicator Contributing Organizations (ICOs) to deliver the indicators in a timely fashion. They will present bi-annual progress and activity reports to the PCU that will allow monitoring and evaluation of the suite of indicators, and their contribution to the Partnership as a whole.

141. Performance monitoring will assess whether the coordination and supervision of Partnership activities is efficient and seek to improve efficiencies when needed so as to improve overall effectiveness of project implementation. It is a continuous process, which will collect information about the execution of activities programmed in the annual workplan (Annex B), advise on improvements in method and performance, and compare accomplished with programmed tasks.

142. The PCU will ensure inputs are made on time and according to expenditure plans for the overall project. Indicator workplans will be monitored by the PCU, but are the responsibility of the ILOs within the Partnership. The monitoring activity of the Partnership project will be the direct responsibility of the PCU, under the supervision of the Steering Committee. See Table 1, Annex N for the execution performance indicators. The analysis of the current development status of the individual indicators in Annex G could provide a baseline from which improvement and development of these indicators could be monitored.

143. Risk assessment and monitoring will also be an integral part of this activity and have been included in the M&E Plan activities shown in Table 2 of Annex N. Briefly, ongoing progress reports will be submitted and early warning of anticipated or experienced problems will be provided to the relevant bodies. Continuous monitoring of indicator and Partnership development will be overseen by the PCU, and verified by a mid-term review and terminal review by an external consultant.

144. An annual meeting of the Partnership will build confidence among Partners in the reliability of information on development effectiveness of the Partnership. This will be particularly beneficial to the Partnership to ensure project performance is maximised, given the specific challenges in producing an aggregated suite of global biodiversity indicators from a wide source of collaborating stakeholders.

Delivery of project outputs

145. At the level of the individual indicator, the information on delivery of outputs (both in quality and quantity) will be collected as part of ongoing project monitoring. This monitoring will be provided by the ILOs in collaboration with the ICOs and presented to the PCU on as part of their progress report. The ILOs will be responsible for ensuring project outputs are met and alerting the PCU to any anticipated problems in this delivery.

146. The PCU will ensure that products of the Partnership are delivered according to expenditure plans and that these products meet both the stakeholders and user needs. The PCU will be responsible for monitoring and delivering outputs of the Partnership that will be presented to the Steering Committee for review and then reported to UNEP on an annual basis.

Monitoring project outcomes and outputs

147. Project outcomes will be monitored through objectively verifiable indicators, detailed below and in the logical framework (Annex B), that will track progress toward the three project outcomes and their associated outputs, the immediate objective, and the development objective. The means of verification are also outlined below.

148. The indicator measuring progress towards the development objective of the 2010BIP project is that 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. The means of verification for the development objective is the availability of indicators by 2010 that demonstrate changes in the rate of biodiversity loss (see Annex F).

149. Two indicators will be tracked to measure progress towards the project's immediate objective:

- (i) 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.
- (ii) 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.

150. The means of verification for the immediate objective of the project are (i) that implemented 2010 indicators are available for use in print and electronic media; (ii) that products of the Partnership containing the implemented indicators, and tailored to meet user needs, are available and disseminated; and (iii) that outputs and decisions by a range of MEAs, governments, and other users incorporate or refer to the implemented 2010 indicators.

151. Objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification for each of the 2010BIP outcomes and outputs are detailed below:

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

Objectively verifiable indicators

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

Means of verification

- Outputs of the Partnership, including website and products disseminated to Conventions and other users.

Output 1.1: Working partnership on 2010 indicators established and maintained

Objectively verifiable 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.

Means of verification

- MoUs and other agreed working arrangements are in place between 2010BIP Indicator Partners.
- Project meeting reports, progress, and financial reports.

Output 1.2: Communication strategy meeting user needs prepared and implemented

Objectively verifiable 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.
- 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.

Means of verification

- Project communication strategy.
- User survey.
- Regularly updated web presence for the 2010BIP.
- Website 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.

Outcome 2: Improved global indicators implemented and available

Objectively verifiable indicators

- 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.

Means of verification

- Products of the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, compared with products containing the same indicators prior to the establishment of this partnership.
- Indicator analysis in first and third years of the project.

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

Objectively verifiable 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.

Means of verification

- 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.

Output 2.2: Individual indicators strengthened and delivered

Objectively verifiable 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.

Means of verification

- Plans, strategies, and activity reports of the individual indicator development processes.
- Products of the 2010BIP.

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

Objectively verifiable 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.

Means of verification

- Reports and analysis on individual indicator development.

- National reports of governments to the CBD, and outputs of regional organizations relating to biodiversity trends, and the 2010 target.

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

Objectively verifiable 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.

Means of verification

- 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.

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

Objectively verifiable 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.

Means of verification

- Documented guidelines produced and disseminated to regional workshops and other fora, including via the project website.
- National and regional reports to conventions and other processes showing increased use of 2010 indicators at the national and regional level.

152. The project will be monitored by the PCU and the Steering Committee. A terminal evaluation organised by UNEP will be conducted as the final assessment of project outcomes by an external consultant.