

This project is
co-funded by the
European Union



Federal Ministry for the
Environment, Nature Conservation,
Building and Nuclear Safety



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Bundesamt für Umwelt BAFU
Office fédéral de l'environnement OFEV
Ufficio federale dell'ambiente UFAM
Uffizi federal d'ambient UFAM



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

The Biodiversity Finance Initiative - BIOFIN First Global Workshop

25-27 February 2014
Bratislava, Slovakia

Summary Report

16 May 2014

Short version



Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Main observations and recommendations	2
3. Background to the First BIOFIN Workshop	5
4. Workshop Agenda and Format	5
5. Day-One: Working Sessions.....	5
6. Day-Two: Working Sessions.....	6
7. Day-Three: Working Sessions.....	9
Annex 1. Agenda.....	12
Annex 2. Participants List.....	13

1. Introduction

The first global workshop of the Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN) was held in Bratislava, Slovakia from 25 to 27 February 2014. The meeting brought together over 100 participants, including representatives from UNDP headquarters and Regional Centres, partner institutions, international experts, the global BIOFIN team and participants from countries participating in BIOFIN. These included representatives from government (including BIOFIN focal points from the Ministries of Finance, Environment, Planning amongst others), national BIOFIN teams and UNDP Country Offices.

The meeting's overall goal was to review and discuss the BIOFIN approach and its implementation in the participating countries. Specific objectives included:

- Introduce new countries to the BIOFIN constituency, approach and methodology
- Develop a common understanding of the updated BIOFIN assessment methodology (the BIOFIN Workbook)
- Capture and share lessons and best-practices extracted from some initial national-level activities
- Establish standards and timelines for national-level BIOFIN deliverables
- Help build strong cross-ministerial ownership of BIOFIN at national level
- Explore appropriate national advocacy processes to position BIOFIN outputs and recommendations
- Prepare for a strong BIOFIN presence at 2014 meetings of the CBD

The full agenda and list of list of participants for the workshop are included in Annex 1 and 2. .

Over the course of the three-day workshop, discussions among the participants resulted in a number of conclusions and recommendations for refining the BIOFIN assessment methodology and to clarify parameters for implementation at the national level.

2. Main observations and recommendations

The BIOFIN approach and assessment methodology

- Participants **reiterated the need for, and endorsed the core principles of the methodology**, citing the “disconnect” between the broad aspirational objectives and goals found in National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and the need for developing actionable budgets and cost requirements that the BIOFIN process is meant to address. The BIOFIN process bridges the national goals of NBSAPs with realistic costing and budgeting targets and ultimately provides a roadmap for filling financing gaps. Participants agreed the workshop helped them to build a deeper understanding of the BIOFIN methodology and process. The workshop as an experience sharing was greatly appreciated and some participants advocated for establishing regional communities of practise and further regional experience sharing workshops. The global BIOFIN team will follow up and identify adequate experience sharing mechanisms at the regional level, while the BIOFIN website will function as the main experience sharing mechanism at the global level.
- Discussions on the methodology highlighted the need for further clarification around **data collection and use** under the BIOFIN workbook assessments at the national level, in particular for the expenditure review. Three specific issues were raised: 1) how does each

country set the boundaries for assessments and data collection, especially around private sector data, 2) how should data gaps be addressed, and 3) how to address data incompatibility issues? With these boundaries and other data issues not being delineated in the methodology, countries need to define these through a multi-stakeholder consultation process.

- Participating BIOFIN teams had **varying levels of experience in conducting Public Expenditure Reviews (PERs)**. This may represent a capacity constraint toward which BIOFIN support will be important, intensifying experience sharing through regional and global events, sharing and documenting of resources to be included in the resources database and website. It was highlighted that Past PERs have led to improved fiscal frameworks and prioritization and have helped to highlight effective/ineffective policies and programmes. The main challenge foreseen by participants within this process is to define what biodiversity related costs are and what not. In this light, the importance for BIOFIN to develop standardized coding/tagging and weighting of biodiversity-related activities was suggested. Based on existing best practices and publications, BOIFIN will develop a short guidance note on this. On the **private sector expenditure reviews**, several countries expressed concerns about the feasibility of data collection. The BIOFIN team clarified the private sector expenditure review should not be regarded as a high priority, with each country having to define its specific scope for the private sector expenditure review, starting out by looking at existing data sources from government entities such as chambers of commerce, or by identifying few key private sector stakeholders that are prepared to share data.
- The BIOFIN team used the opportunity to clarify issues around **data sovereignty**, highlighting the policy not to share any data emerging from the work unless prior consent is given by participating governments. One area of particular concern was the planned **online tool** to fill the BIOFIN workbook. There was a general impression countries did not feel a great need to have this tool while preferring to work with offline spreadsheets, and in order also to eliminate any possible concerns about online data storage and security, it was decided to cancel the online workbook tool. The global team will develop spreadsheets with general costing models and other data included, which can be utilised for the same purpose and further tailored to the national context in each country.
- Participants expressed the view that further alignment of the **costing methodology (Component 2)** with national financial systems is needed. To cost NBSAPs, the current model relies on an 'activity-based cost accounting' method, where each strategy is broken into a set of actions, and each action is broken down into cost elements. Government financing systems show a greater deal of complexity. Each country needs to refine the cost calculation model further to fit to the national context and existing costing methodologies. It is important to have 'actionable' items for costing and to recognize that biodiversity costing is, by definition, a multi-disciplinary activity and also be able to generate costings for different scenarios, ranging from business as usual to optimal. Another important area of distinction are the different types of biodiversity costing – financial, economic and opportunity costs. BIOFIN is in the process of recruiting a costing expert to further refine the assessment methodology and develop a standard costing model that can be applied to the country specific context. The expert will also provide in-country support to develop the national models.

The national policy process

- Participants expressed the **importance of positioning the BIOFIN objectives, deliverables and recommendations towards high-level decision making processes, such as in the context of existing National Development Plans**. Additionally, BIOFIN should **involve senior policy-makers** dealing with the kinds of policies and subsidies that may have detrimental or positive impacts on the long-term sustainability of a country's biodiversity resource base, such as in the agricultural, manufacturing or energy sectors.
- A key message from the discussions was the **need for the BIOFIN process to clearly articulate the "value proposition" of biodiversity conservation and sustainable ecosystem management** to ministries of finance and planning and other senior government officials. The value proposition would explain why investments and spending in biodiversity have wider developmental benefits that justify the costs and trade-offs with regard to other potentially competing national priorities. The use of concepts such as 'negative expenditures' are likely to generate confusion and may have a different connotations with different line ministries and will be revisited. The BIOFIN process also needs to be strongly embedded into national planning and policy development process to be successful.
- During discussions on activities under **BIOFIN Component 4 - Initiate implementation of the Resource Mobilisation Strategy at national level** - countries reviewed the most suitable strategies to position recommendations from the Resource Mobilisation Strategy at the national level. Participants stressed the need for 2 types of activities: (1) Advocacy and Communications, and (2) Making the 'business case' for biodiversity. As a result, the BIOFIN global team agreed to expand the scope of component 4 not limiting activities to direct support with the development and implementation of biodiversity finance mechanisms, but enabling countries to propose activities related to advocacy, economic valuation, policy dialogues or other aspects of the national process that can be supported. The BIOFIN will also recruit a communication expert that supports countries with the development of national advocacy/communications strategies.

3. Background to the First BIOFIN Workshop

Available evidence and the decisions adopted by Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) indicate that a significant gap remains in finance for biodiversity management, for countries to drastically scale up their efforts and achieve the 20 Aichi Targets defined in the CBD's Strategic Plan for 2011-2020. A preliminary assessment recently conducted under the auspices of the High-level Panel on Global Assessment of Resources for Implementing the CBD Strategic Plan estimated that the global investment required ranges between 130 and 440 billion US\$ annually. While useful, this and similar other global estimates are based on extrapolations sensitive to the underlying assumptions. To define biodiversity finance needs and gaps with greater precision and determine related challenges and opportunities for resource mobilisation, detailed national-level (bottom-up) assessments are therefore required.

In this context, UNDP in October 2012 launched the Biodiversity Finance Initiative – BIOFIN, as a new global partnership seeking to address the biodiversity finance challenge in a comprehensive manner – building a sound business case for increased investment in the management of ecosystems and biodiversity. BIOFIN is managed by the UNDP Ecosystems and Biodiversity Programme, in partnership with the European Union and the Governments of Germany and Switzerland, who support the initiative with a total of USD 15 million (as of March 2014 – further support is being sought). The Global Environment Facility is a further partner financing parallel in-country projects in support of the revision of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). As of February 2014, the following 19 countries participate in BIOFIN: Botswana, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Fiji, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Seychelles, South Africa, Thailand, Uganda and Zambia. Several countries joined recently, and the workshop provided a good platform for key stakeholders of those countries to become familiar with the basic concepts of the BIOFIN methodology.

The first global BIOFIN workshop was intended to develop a common understanding of the updated BIOFIN assessment methodology (the BIOFIN Workbook), capture and share lessons and best-practices extracted from some initial national-level activities, establish standards and timelines for national-level BIOFIN deliverables and explore appropriate national advocacy processes to position BIOFIN outputs and recommendations.

4. Workshop Agenda and Format

The three-day workshop was organized to focus on providing country participants with a maximum opportunity to share experiences and learn from the lessons of other countries. This was done by having short plenary presentations and discussions to introduce agenda topics, followed by extended small-group assignments and roundtable discussions and exercises. The small-group assignments sought to allow participants to interact across countries, by functional responsibilities, and as individual country teams. A special focus was made to allow for the exchange of views and perspectives between participants from environmental ministries and similar agencies and those from finance and planning ministries. In addition, particular emphasis was placed on helping country delegations assess where they were in the BIOFIN process and what further steps were needed to accelerate the process in their respective countries.

5. Day-One: Working Sessions

The day-one morning session welcomed the participants to the workshop and provided an overview of the three-day agenda and the background to BIOFIN Initiative: notably its origins and

rationale. Mr. Martin Krause, Regional Team Leader Environment and Energy of the UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre welcomed the participants to Bratislava, and Mr. Nik Sekhran, Head of UNDP's Biodiversity Programme, and Mr. Yves de Soye, UNDP-BIOFIN Project Manager, outlined the history of BIOFIN and the specific niche it was filling in providing a national-level costing methodology for determining the biodiversity finance gap. Introductory interventions were also made by representatives of BIOFIN donors: Mr. Arnold Jacques de Dixmude of the European Commission and Mr. Axel Benemann from the German Ministry of Environment. Mr. Markus Lehman introduced a video presentation from Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Finally, Mr. Francis Ogwal from Uganda spoke on behalf of the participating country delegations and expressed the represented countries' appreciation to UNDP for having organized the workshop.

During the workshop's second session, the BIOFIN Workbook was introduced. This discussion, led by the BIOFIN Senior Advisor and lead expert on the methodology, Dr. Jamison Ervin, offered an overview of the conceptual framework and organization of the Workbook and the purposes it was meant to serve. This short introduction was followed by a table-level working session allowing participants to give initial feedback about the Workbook and suggest ways it could be improved. One of the key messages from the table discussions was that the Workbook was seen as generally a useful technical tool, but "messaging" and marketing the findings was a major political-policy challenge.

During session three in the afternoon, the topic shifted to stocktaking and early lessons from the NBSAP process and initial experience with the BIOFIN process. For group work, each country delegation was asked to map where it stood in the NBSAP and BIOFIN processes. The mapping exercise demonstrated that participating BIOFIN countries were at different stages in the cycle of preparing their NBSAPs and undertaking the BIOFIN work.

The final working session of the day turned to country experience in undertaking the section of the Workbook on conducting policy and institutional reviews and identifying key drivers impacting each government's approach and capacity to addressing biodiversity as part of the national development agenda (workbooks 1a and b). Table groups were asked to explore the issues in undertaking a policy and institutional review and identifying policy drivers. Participants then reconvened in mixed table discussions to provide a cross-country review of their national experience and challenges.

Some of the "take-aways" from this country-level reflection were:

- (i) The need for a phased approach to conducting the BIOFIN process as countries build up their human and institutional capacity;
- (ii) The need for more guidance and support for adapting the BIOFIN conceptual framework to the national and sub-national levels;
- (iii) Difficulties of weighing policy drivers and prioritizing impacts;
- (iv) Problems associated with cross-sectoral or multi-sectoral costing and policy analysis that touch upon biodiversity; and
- (v) The importance of "champions" for the BIOFIN process in the government, business and academic communities.

6. Day-Two: Working Sessions

On the second day, the morning session focused on the methodology for conducting public/private expenditure reviews (PERs) for biodiversity and costing biodiversity initiatives. In addition, a session was devoted to exploring key issues in developing resource mobilization plans.

At the outset, Mr. Nik Sekhran of UNDP highlighted the often competing and conflicting demands from different sectoral ministries and explained aspects of public expenditure review work done in other sectors. This was followed by a brief overview of the relevant section in the BIOFIN Workbook on expenditure reviews and a reflection by Mr. Guillermo Zuñiga, former Minister of Finance in Costa Rica and current Costa Rican BIOFIN team leader. Mr. Zuñiga commented on the dilemma that many governments face as they try to reconcile and balance public policy priorities, which may or may not correspond to programmes or activities that have short-term and widespread popular support. Other countries having conducted Climate Public Expenditure and Institutional Reviews (CPEIRs) shared their experiences.

Following this plenary overview, during small-group table discussions participants were asked to assess their own country experiences undertaking PERs and what their expectations were with respect to this specific BIOFIN component. Table groups were also asked to examine how best to conduct private expenditure reviews (private sector/business and NGO sectors). In addition, tables were asked to evaluate the current relationship between the ministry of finance/planning and the main environmental agencies in their respective countries and how that might be improved.

Some of the key conclusions from these table-level discussions included:

- (i) Past PERs have led to improved fiscal frameworks and prioritization and have helped to highlight effective/ineffective policies and programmes;
- (ii) It will be important specifically for BIOFIN to develop standardized coding/tagging and weighting of biodiversity-related activities;
- (iii) There will be difficulties disaggregating sector expenditures to determine what is and what isn't a biodiversity expenditure;
- (iv) It is difficult to determine the full range of data requirements needed for BIOFIN;
- (v) There are constraints assessing impact and relevance of different biodiversity actors or institutions;
- (vi) There are constraints in regards to gathering data on private spending and investments on biodiversity (having either a positive or negative impact on biodiversity), thus requiring involvement and input of the private sector from the outset, although it was felt that getting data from environmental NGOs could be easier; and
- (vii) The importance of strong relationships between the ministries of finance/planning and environmental ministries and agencies include their value for 1) ensuring technical competencies in the budgeting process, 2) effectively presenting the need for increased spending on biodiversity, and 3) effective marketing and communications strategies for making the business and political case to senior government officials.

The next session of the day's discussion shifted from expenditure reviews to costing -- the second component in the equation to determine the national biodiversity financing gap. In the plenary session, a brief presentation was made about costing and how to undertake a comprehensive costing exercise. Dr. Ervin explained that this section was going to be expanded in the coming months but that Workbook 2 provided a general framework for costing national biodiversity requirements. The participants then returned to their work groups to conduct a short exercise using a worksheet that highlighted key issues in the costing process. The costing exercise helped country delegations ascertain their own progress in terms of undertaking a full costing assessment.

The costing session continued in plenary with a panel discussion by Mr. Juan Ladron de Guevara (Chile), Ms. Laura Nuñez (Ecuador), Mr. Ahmad Kamal Wasis (Malaysia), Mr. Acer Godfrey Okot

(Uganda) and Mr. Matt Rayment (ICF/GHK Consultants, UK). The panellists shared their personal perspectives and experience in costing exercises and the national budgeting process in general.

Some of the key points from the panel discussion include:

- (i) There are conceptual and analytical challenges in both biodiversity mainstreaming and in the related challenge of disaggregating sectoral or ministry budgets to identify biodiversity-specific activities or programmes;
- (ii) It is important to understand the impact of laws and regulations (positive and negative) not only in economic or financial terms, but also their social impact and their ability to encourage behavioural change;
- (iii) Many governments have been generally successful in costing protected areas, but other kinds of biodiversity activities have been more difficult to cost, such as assessing the costs and benefits from sustainable use of natural resources and other ecosystem services;
- (iv) There is no clear method for measuring current and future costs if biodiversity issues are not addressed;
- (v) It is essential to understand that the budget process is both a policy and political process and not based on technical merits alone; other ministries and national priorities will place competing demands on the same limited resources;
- (vi) Expenditure and costing decisions are often based on a range of existing commitments: national development priorities, international obligations, donor partner preferences, and citizens' aspirations, to name but a few;
- (vii) It is important to have "actionable" items for costing and to recognize that biodiversity costing is, by definition, a multi-disciplinary activity;
- (viii) The "level of ambition" is important in the costing process – distinguishing between what one would like to achieve and what one thinks can be realistically achieved; and
- (ix) It is important to understand and describe the different kinds of biodiversity costing – financial, economic and opportunity costs.

The final session of day two focused on "Developing a Resource Mobilization Plan (part 3 of the BIOFIN Workbook)." While conducting an expenditure review and costing exercise to determine the national biodiversity financing gap are crucial first steps, the ultimate success of the BIOFIN process will be determined by the appeal and value proposition of the national Resource Mobilization Strategy. During the plenary, Mr. Matt Leggett, of the Global Canopy Programme, outlined some of the work his organization had done on sources and options for biodiversity finance much of which is captured in the "Little Biodiversity Finance Book^{*}".

In the ensuing table discussions, participants were asked to list the kinds of financing mechanisms they were most interested in exploring in their respective countries. Participants then discussed the expected challenges and solutions for using these financing mechanisms. Some of the most commonly mentioned financing schemes during table discussion were Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES), user/polluter/extractor/consumer payment schemes, debt-for-nature swaps, community-based natural resource management, biodiversity offsets, Conservation Trust Funds (domestic and international, public and private), carbon finance, and options for levies and taxes[†].

The table discussions highlighted several challenges and solutions in using different financing mechanisms: the slow pace of institutional and policy change for undertaking new initiatives, the low levels of political will, limited and/or shrinking domestic and donor-supported (ODA) funding,

^{*} <http://www.globalcanopy.org/materials/little-biodiversity-finance-book>

[†] OECD shared a recent publication on biodiversity financing - http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/fr/environment/scaling-up-finance-mechanisms-for-biodiversity_9789264193833-en

weak institutional and governance structures, challenges to scale pilot projects and the complexity of national contexts for biodiversity financing, and quality and quantity of data sources.

At the same time, many participants noted the BIOFIN process itself was a useful mechanism for informing government policy-makers and financial managers of the issues and importance of biodiversity by using sound economic and financial tools.

7. Day-Three: Working Sessions

The final day of the workshop covered five topics: 1) a brief overview of the online tool for the BIOFIN Workbook that is being developed[‡]; 2) discussion of economic valuation of biodiversity; 3) positioning BIOFIN outputs and recommendations and implementing the resource mobilization strategy; 4) developing country road maps for the BIOFIN process – especially planning for 2014; and 5) an overview of the next steps in the BIOFIN Initiative.

The online tool was presented, and was designed to become part of the BIOFIN website. Country participants expressed their preference to work with offline instruments, such as spreadsheet based models, and issues of data sovereignty and security could also better be ensured in such models. Following this, it was decided to leave out the online tool for now, unless countries express strong requests for the tool at a later stage.

With respect to economic valuation, it was noted this was not currently within the scope of BIOFIN, but it was acknowledged that biodiversity and ecosystem service valuation underpins the argument and rationale for biodiversity finance, and that potentially if countries chose to invest some of their BIOFIN resources under Component 4 to fill a key gap and build the case, this could be considered by the BIOFIN team. Accordingly, understanding the tools and methodologies of economic valuation and natural capital accounting will be useful in the BIOFIN process. Mr. Andrew Bovarnick of UNDP provided an overview of economic valuation and outlined different methodologies and approaches. He introduced the participants to the theoretical and empirical work being developed by UNDP using a new tool: “Targeted Scenario Analysis” (TSA). A key benefit of TSA to decision-makers is that it allows comparison of two different economic scenarios – a business as usual scenario compared to a sustainable environmental management scenario.

The presentation by Mr. Bovarnick elicited a number of questions and comments. Some participants expressed concern about the plethora of tools that are being implemented for biodiversity valuation, and how these tools may be beyond the understanding or interest of senior decision-makers. Related approaches include TEEB for Countries (UNEP) and the WAVES project of the World Bank for natural capital accounting. Another concern expressed was the challenge of linking economic tools and methodologies to those tools and approaches commonly employed by biologists and environmentalists. It was agreed that regardless of the tool used for biodiversity valuation, advocates for biodiversity financing must capture the overall policy, political, and economic context in which government budgeting occurs.

A short table discussion followed which allowed the participants to discuss their country experiences with economic valuation and in particular biodiversity valuation and natural capital accounting. Those countries that had undertaken or are undertaking biodiversity valuation studies shared their experiences with those countries that have not.

[‡] This work has been put on hold as there appears little demand for this.

The group exercise was followed by a panel discussion on biodiversity valuation. The panellists were Mr. Guillermo Zuñiga (Costa Rica), Mr. Raymundo Talento (Philippines), Mr. Olimpio Nhuleipo (Namibia), Mr. Nik Sekhran (UNDP), and Ms. Sharlin Hemraj (South Africa). The panellists shared their experiences with assimilating biodiversity valuation into the national budgeting process. A common message from the panellists was the importance of linking biodiversity valuation with economic growth and demonstrating the long-term economic benefits at the macro level as well as at the level of the individual citizen or family, especially if additional costs are incurred. The panellists mentioned some of the tools they had used, such as environmental accounting, TEEB[§] and WAVES^{**} tools, as well as basic social accounting matrices (input-output models).

The next discussion topic concerned positioning BIOFIN outputs and implementing the national Resource Mobilization Strategy. Following a very brief introduction in plenary, the participants broke into four working groups where they were asked to examine four questions:

- What are the key entry points for making the case for BIOFIN?
- What challenges do you anticipate in positioning BIOFIN and its outputs?
- What specific advocacy and communications strategies are most likely to be successful?
- What information is missing to successfully position BIOFIN?

With regard to entry points, there was the general feeling that biodiversity needed to be specifically linked to commonly identifiable issues, such as disaster mitigation (flooding, drought, desertification), food security and poverty, green economy and climate change, cultural and environmental heritage, and human health.

Several anticipated challenges, were identified: competing national priorities; problems of weak institutional, financial and human capacity; limited data availability; problems of coordination among different stakeholders; and different levels of engagement by the private sector in social and environmental responsibility.

A number of different advocacy and communications strategies were discussed. These included: mass media strategies; political strategies involving bilateral dialogue and meetings with different political groups; multi-stakeholder engagement using focus groups, committees, and special events; incentive schemes for businesses and communities; and tailored communications packages for different sectors and stakeholders.

Finally, with regard to missing information and data gaps to successfully position BIOFIN, a number of common limitations were heard from the four groups: lack of baseline and scientific data on biodiversity loss or threats; need for case studies; more experience in conducting cost/benefit analyses and other valuation methodologies; need for guidance on monitoring and evaluation options for the BIOFIN process; problems of standardized budget coding and weighting; and guidance on defining and delimiting the boundaries of “biodiversity” for expenditure reviews and costing.

A common theme heard among the four groups was the need to make the BIOFIN process “user friendly” for policy- and decision-makers by focusing on key messages and priorities and articulating the merits and importance of linking biodiversity with major actions to achieve national development goals.

[§] The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity, see www.teebweb.org

^{**} Wealth Accounting and the Valuation of Ecosystem Services, see www.wavespartnership.org

On the afternoon of the last day of the workshop, attention turned to planning for the remainder of 2014 and developing BIOFIN country road maps. During plenary, Mr. Onno van den Heuvel of the UNDP-BIOFIN team introduced the template for country delegations to use in planning their upcoming activities and objectives. Participants then broke into country groups to discuss their possible country plans/road map of activities. A summary of the results is presented in Annex 3, showing countries are at various stages of progress.

In the closing plenary session to the workshop, country delegations were asked if they had any final comments and suggestions. Several countries mentioned how valuable the workshop had been with its emphasis on understanding and addressing not just the technical issues of biodiversity financing but also the political and institutional issues in the BIOFIN rollout and advocacy. Namibia proposed the idea of establishing regional communities of practice to allow for more exchange of best practices and sharing of lesson learned across countries. Country delegations thanked UNDP and the BIOFIN team for organizing the workshop and having the opportunity to exchange country experiences.

In wrapping up, Mr. Nik Sekhran of UNDP thanked participants for their very active and useful contributions for improving the BIOFIN approach and tools and stressed that the process of successfully integrating BIOFIN into national budgeting systems was perhaps more important than the specific recommendations that emerged from the first round of determining national biodiversity financing gaps. Successive iterations and refinements to the BIOFIN process could improve the long-term benefit to biodiversity through improved integration in ongoing budget-cycles.

Annex 1. Agenda

Tuesday, 25 February 2014

- Session 1: Welcome, Opening Remarks and Introductions of Participants
Introduction to Biodiversity Finance, BIOFIN and the Workshop
- Session 2: The BIOFIN Workbook
- Session 3: NBSAPs and BIOFIN: Stocktaking and Early Lessons
- Session 4: Implementing Policy and Institutional Reviews and Identifying Drivers
- Session 5: Reflections on Day 1

Wednesday, 26 February 2014

- Session 6: Expenditure Reviews: Expenditure Reviews and Best Practices
- Session 7: How to Conduct a Comprehensive Biodiversity Costing
- Session 8: Developing a Resource Mobilization Plan
- Session 9: Review of Day 2 Results

Thursday, 27 February 2014

- Session 10: The BIOFIN Workbook Online Tool
- Session 11: Exploring Linkages: Economic Valuation and National Capital Accounting
- Session 12: Positioning BIOFIN Outputs and Recommendations and Implementing the
Resource Mobilization Strategy
- Session 13: Breakouts: Positioning BIOFIN Outputs and Recommendations and
Implementing the Resource Mobilization Strategy
- Session 14: Planning for 2014: Developing country Roadmaps
- Session 15: Next Steps and Closing

Annex 2. Participants List

NO	NAME SURNAME	COUNTRY	TITLE	Email
1	Phemo Kgomotso	UNDP Botswana	Programme Analyst, Head of Unit - Energy and Environment	phemo.kgomotso@undp.org
2	Nadia Mujica	UNDP Chile	Programme Assistant Energy and Environment	Nadia.Mujica@undp.org
3	Karin Molt	Government of Chile	NBSAP Project Director	KMolt@mma.gob.cl
4	Andrea Cabezas	Government of Chile	Marine Strategy Specialist	ACabezas@mma.gob.cl
5	Juan Ladrón de Guevara	Government of Chile	Expert	Juan.ladrondeguevara@gmail.com
6	Jimena Puyana	UNDP Colombia	Programme Analyst	jimena.puyana@undp.org
7	Nils Eduardo Miguez	Government of Colombia	Biodiversity Advisor	nmiguez@dpn.gov.co
8	Jenny Arias	Government of Colombia / UNDP	NBSAP Principal National Advisor	Jenny.arias@pnud.org.co
9	Kifah Sasa	UNDP Costa Rica	Programme Officer, Environment, Energy and Risk Management	kifah.sasa@undp.org
10	Guillermo Zuñiga	BIOFIN Costa Rica	BIOFIN Team Leader	guillermo.zunigach@gmail.com
11	Ana Lucía Orozco	BIOFIN Costa Rica	National Technical Adviser	analuciaorozco79@gmail.com
12	Eugenia Arguedas	Government of Costa Rica	CBD National Focal Point	Eugenia.arguedas@sinac.go.cr
13	Francisco Tula Martínez	Government of Costa Rica	Director, Area of Public Investments	francisco.tula@mideplan.go.cr
14	Marjorie Morera González	Government of Costa Rica	Budget General Director	moreragm@hacienda.go.cr
15	Gabriel Jaramillo	UNDP Ecuador	Programme Specialist Energy, Environment and Disaster and Risk Management	gabriel.jaramillo@undp.org
16	Alfredo Danilo López Mora	BIOFIN Ecuador	BIOFIN Team Leader	alfredo.lopez@ambiente.gob.ec

NO	NAME SURNAME	COUNTRY	TITLE	Email
17	Edison Bolivar Reza Paocarina	Government of Ecuador	Official, Under-secretariat of Fiscal Policy	ereza@finanzas.gob.ec
18	Laura Nuñez	Government of Ecuador	Director of Project Analysis, Under-secretariat of Public Investment	lenunez@senplades.gob.ec
19	Francisco Prieto	Government of Ecuador	National Biodiversity Director	francisco.prieto@ambiente.gob.ec
20	Maria Tatiana Egüez Larrea	Government of Ecuador	Ministry Advisor	tatiana.eguez@ambiente.gob.ec
21	Winifereti Nainoca	UNDP Fiji	Environment team leader	winifereti.nainoca@undp.org
22	Sele N Tagivuni	Government of Fiji	Manager Project Management Unit	sele.tagivuni@environment.gov.fj
23	Kelera Ravono	Government of Fiji	Economic Planning Officer	KKolivuso@finance.gov.fj
24	Rahul Chand	Government of Fiji	Biodiversity Officer, Department of Environment	rahul.chand@govnet.gov.fj
25	Flor Bolaños	UNDP Guatemala	Program Analyst, Energy and Environment	flor.bolanos@undp.org
26	Sergio Ruano	Government of Guatemala	Vice Minister	
27	Juan Quiñonez	Government of Guatemala	NBSAP Lead	jquinonez@conap.gob.gt
28	Iwan Kurniawan	UNDP Indonesia	Technical Officer for NRM	iwan.kurniawan@undp.org
29	Ersa Herwinda	Government of Indonesia	Senior Planning Adviser	herwinda@bappenas.go.id
30	Fachruddin Mangunjaya	Government of Indonesia	Lead writer	fmangunjaya@yahoo.com
31	Dhani Setyawan	Government of Indonesia	Researcher, Center for Climate Change Financing & Multilateral Policy	dhanisetawan83@gmail.com
32	Ibnu Maryanto	Government of Indonesia	Researcher, Center for Biology Research	ibnu_mar@yahoo.com
33	Viktoriya Baigazina	UNDP Kazakhstan	Programme Associate	Victoria.baigazina@undp.org
34	Kerteshev Talgat	BIOFIN Kazakhstan	National project coordinator, BIOFIN/NBSAP	talgat.kerteshev@undp.org
35	Sarsembayeva Meruyert	BIOFIN Kazakhstan	BIOFIN National expert on financial tools	Sarsembayeva.m@gmail.com

NO	NAME SURNAME	COUNTRY	TITLE	Email
36	Ustemirov Kairat	Government of Kazakhstan	Deputy Chairman of FHC, MEWR	ustemirov.k@eco.gov.kz
37	Almagul Mazhrenova	Government of Kazakhstan	Head of Budget planning program department, MEBP	mazhrenova_ab@minplan.kz
38	Natalya Panchenko	Kazakhstan Interpreter		Natalya.panchenko@gmail.com
39	Pek Chuan Gan	UNDP Malaysia	Programme Manager	pek.chuan.gan@undp.org
40	Muthusamy Suppiah	UNDP Malaysia	National Technical Adviser, Protected Area Financing	muthu@wildlife.gov.my
41	Ahmad Kamal Wasis	Government of Malaysia	Principal Assistant Director Environment and Natural Resources Section	kamal@epu.gov.my
42	Martin Nowack	GIZ Project, Namibia	Expert	martin.nowack@giz.de
43	Lawrie Harper-Simmonds	GIZ Project, Namibia	Expert	LH@NNF.ORG.NA
44	Veikko Shigwedha	Government of Namibia	Expert	veikko@met.na
45	Olimpio Nhuleipo	Government of Namibia	Expert	olimpio@met.na
46	James Leslie	UNDP Peru	Technical Advisor	james.leslie@undp.org
47	Martín Carlos Orellana Flores	Government of Peru	Expert, Ministry of Economy and Finance	morellana@mof.gob.pe
48	Antonio Wenceslao Salas Jaramillo	Government of Peru	NBSAP Coordinator	asalas@minam.gob.pe
49	Luis Antonio Sanchez Perales	BIOFIN Peru	BIOFIN Team Leader	mrgrasss@hotmail.com
50	José Álvarez Alonso	Government of Peru	Director General, Biodiversity	jalvarez@minam.gob.pe
51	Fidencio Edmundo Gregorio Chávez	GIZ Project, Peru	Environment Sector Analyst	fgregorio@mef.gob.pe
52	Grace Tena	UNDP Philippines	Programme associate of the Energy and Environment Unit	grace.tena@undp.org
53	John Narag	Government of Philippines	Division Chief (PO V)	jnarag@dof.gov.ph
54	Anabelle Plantilla	Government of Philippines	NBSAP/BIOFIN Coordinator	a.plantilla@yahoo.com.ph
55	Raymundo Talento	Government of Philippines	Director IV	rj.talento@nscb.gov.ph
56	Annabelle Trinidad	BIOFIN Philippines	Senior Finance Expert	abbietrinidad@gmail.com

NO	NAME SURNAME	COUNTRY	TITLE	Email
57	Denis Matatiken	Government of Seychelles	CEO	boga@seychelles.net
58	Patrick Course	Government of Seychelles	BIOFIN Focal Point	pcourse@finance.gov.sc
59	Anniké Faure	Government of Seychelles	BIOFIN & NBSAP Project Manager	a.faure@pcusey.sc
60	Bertrand Rassool	Government of Seychelles	BIOFIN Lead Finance Expert	lbrassool@yahoo.co.uk
61	Maria Mbengashe	UNDP South Africa	Programme Manager Energy and Environment	maria.mbengashe@undp.org
62	Wilma Lutsch	Government of South Africa	Director: Biodiversity Conservation	wlutsch@environment.gov.za
63	Wadzi Mandivenyi	Government of South Africa	Biodiversity Specialist	WMandivenyi@environment.gov.za
64	Tracey Cumming	Government of South Africa	Policy Advisor	T.Cumming@sanbi.org.za
65	Sharlin Hemraj	Government of South Africa	Director, National Capital Projects Unit	sharlin.hemraj@treasury.gov.za
66	Sutharin Koonphol	UNDP Thailand	Programme Analyst, Environment Unit	sutharin.koonphol@undp.org
67	Ladawan Kumpa	Government of Thailand	Deputy Secretary-General	ladawan@nesdb.go.th
68	Patama Domrongphol	Government of Thailand	Senior Environmental Specialist, Biodiversity Division	pimdomrongphol@yahoo.com
69	Daniel Omodo McMondo	UNDP Uganda	Programme Officer, Energy and Environment	daniel.omodo@undp.org
70	Francis Ogwal	Government of Uganda	Natural Resources Management Specialist/CBD NFP/NBSAP Coordinator	fogwal@nemaug.org
71	Monique Akullo	Government of Uganda	NBSAP Officer	makullo@nemaug.org
72	Angella Rwabutomize Matsiko	Government of Uganda	Senior Economist	Angella.Rwabutomize@finance.go.ug
73	Godfrey Okot Acer	Government of Uganda	Member, National Planning Authority	gokot@npa.ug
74	Winnie Musonda	UNDP Zambia	Environment Advisor	Winnie.Musonda@undp.org

NO	NAME SURNAME	COUNTRY	TITLE	Email
75	Ritesh Joshi	Government of India	Deputy Director, Ministry of Environment and Forests	ritesh.joshi@nic.in
76	Markus Lehmann	CBD Secretariat	Economist	markus.lehmann@cbd.int
77	Matthew Rayment	GHK Consultants	Principal	Matt.Rayment@ghkint.com
78	Carlos Manuel Rodriguez	Center for Environment and Peace	Senior Policy Adviser, Vice President	cm.rodriguez@conservation.org
79	Katia Karousakis	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	Environment Directorate	katia.karousakis@oecd.org
80	Matt Leggett	Head of Policy	Global Canopy Programme	m.leggett@globalcanopy.org
81	Tristan Tyrrell	CBD HLP	Coordinator	tristan.tyrrell.consultant@cbd.int
82	David Meyers	Expert	BIOFIN Senior Advisor Environmental Finance	david@greenantadvisors.com
83	Kavita Sharma	The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB)	Consultant	Kavita.SHARMA@unep.org
84	Marlon Flores	UNDP Expert	BIOFIN Senior Advisor Environmental Finance	marlon.flores@eius.org; marlon.flores@undp.org
85	Arnold Jacques de Dixmude	European Commission		Arnold.Jacques-de-Dixmude@ec.europa.eu
86	Axel Benemann	Government of Germany		Axel.Benemann@bmu.bund.de
87	Gabriela Blatter	Government of Switzerland	Scientific Adviser, Environment Finance and Climate	gabriela.blatter@bafu.admin.ch
88	Nik Sekhran	UNDP	Principal Technical Advisor, EBD	nik.sekhran@undp.org
89	Alice Ruhweza	UNDP-GEF	Regional Team Leader & Regional Technical Adviser	alice.ruhweza@undp.org
90	Helen Negret	UNDP-GEF	Senior Technical Advisor Ecosystems and Biodiversity	helen.negret@undp.org
91	Joseph d'Cruz	UNDP-GEF	Regional Environment Advisor	joseph.dacruz@undp.org

NO	NAME SURNAME	COUNTRY	TITLE	Email
92	Maxim Vergeichik	UNDP-GEF	Technical Advisor, Biodiversity and Ecosystems	maxim.vergeichik@undp.org
93	Martin Krause	UNDP	Team Leader Environment, Energy, Climate - Eastern Europe & Central Asia at UNDP	martin.krause@undp.org
94	Caroline Petersen	UNDP	Technical Specialist for Ecosystems and Biodiversity	caroline.petersen@undp.org
95	Andrew Bovarnick	UNDP	Global Head - Green Commodities Facility	andrew.bovarnick@undp.org
96	Fazal Rahman Tasal	UNDP Afghanistan	Programme Officer for Sustainable Development	fazal.rahman.tasal@undp.org
97	Yves de Soye	UNDP-BIOFIN Global	BIOFIN Manager, UNDP-GEF Technical Advisor	yves.desoye@undp.org
98	Jamison Ervin	UNDP-BIOFIN Global	BIOFIN Senior Advisor	jamison.ervin@undp.org
99	Onno van den Heuvel	UNDP-BIOFIN Global	BIOFIN Project Specialist	onno.heuvel@undp.org
100	Blerina Gjeka	UNDP-BIOFIN Global	BIOFIN Project Management Associate	blerina.gjeka@undp.org
101	Liz Zeidler	Facilitator		liz.zeidler@modoto.co.uk
102	Thomas Stephens	Facilitator		tstephens@prescient360.com
103	Cristina Orriols Bouza	Interpreter		contact@translateplus.com
104	Miriam Gonzalez Arce	Interpreter		miriaminterpreter@gmail.com
105	Sarah Challe	UNDP	Consultant	Sarah.challe@undp.org