

# **Annual Report, 2003**

## **Swedish International Biodiversity Programme, SwedBio**

April 18, 2004

## **CONTENTS**

1. Brief summary and introduction .....	3
2. Collaborative programme.....	7
2.1 Support to biodiversity capacity building in developing countries (support programme) .....	7
2.2 Back-stopping and advice to Sida on biodiversity integration in specific cases.....	9
2.3. Inventory of BD-projects .....	11
2.4 Development of criteria for collaborative programme.....	12
2.5 Follow international policy- and methods development .....	13
2.6 Development of administrative routines .....	15
3. Capacity building for integration of biodiversity issues in Swedish development cooperation.....	15
3.1 Development of methods, tools and guidelines for biodiversity integration at Sida .	16
3.2 Information material for Sida.....	18
3.3 Information and training.....	18
3.4 Interaction with the Swedish government.....	19
4. Capacity building of and collaboration with Swedish actors and organisations.....	20
4.1 Organising seminars/workshops .....	21
4.2 Participate in other workshops in Sweden .....	23
4.3 Information and media .....	23
4.4 Supporting Swedish BD-research .....	24
4.5 Dialogue and exchange of experience with Swedish organisations.....	24
5. Planning, reporting and administration .....	25

## 1. Brief summary and introduction

Biodiversity is a crucial resource for the world's poorest. Rights to and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services are often critical for local livelihoods, and are intimately linked to fundamental development aspects such as poverty, food security, equity, health, and trade. Sustainable use of biodiversity is thus a prerequisite for sustainable development and poverty alleviation in both local and global perspectives.

The Swedish International Biodiversity programme (SwedBio) was therefore initiated by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and the Swedish Biodiversity Centre (CBM), to allow a pro-active and strategic approach to addressing biodiversity for local livelihoods within Swedish international development cooperation.

This report summarises the main activities, achievements and lessons learned from SwedBio's first year. The report is structured the same way as the Annual Work Plan, and a direct follow-up of activities undertaken in comparison with the WP is made. Since time is one of SwedBio's main assets, but also a key constraint (since there are two full time programme positions only), a follow-up of time spent (and thus priorities) is also made. The report includes the following main sections.

As 2003 was SwedBio's first year, this of course coloured both the activities and the achievements. The work focussed mainly on:

- Launching of SwedBio.
- Developing international and Swedish contacts and networks, creating routines (e.g. for the collaborative programme and handling of financial support).
- Drawing lessons from earlier BD-integration work at Sida and identifying and initiating key activities for its continuation.
- Getting familiar with the supported organisations and start developing new ideas.
- General strategy development (participation in meetings, SwedBio strategy workshop).

Time allocation to different activities and component varied over the year. Less time than anticipated was spent on integration work at Sida (which is reflected under both "Capacity building in developing countries.." and "Integration work at Sida", see further under each heading) and following the international policy development, whilst considerably more time than anticipated was spent on interacting with Swedish actors and networks in different ways. This is partly due to time spent on developing the website and "internal" interaction within CBM.

<b>Component</b>	<b>Planned time 2003</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Capacity building in developing countries – Collaborative programme</b>	<b>57 %</b>	<b>50 %</b>
<b>Integration work at Sida</b>	<b>18 %</b>	<b>14 %</b>
<b>Capacity building in Sweden</b>	<b>15 %</b>	<b>24 %</b>
<b>Administration</b>	<b>10 %</b>	<b>12 %</b>

### 1.1 Collaborative programme

#### 1.1.1 Main achievements

- A good dialogue with all programmes/organisations that were previously supported directly from Sida has been established, and several potential new initiatives to support have been identified. Two external evaluations have been carried out, and agreements extended with two organisations.
- SwedBio has also contributed to increase participation of civil society (NGOs, indigenous peoples, farmers etc) in important international biodiversity events.
- A good understanding and knowledge on “what is presently moving out there” around BD, local livelihoods and poverty alleviation has been obtained - through participation in meetings, dialogues with a vast number of organisations and persons, and some reading of relevant literature. SwedBio is also starting to become known both internationally and in Sweden, and a good contact network has been established.
- A strategic workshop was organised in December 2003, with participants from both Sweden and a number of international organisations representing different aspects of biodiversity and ecosystem management. The workshop discussed and identified the current “frontline” and key emerging issues regarding biodiversity, poverty alleviation and local livelihoods, and helped to identify priorities for SwedBio’s future work.

#### 1.1.2 Relationship to Sida objectives – poverty, governance/HR, gender

- As noted below (3.1) the support programme is clearly addressing both poverty and livelihoods concern, and setting governance and human rights perspectives for natural resource management in focus. Linkages to trade and effects of e.g patenting (of biological material traditional knowledge) are also of high relevance in this respect.

#### 1.1.3 Challenges for 2004

- The rights-based approach so strongly put forth during the SwedBio strategy workshop should be clearly high-lighted among the criteria to be finalised during 2004 for the support programme.
- Gender aspects are important and addressed within most of the supported programmes but there may be scope for improving gender considerations within the support programme.
- New initiatives should remain firmly focussed on sustainable use aspects and biodiversity managed by and for local communities, but should be broadened to also include other types of landscape than agriculture. The role and importance of ecosystem services should be high-lighted, and more clearly addressed within
- Time for the collaborative support programme must increase during 2004 (with support to an increasing number of organisations or initiatives), and international travel during

## SwedBio Annual Report 2003

2004 should focus more on visits and follow-up of supported organisations than 2003 (only one field visit was made during 2003).

### 1.2 Integration work at Sida

#### 1.2.1 Main achievements

- The BD-integration work at Sida has been initiated – including start-up of work on BD and EIAs, BD in country strategies, inventory of Sida’s BD-work, and providing comments on a number of specific cases.
- Reports and information material have been produced. This has included finalisation of a number of BD-case studies and reports from earlier BD-integration work at Sida, developing SwedBio’s homepage and presentation folder, and supporting a Future Earth publication on Biodiversity and poverty alleviation.
- A special “invitation area” on BD and local livelihoods through Sida-SAREC have been initiated, which will be announced early 2004.
- Comments and advice to the Swedish Government (mainly Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Foreign Affairs) has been sought and provided on a number of occasions, including comments on two batches of GEF-proposals.

#### 1.2.2 Relationship to Sida objectives – poverty, governance/HR, gender

- The approach of SwedBio takes Sida’s development objectives as a starting point and is thus firmly based on a people-centered conceptual view, regarding biodiversity as a key resource for local livelihoods and poverty alleviation. This basic outlook flavours all expert comments and advice provided.

#### 1.2.3 Challenges for 2004

- Increased emphasis must be put on work with BD-integration at Sida. More efforts must be made at finding good entry-points for this work. The initiated work related to the Country Strategy-process, and work on BD & EIA are good starts but not enough. More focus and time on interaction and developing capacity with Sida is thus required.
- A communication strategy for information work in Sweden (Sida and other organisations) should be developed.

### 1.3 Collaboration and contacts with Swedish organisations and actors

#### 1.3.1 Main achievements

- SwedBio participated in a number of meetings, workshops and seminars during 2003, and also provided in-puts and lectures on and several occasions.

1.3.2 Relationship to Sida objectives – poverty, governance/HR, gender

- Focus in all presentations and interaction was on stressing the linkages between poverty alleviation and biodiversity, and clarifying the importance of ecosystem products and services to local communities.

1.3.3 Challenges for 2004

- SwedBio should continue interacting with different Swedish organisations and actors but less time should be spent on this compared to 2003, and activities should be more focussed.

## 2. Collaborative programme

SwedBio spent – according to plan – more than 20% of the time on contacts and dialogue with and follow-up of supported organisations. Less time than anticipated was spent on the Sida-related work – e.g. direct advice to Sida on specific projects, and inventory of Sida’s biodiversity-related support, and following the international policy development. However, the SwedBio strategy workshop (reported under “developing criteria”), which was not originally planned, also contributed considerably to a further understanding and knowledge of the international policy development.

Activity	Planned time	Actual time spent	Planned final date (AP)	Status
<b>1. SwedBio support programme</b>	21%	21%	Continuous	Cont.
<b>a) Advice to Sida on specific projects, programmes, strategies etc</b>	12%	8%	Cont.	Cont.
<b>2. Inventory of Sida BD-related support</b>	6%	2.5%	30 Sept.	On-going
<b>3. Developing criteria for SwedBio support programme</b>	2%	5.5%	Sept	On-going. Included strategy-workshop in Dec.
<b>4. Follow international policy- and methods development</b>	15%	10%	Cont.	Cont.
<b>5. Develop administrative routines for support programme</b>	1%	2.5%	15 April	Finalised (April 2003)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>50%</b>		

### 2.1 Support to biodiversity capacity building in developing countries (support programme)

#### 2.1.1 Progress & results

During 2003, SwedBio took over the full responsibility (including financial) for three organisations earlier supported by Sida - Third World Network (TWN), Community Biodiversity Development and Conservation Programme (CBDC), and ETC group (from September 2003) – and the responsibility for contacts and follow-up for an additional one – GRAIN (where Sida maintained financial responsibility throughout 2003). SwedBio had the opportunity to establish contacts and meet with representatives from all four organisations during 2003. Persons from two organisations (CBDC and TWN) also participated in SwedBio’s strategy workshop (see 2.4). SwedBio further arranged seminars/workshops in Sweden (see 4.1) on this (and other occasions) with representatives from the supported organisations.

## SwedBio Annual Report 2003

Two external evaluations (GRAIN and CBDC) were undertaken during 2003, and two additional evaluations were planned (TWN and ETC Group), which will be conducted during 2004.

After the evaluation, the agreement with CBDC was extended two years (2003-2004) to cover the whole on-going programme phase. A one-year bridging support to TWN during 2003 was provided, whilst decision on a more long-term collaboration will depend on the outcome of the planned evaluation. An 18-month bridging support to ETC Group to cover the remainder of the present on-going programme period was discussed and tentatively agreed (though not formally finalised during 2003), whilst (similar to TWN) any decision on a continued long-term collaboration will be taken after the evaluation has been finalised.

During the first year, and in the absence of clear criteria for which type of initiatives to support, SwedBio was deliberately restrictive in identifying new long-term collaborations. However, “seed money” (an initial one-year funding of longer initiatives) was provided to two organisations: Forest Peoples’ Programme (FPP), and the Equator Initiative (EI). Participation of Southern representatives in several international biodiversity-focused workshops and events (mainly related the 7<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity in Malaysia, February 2004) has also been supported, mainly from the so called “multi-vote”<sup>1</sup> funding window.

See Annex 2 for a summary of results and achievements by each of the supported initiatives.

### 2.1.2 Lessons learned

The main lessons include:

- The two evaluations undertaken (CBDC and GRAIN) were both very positive, and a continued support is therefore highly motivated in both cases. A new agreement with CBDC for 2003-2004 was therefore concluded, whilst a new three-year agreement with GRAIN is anticipated for 2005-2007.
- Sufficient time need to be given to ensure adequate dialogue with the supported organisations. Consequently, total time for contacts and dialogue need to be increased during 2004 with the expected increase in number of supported organisations. International travel should in the future focus more on visits and follow –up to supported organisations
- Through the supported organisations SwedBio has built up its network and contacts, and has thereby also contributed to capacity building in Sweden, providing new contacts between Swedish and supported organisations.
- The main focus in the present long-term “portfolio” is on agro-biodiversity and genetic resources – which often are crucial for local livelihoods and poverty alleviation. The two additions (FPP and EI) represent a broadening, and address other biodiversity-livelihood

---

<sup>1</sup> The “multi-vote” is specifically intended for supporting implementation of multilateral environmental agreements, with particular focus on broadening participation from the South in key meetings and events. SwedBio received 3,3 MSEK, 2003 for supporting participation related to key international biodiversity-meetings.

linkages (expanding to e.g. forestry biodiversity resources). This trend should be continued during 2004, in order to allow a broader focus.

- “Rights issues” are crucial aspects in both the long- and short-term support. This means stressing the importance of local access, control and benefit-sharing within sustainable biodiversity management, and promotion of local stakeholder involvement and participation. Rights and governance issues also featured strongly during the discussions at the SwedBio strategy workshop (see 2.4). The international discourse related to biodiversity management & poverty alleviation also puts a clear emphasis on governance, rights and developing policy frameworks for decentralised management and control (see e.g. 2.5).
- The SwedBio-support to participation of indigenous biodiversity custodians and NGOs from the South in international meetings (e.g. COP7-related processes), is thus also important to bring local voices into the international debate and provide increased space for democratic dialogue.
- Gender aspects are addressed within several of the supported programmes, but e.g. the GRAIN-evaluation notes that GRAIN need to improve further in this area. This will be taken up and discussed in future dialogue with GRAIN in order to ensure a more comprehensive inclusion of gender aspects in the coming three-year programme phase of GRAIN. The SwedBio-support to participation in international meetings may also have been more targeted to men than to women. SwedBio should therefore generally in the future strive to give increased emphasise to gender aspects in supported initiatives.
- Implications of trade - and of privatisation of ecosystem goods and services – on both biodiversity and local communities is another common issue which is addressed within most of the supported initiatives. The importance of international processes and negotiations in fora such as WTO and WIPO was also stressed in several of the concept papers produced for the SwedBio strategy workshop and during the workshop discussions. These issues will continue to be important within SwedBio’s criteria of support.
- Criteria for which types of initiatives to support must be developed as a matter of priority during 2004, to provide a solid platform for expanding the support programme.

## **2.2 Back-stopping and advice to Sida on biodiversity integration in specific cases**

### **2.2.1 Progress and results**

SwedBio has not made any formal presentation at Sida (except for a presentation to five persons in SAREC’s NRM-group), and contacts with Sida-staff – including demand/interest for comments – has mainly depended on more individual contacts between individuals at SwedBio<sup>2</sup> and individuals at Sida. This has mainly included the Environment Policy Unit and a few others at Sida-DNRE and Sida-SAREC.

SwedBio has nevertheless provided comments and advise to Sida in a number of specific cases during 2003 (see Box 1). The two most time-consuming were the involvement in the

---

<sup>2</sup> All SwedBio staff have earlier worked at Sida.

Vietnam country strategy process (April-August), and the desk study on entry-points for holistic watershed/water resources management in Malawi (October-November).

<b>Box 1. Examples of cases where advice/comments were provided by SwedBio</b>	
<u>What</u>	<u>Requested by</u>
• Commenting on biodiversity-classification in Sida’s statistics manual (PLUS)	Sida-DNRE /Environment Policy Unit
• Eucalyptus-plantations in the Kenya agriculture extension programme	The EIA-help desk at SLU
• Draft Country Strategy for Laos	Sida-DNRE /Environment Policy Unit
• Country Strategy process – Vietnam (Strategic Environment Analysis, Country Report, Country Strategy). Comments on different documents and different stages. Also provision of suggested text	Sida-DNRE/Rural Development Unit
• New environment training manual – comment on BD-aspects plus contributing with two BD-related cases/examples	Sida-DNRE /Environment Policy Unit
• Elicit and coordinate cases/example on biodiversity and wetlands for joint Sida/UD brochure on environmental conventions	Sida-DNRE /Environment Policy Unit
• Comment on ToRs for new position-paper on GMOs (to be written by SEI)	Sida-DNRE /Environment Policy Unit
• Comment on request from Global Conservation Trust	Sida-DNRE /Environment Policy Unit
• Comment on suggested EU-follow up to the WSSD	Sida-DNRE /Environment Policy Unit
• Comment on CS’s for Mali, Burkina Phaso and regional strategy for West Africa	Sida-DNRE /Rural Development Unit
• Commenting ToR for forest plantation/concessions in Malonda. Mocambique	EIA help desk at SLU
• Case study on entry-points for holistic river basin management and biodiversity, Lake Malawi	Sida-DNRE /Water Unit
• Dialogue/exchange with IUCN – encouraging Swedish interaction with IUCN	Sida-DNRE /Rural Development Unit
• Commenting on request to Sida from ELCI	Sida-DNRE /Environment Policy Unit

2.2.2 Lessons learned

- The involvement in the Vietnam Country Strategy (CS) process illustrated that BD-issues have low priority (i.e. are little considered and little understood), and that even Natural Resources issues may not be perceived a priority. Even the Strategic Environment Assessment that was undertaken (though otherwise of high quality) did not perceive a high correlation between biodiversity and poverty. BD-issues seem to be primarily associated with “conservation”. As a contrast, the Lao CS made a clear link between biodiversity and livelihoods – e.g. emphasising the crucial importance of Non-Timber Forest products (NTFPs) and wild resources to local livelihoods.

- The Malawi-case study showed that a strategic approach in an early stage of programme planning and a more holistic thinking provides opportunities for including relevant and livelihood-linked BD-aspects. It also high-lighted that a watershed focus (as opposed to a water resources focus) gives a good basis for integrated planning of land and resource management in river basins.
- There is a need for a more formal presentation and introduction by SwedBio at Sida-DNRE. There is also a need for initiating meetings and interactions with other Sida-units and departments. This should also include introduction to and interaction with the so called “Life”-group (that works with GM and genetic resources).
- There wasn't much direct collaboration on providing comments on specific documents and projects/programmes with the two Sida environmental help-desks (the EIA help desk at SLU, and the Country Strategy/Environmental Economics helpdesk in Gothenburg, EEU). The EIA help desk requested biodiversity-related comments from SwedBio on two occasions (two fairly minor cases), whilst SwedBio's involvement in the Vietnam and Lao CS were directly requested from Sida. However, EEU and SwedBio exchanged drafts and comments on the documents and drafts related to the Vietnam CS throughout the process. It is expected that collaboration and exchange on specific cases will increase during 2004, particularly focussing on collaboration with EEU and SEI around Country Strategies (see 3.1).

### 2.3. Inventory of BD-projects

#### 2.3.1 Progress and results

An inventory of Sida's support to biodiversity-related activities and projects was planned to be finalised by September 2003. The purposes of the inventory are multi-fold, and include providing background for e.g.: a) the Sida-reporting related to biodiversity; b) the planned revision of Sida's biodiversity policy document (“*Sida and the CBD*”), and c) the development of SwedBio criteria for financial support and collaboration.

A Terms of Reference has been developed, including a matrix for classifying different biodiversity-issues and aspects. This classification builds on categories in the Convention on Biodiversity (to facilitate further reporting and follow-up in relation to CBD). Data collection and interviewing has started. The survey is expected to be finalised by end of May 2004.

#### 2.3.2 Lessons learned

- There is a clear difficulty in identifying what should be regarded as a “biodiversity-related” project, particularly so in projects/programmes dealing with natural resources management (which often include management of biological resources).
- The Sida classification system (PLUS) does not provide the means for any kind of in-depth classification on biodiversity. The question remains if (given that the system already is perceived as complex, and multi-dimensional) the system could be more developed in the future.
- This kind of survey is more time consuming than originally anticipated, and adequate time need to be set aside for it during 2004.

### 2.4 Development of criteria for collaborative programme

The work with developing criteria for SwedBio's collaborative programme - including which types of initiatives and projects to support – was originally intended to be completed by end of September. This process was delayed and also redefined for several reasons, one being the delayed inventory (2.3). However, and more importantly, it was realised that SwedBio's strategic priorities (including criteria for the support programme) must be based on a wider and more comprehensive consultation – including getting up-dated on international discourse (2.5), drawing on experiences from supported organisations, and contacts & exchange with relevant Swedish organisations and institutions (see 4).

To get opportunities for a structured discussion focussing directly on identifying strategic biodiversity priorities for Sida and SwedBio, it was also decided to organise a strategy-seminar with international and Swedish participants. This workshop (which was not anticipated in the 2003 Annual Plan) took place in December 2003, and was a major undertaking by SwedBio. Key results and recommendations from the strategy workshop are summarised in Box 2. The workshop report will be finalised in spring 2004.

#### **Box 2. Lessons learned from the strategy workshop, 8 December 2003**

About 20 participants from all over the world gathered outside Uppsala on 8<sup>th</sup> December to discuss strategic priorities for SwedBio's work. This was an important (although time consuming) activity which helped to ensure that SwedBio is on the right track. Prior to the workshop most participants, as well as other individuals, had produced concept notes, discussing and suggesting key concepts and new ideas. The concept notes are posted on SwedBio's website, and workshop proceedings will be finalised during the March/April 2004.

#### ***Results and recommendations:***

During the workshop there was a clear and general consensus that:

- Biodiversity issues are contextual and that legal, social, cultural etc aspects are crucial
- A rights-based perspective should be applied, emphasising ensured access to (and control of) biological resources by local communities as a crucial pre-requisite for both maintaining biodiversity and poverty alleviation
- A framework of ecosystem services (including both provisioning of products/goods and key ecosystem functions) should be applied
- Capacity building is a key issue.

It was further a general agreement that SwedBio should support:

- "Intermediate" networks/organisations and collaborative programmes
- Initiatives for linking local voices/actors with national and international decision making – and support policy reform at different levels (national, regional, global)
- Case studies and action research – bringing together different knowledge systems
- Collaboration between different types of stakeholders and different sectors.

### 2.5 Follow international policy- and methods development

#### 2.5.1 Progress and results

SwedBio has during 2003 attempted to give priority to following the international policy- and methods development and key issues relating to different aspects of biodiversity, local livelihoods and poverty alleviation. The strategy workshop, and contacts with Swedish and international organisations have all been important in this respect. SwedBio therefore participated in several international workshops and events.

#### 2.5.2 Lessons learned

- *The CIFOR-conference on “Rural Livelihoods Forests and Biodiversity”, May 2003*, provided a thorough up-date on the current state of knowledge on forest-related livelihoods, and also gave opportunities for establishing new contacts, particularly with CIFOR and its DG David Kaimowitz. Important conclusions include: 400 million people live in forests – who mostly are poor and dependent of forest BD. More than 2 billions get medicines from forests! NTFPs are important for poverty reduction/temporary incomes and aid-food, but cannot really help people to rise out of poverty. SwedBio supported participation of researchers and practioners from the South in the conference.
- *The “2010 Challenge”-meeting in London, May 2003*, discussed methods and actions for reaching the 2010-target<sup>3</sup> and for measuring biodiversity loss. The meeting stressed the impossibility of reaching the 2010-target but also reiterated the importance of the target to get political commitment. The need for addressing all aspects of biodiversity loss – genetic, functional, and services (and not just species loss) – was underlined. It was highlighted that user-related aspects of biodiversity (and its loss), including socio-economic aspects and values and ecosystem services, have a higher “communication value” and often are more effective to get local and national commitment to sustainable biodiversity management. The meeting resulted in an information document on monitoring & indicators to the COP7 of CBD.
- *The Millenium Ecosystem Assessment(MA), sub-global assessments working group meeting in Stockholm, June 2003*, gathered to review the progress of the sub-global assessments (SGAs) and of the Sub-Global Working group, within the overall process of the MA. Some 70 researchers participated in the meeting, which was hosted by the Centre for Research on Natural Resources and the Environment, Stockholm University. Marie Byström and Maria Berlekom participated in parts of the meeting as observers. The meeting stressed local knowledge and local rights as a basis for long-term conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems. It also stressed the importance of increased focus on translation between different epistemologies, or ways of knowing the world, rather than relying on one global conceptual framework.
- *The Conference on Technology Transfer and Capacity Building in Trondhiem, June 2003* was a pre-COP meeting to share experiences of Technology Transfer and Capacity Building, attempting to concretize conditions for successful technology transfer between north and south. Karin Gerhardt chaired one of the sessions. Expected outputs were not

---

<sup>3</sup> To significantly reduce the rate of biodiversity loss

clear and the Chairmans report to CBD was more a product of its own than conclusions from the meeting. Technology transfer is one of four priority issues to be discussed at COP7 in Malaysia, February 2004.

- *The International conference on Urban Landscape Dynamics, August 2003, Uppsala* focussed on people, environmental changes and historical development in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The workshop was organised by the Dep. of Archaeology and Ancient History, Uppsala University Karin Gerhardt and Marie Byström participated, and Marie co-organised and chaired a session on “Multiple global identities: discovering epistemological common ground”. The workshop was productive and produced new data on the relationships of humans and the environment in a historical perspective and in different cultures.
- *The World Park Congress in Durban, September 2003, on the theme “Benefits Beyond Boundaries”*, gathered 2.500-3.000 participants and sent a strong message to the protected area community that PAs no longer can be seen in isolation from neither the surrounding landscape nor the people within and around PAs. It was acknowledged that indigenous peoples and local communities in many cases have been very severely affected by establishment of protected areas (being deprived of their livelihood base, and often resettled without prior informed consent). At the same, the contribution and importance of local communities to a long-term and sustainable management of biodiversity was high-lighted, and the potential of acknowledging local governance regimes (co-management, community management) was stressed. The meeting resulted in several policy statements including the “Durban Accord” and a message to CBD. There was a strong presence of indigenous and community-representatives in the congress (to which SwedBio contributed).
- *The IPGRI/CAPRI (Collective Action and Property Rights<sup>4</sup>) workshop on Property Rights, Collective Action and Local Conservation of Genetic Resources”, in Rome 29 September – 2 October*, focused on access to genetic resources and sharing of benefits from a local perspective. The meeting gathered researchers from most CGIAR-institutes and from universities in the North and South. It was a very fruitful meeting, which had a strong consensus in support of continued access to genetic resources at the local level. A paper was presented by SwedBio (Marie Byström) on formal and informal systems in support of farmer management of agro-biodiversity at the meeting.
- *A one-day European advisory workshop to IIED, October held in Brussels*, to identify and discuss key issues for sustainable livelihoods and sustainable development from a European (and EU) perspective, and future IIED-priorities. Trade-related issues (market access, perverse incentives, intellectual property rights etc) were underpinning most of the discussions, whilst natural resources and their management per se did not feature highly.
- *A study tour to Peru, was undertaken in October 2003* (by Marie Byström). The main objective of the visit was capacity development through visits to local communities working in the field with sustainable use of biodiversity in innovative ways. Some 9 different communities were visited. The organisations visited were: Asociation Inca, the local CBDC programme partner in Peru (supported by SwedBio), PRATEC (Andean Project of Peasant Technologies), CEPROSI (a local organisation in the Andes working

---

<sup>4</sup> A CGIAR-programme

## SwedBio Annual Report 2003

with children, culture and biodiversity), ANDES (a local organisation who is part of the Millenium Ecosystem Assessment), the Peruvian Society for Environmental Law (SPDA) and the International Potato Center (CIP). Marie also lectured on genetic resources and local communities at PRATEC's M Sc course in Andean Cosmovation. The visit provided many useful experiences and input into SwedBio's future work.

### 2.6 Development of administrative routines

#### 2.6.1 Progress and results

Administrative routines were developed by April 2004, including routines for decision-making, project assessment, preparation of background documents etc. A set of formats has been developed including formats for agreements and decisions. Procedures have been approved by the Steering Group. A Working Group (WG) to discuss received project proposals was initiated in November. The WG consists of the SwedBio programme staff, and one CBM-member from the Steering Group and meets every 6-8 weeks

#### 2.6.2 Lessons learned

- The routines function well, but need to be further developed during 2004. There is e.g. a need to look more into SLU tendering-requirements, and also to develop routines for ensuring that reports and documentation from supported organisations are received as per agreement.

### **3. Capacity building for integration of biodiversity issues in Swedish development cooperation**

Some activities were postponed to 2004, and less time than anticipated was spent on development of Sida-capacity.

In addition to the activities detailed below, a draft strategy for the work with BD-integration was produced for discussion.

Activity	Planned time	Actual time spent	Planned final date	Status
<b>1. Development of tools &amp; methods for BD-integration at Sida</b>	9,5%	6%		
• Development/finalising earlier BD integration-work including case studies			2003-2004	On-going
• Up-dating "Sida and the CBD"			30 Nov.	Postponed to 2004
• Development of BD-aspects in EIA and CS-guidelines			2003-2004	On-going
• Initiate "invitation-area" for BD-focussed research			During 2003	Announced 2004

## SwedBio Annual Report 2003

<b>2. Information- and training materials</b>	2,5%	2%		
• Prepare information folder & home page			2003	Finalised
• Produce information folder on biodiversity & poverty linkages ("Biodiversity matters")			30 June	Postponed for 2004
<b>3. Training at Sida</b>	1%	1%		
• Information at selected departments			2003-2004	Provided a few times
• BD-aspects included in training materials for Embassies, including e-training			2003-2004	Not initiated
• Review BD-aspects within Sida's environment course			2003-2004	Not initiated
<b>4. Support/comments to the Swedish Government</b>	5%	5%		
• Support Sida with BD- reporting etc to the Government			When needed	Some occasions
• Support/participating/preparations in meetings etc to/for the Government (e.g. Min. of Environment) related to convention-processes			When needed	A few times 2003
• Comments to the Gov. (Min. of Foreign Affairs) on GEF-proposals			Twice/year	Provided
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>14%</b>		

### 3.1 Development of methods, tools and guidelines for biodiversity integration at Sida

#### 3.1.1 Progress and results

During 2003, progress and results included:

1. *Finalising and developing earlier BD-integration work and case studies*: Two reports resulting from earlier mainstreaming work within Sida were finalised by SwedBio during the first six months: a) A case study from the planning phase of a forestry programme in the State of Orissa, India, and b) an analytical report on main experiences from the biodiversity integration work at Sida 1998-2000. The Orissa case study, and the other two case studies from Vietnam and Zambia) were printed 2003. The documents can be downloaded from the SwedBio web-site. Follow-up on the case studies (planned for late 2003), and a national stakeholder seminar in e.g. Zambia was postponed until 2004. The latter was mentioned in the AP 2003 as a possibility – but to depend on interest from the Embassy and the programme. Tentative ideas have been floated with the programme and with Sida's regional unit in Nairobi, and there is a preliminary interest
2. *Up-dating "Sida and the CBD"*: Up-dating of the document was postponed until 2004, to include the up-dated results of the inventory (3.3), the strategy workshop (3.4) and recent development in connection to the CBD during COP7 in Malaysia February 2004.

3. *Development of BD-aspects in EIA-guidelines and Strategic Environment Guidelines:*

*EIAs:* A review of international experience of biodiversity in Environmental Impact Assessment was initiated during 2003. The objective of the review was to draw lessons from international good practice examples of biodiversity impact assessment in EIA and make recommendations for Sida's future work with EIA of Sida-supported projects and programmes. Information was gathered from other donor agencies, international organisations (e.g Convention on Biological Diversity and International Association of Impact Assessment, IAIA) and key EIA experts. We also collaborated with the review of biodiversity in EIA in Sweden, assigned by the Swedish government and carried out by the Swedish Biodiversity Centre together with the EIA Centre at SLU.

*Biodiversity in country strategies:* A brief review of earlier environmental fact-sheets produced by the EEU-Gothenburg at the on-set of CS-processes was undertaken (June), and collaboration initiated with the EEU and SEI. This has included two meetings with the EEU in Gothenburg (June and August), the latter with participation also by SEI, and one meeting focussing on vulnerability-analysis in Stockholm (November) with SEI, Sida and EEU. This work will continue during 2004, with EEU as overall responsible for integration of environmental aspects in the CS.

4. *Initiate "invitation-area" for BD-focussed research:* This was successfully completed during 2003 (see 4.4).

3.1.2 Lessons learned

The main lessons learned are:

- *Mainstreaming experiences:* The three national case studies (Orissa, Vietnam and Zambia) and the main report show that biodiversity integration within particularly Sida - Department for Natural Resources and the Environment (DNRE) has a long history, but that progress so far is more mixed. The case studies clearly show that there is a big scope for pro-actively addressing biodiversity & livelihood-concern within NRM-programmes (since they by definition normally included strong aspects of managing biological resources, ie within a forestry, marine or agricultural programme), particularly when BD-are identified and incorporated early during the planning phase. However, the mainstreaming-report also found that there is not enough understanding and knowledge about the role that biodiversity plays for livelihoods, and notes that biodiversity often tend to be equated with "conservation", and therefore receive limited attention. The report further notes that Sida-staff are overwhelmed with a large number of issues and aspects that shall be taken into account, with the consequence that interest and inclination to take on additional issues (particularly of they are perceived to have low relevance) is limited.
- *EIA and biodiversity:* Good practice EIA cases were hard to find, and our work came to focus more on gathering state-of-the-art guidelines for integration of biodiversity assessment into EIA. The study was initially scheduled to be completed by September 30, 2003, but because of the paucity of good EIA examples the study continued with a new deadline set at April 30, 2004. Our preliminary results show that emphasis in the near future should be on further developing EIA practice of Sida-supported projects and programmes on a case-to-case basis and in close collaboration with the EIA Centre at

## SwedBio Annual Report 2003

SLU. This work should be based on i.e. the guidelines for biodiversity in EIA developed and agreed by the 6<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties to the CBD. Collaboration will also be sought with IAIA's project for capacity building on Biodiversity in EIA.

- *Biodiversity in country strategies*: SwedBio has during 2003 identified the Country Strategy-processes as one of the more important entry-points within the Sida policy-and planning framework for ensuring that BD-issues and aspects are addressed. They provide a real opportunity for "up-streaming" biodiversity thinking at early stages in programming. The CS-process can also constitute a good opportunity for awareness-raising within Sida, through showing the linkages between biodiversity, livelihoods and poverty alleviation in each national context. SwedBio should therefore during 2004, prioritise involvement in the CS-processes, particularly for the so called "Country frame"-countries (see 2.2).

### 3.2 Information material for Sida

#### 3.2.1 Progress & results

A folder about SwedBio and a SwedBio homepage was developed as planned. A one-page presentation to Sida-staff about SwedBio has been drafted, but is not yet distributed.

The planned information brochure on biodiversity & poverty (based on an earlier version prepared 2001 by IUCN) was delayed, and may not be undertaken. Two of the activities where SwedBio provided advice to Sida (Environment Manual and Sida/UD-brochure, see Box 1) relate to information material. The set of three BD case studies and the mainstreaming-report were finalised (see 3.1).

#### 3.2.2 Lessons learned

- Information material must be developed with a clear view on their target group and use. Future material should be produced as part of a more comprehensive communication strategy. However, at the same time it is important to retain flexibility and be able to respond to emerging opportunities and interest (e.g. in connection with a specific workshop/seminar or issue).
- Providing BD-related inputs to the environmental fact sheets that are produced by EEU-Gothenburg at the on-set of each country strategy process will be important during 2004 (2.2, 3.1), since this is information material which fill a clear purpose in an on-going strategic process.

### 3.3 Information and training

#### 3.3.1 Progress & results

Only limited attention has been given to information and training at Sida. There have been no formal training sessions, but SwedBio has during a number of occasions held briefings – or information sessions - for and with selected staff at Sida (see Box 3).

<b>Box 3. Information sessions held at Sida</b>	
<u>What</u>	<u>With whom</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General information about SwedBio (a few times)</li> </ul>	2-3 selected individuals at Sida-DNRE (happened on ad hoc basis)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General information about SwedBio – discussion about BD-research and priorities (April)</li> </ul>	Sida-SAREC/Natural Resource Management group
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General information about SwedBio – discussion about possibilities for collaboration in Africa, and scope for addressing BD-issues (June)</li> </ul>	Staff from the new RDD in Nairobi (prior to posting)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seminar/presentation on nanotechnology by Pat Mooney, ETC Group (November)</li> </ul>	Sida-DNRE/Environment Policy Unit, Director of Sida-DNRE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seminar and discussion based on presentations from three of the participants in the SwedBio strategy workshop (Yoke Ling -TWN, Jeff McNeely -IUCN and Charles McNeal-EI) – focussing on MDG-BD linkages, BD and health, and biosafety (December)</li> </ul>	Sida-DNRE/Environment Policy Unit, Sida-SAREC/NRM group

### Lessons learned

- As already noted (2.2) there is a need for SwedBio to be more widely introduced at Sida, and also to target specific information to different Units and Departments. Tailored meetings should therefore be a priority during 2004.

## **3.4 Interaction with the Swedish government**

### 3.4.1 Progress & results

SwedBio provided advice and in-puts to the Swedish government on a number of occasions during 2003 (see Box 4), in three main areas: a) assisting Sida with BD-related reporting to the Government, b) directly supporting an international BD-related process, and c) providing comments on GEF-proposals.

<b>Box 4 Interactions with Swedish government 2003</b>	
<b>What</b>	<b>Requested by</b>
<p><b>1. Assisting Sida with BD-reporting to the Government</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On behalf of Sida comment on the FAO/COAG-document “<i>Biosecurity in Food and Agriculture</i>” to the Ministry of Agriculture</li> <li>• Identify Sida-support to biodiversity &amp; trade related initiatives - for Sida-report to Ministry of Foreign Affairs on trade-related support</li> <li>• Listing Sida/SwedBio biodiversity-projects where Indigenous Peoples (IPs) are stakeholders or affected - for Sida-report to Ministry of Foreign Affairs on Ips</li> <li>• Comment on and suggesting wording (in consecutive drafts &amp; versions) , on objectives &amp; targets for development cooperation under the new (16<sup>th</sup>) Swedish environmental quality goal on biodiversity</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>Sida-DNRE/ Environment Policy Unit</p> <p>Sida-DNRE/ Environment Policy Unit</p> <p>Sida-DNRE/ Environment Policy Unit</p> <p>Sida-DNRE/ Environment Policy Unit</p>
<p><b>2. Support/comments/participation regarding international biodiversity-related meetings/processes/conventions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Participation as Swedish delegate in the Trondhiem-meeting on Technology-transfer &amp; capacity building. June 2003 (see 3.5)</li> <li>○ Commenting on selected SBSTTA-document prior to SBSTTA9 in December (Tech transfer, monitoring &amp; indicators etc)</li> <li>○ Participating in initial preparatory meetings for COP7</li> </ul>	<p>Ministry of Environment</p> <p>Swedish Scientific Committee on Biodiversity</p> <p>Ministry of Environment/ Sida-DNRE/ Environment Policy Unit</p>
<p><b>3. Commenting on GEF-proposal up for approval/discussion by the GEF-board</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nine proposals in May</li> <li>• Nine proposals in November</li> </ul>	<p>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Provided</p>

### 3.4.2 Lessons learned

- Comments and involvement in international meetings and processes, as well as commenting on GEF-proposals, is highly appreciated by the Swedish government representatives. It has also contributed to keeping SwedBio up to date regarding important international BD-processes and development. However, it is important to be selective and focus on meetings/processes of most relevance to biodiversity for local livelihoods and poverty alleviation

## **4. Capacity building of and collaboration with Swedish actors and organisations**

This area contained quite a lot activities, and SwedBio has managed to increase its network and outreach considerably. SwedBio is generally approached by many different kind of organisations, researchers (individuals or groups) and asked to participate in Swedish networks working with development issues.

## SwedBio Annual Report 2003

However, this meant that more time than originally planned was spent particularly on dialogue and exchange with Swedish organisations and contacts within CBM.

Activity	Planned time	Actual time spent	Planned final date	Status
<b>1. Own seminars/workshops</b>	3,5%	4%	2003-2004	Several undertaken
<b>2. Participation in workshops/seminars in Sweden</b>	3,5%	6%	Cont.	Participated in several
<b>3. Information material</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Launch SwedBio homepage</li> <li>• In-puts to Swedish newsletters</li> </ul>	2,5%	3%	2003 Cont.	Finalised Some provided
<b>4. Initiate "invitation-area" for BD-focussed research by Swedish researchers, at Sida-SAREC</b>	2,5%	2%	Dec. 2003	See above
<b>5. Dialogue and exchange</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings with organisations/institutions</li> <li>• Participate in CBM-meetings etc</li> </ul>	3%	9%	Cont.  Cont.	Several held  Regular
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>24%</b>		

### 4.1 Organising seminars/workshops

#### 4.1.1 Progress and results

SwedBio organised or co-organised a number of seminars and workshops in Sweden during 2003, with the aim of sharing information on biodiversity, local livelihoods and poverty alleviation, as presented in Box 5. The seminars had participants from many of the Swedish organisations with whom SwedBio had exchange during 2003 (see Annex 2).

<b>Box 5. Seminars/workshops where SwedBio has been involved in the organising</b>				
<u>Date</u>	<u>Title/what</u>	<u>Lecturers/resource persons organised through SwedBio</u>	<u>In collaboration with</u>	<u>Participants</u>
7 /3	SwedBio inauguration – including SwedBio-presentation on "Biodiversity and poverty alleviation"	Mats Segnestam, Urban Emanuelsson, Maria Berlekom etc	Organised by SwedBio – with CBM and Sida	Approx. 100, from Univ., Gov.auth., Swedish NGOs, cons.comp.
14 /5	Short presentation at Naturicum, SLU on "SwedBio, biodiversity and poverty alleviation"	Maria Berlekom	Organised by SwedBio	5 staff at Naturicum

## SwedBio Annual Report 2003

28/8	Seminar at SLU on "The Andean Project on Farmer Technologies; Indigenous farming knowledge and biodiversity"	Jorge, Ishizawa, PRATEC, Peru	Organised by SwedBio	Approx. 10
30/8	Session at international conference on Urban Landscape Dynamics on "Multiple global identities: discovering epistemological common ground".  This was a multidisciplinary research workshop focussing on people – environment and historical development in Africa. Contacts with SAREC-supported programs in Africa and Asia.	Marie Byström, Jorge Ishizawa,	Conference org. by Dep. of Archaeology and Ancient History, Uppsala University. SwedBio co-organised this session	50-60 participants – researchers from different disciplines, mainly humaniora/social sciences
8/9	Genetic resources, local livelihoods and world trade – lessons learnt from farmers across South-East Asia	Neth Daño, SEARICE (CBDC-partner), Philippines	Organised by SwedBio in collaboration with SDS and SSNC	5 participants
22/9	Priorities for Sida/SAREC-support to BD-related research in developing countries by Swedes	Karin Gerhardt, Marie Byström and Maria Berlekom	SwedBio and EBC	Approx. 20 participants, PhD-students, lecturers etc
25 /10	SDS-seminar: "Communal Sovereignty in the Era of Globalization –Competing for Natural Resources"	Jorge Calbucura and others	Organised by SDS with inputs from SwedBio	Approx. 20
5 /12	SLU-seminar with SwedBio strategy-workshop facilitator: "Possibilities for building bridges between indigenous knowledge and science"	Timmi Tillmann, IKAP-Network, Daphne Tuveesson, SLU	SwedBio in collaboration with 'Inspiring Dialogues' at SLU	25 participants
9 /12	Seminar at CEMUS by participants at SwedBio strategy workshop: "Biodiversity, knowledge and power: creating space for dialogue across cultural and social boundaries"	Michel Pimbert, IIED and Timmi Tillmann, IKAP-Network	SwedBio in collaboration with SDS	27 participants
9 /12	A 'Stockholm seminar' at the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences by participants at the SwedBio strategy workshop on "The role of biodiversity for ecosystem goods and services and its importance to local livelihoods in developing countries: priorities for the future"	Neth Daño, SEARICE, Phil.  Maria-José Guazelli, Ipe Ecological Center Brazil  David Obura – CORDIO, Kenya	By SwedBio and Stockholm Seminars, Dep of Systems Ecology, Stockholm University	
9 /12	Seminar at the MoE by participants at the SwedBio strategy workshop on some key topics for the upcoming COP7 to CBD (protected areas, biosafety and biodiversity-MDG linkages)	Jeff McNeely, IUCN  Chee Yoke Ling, TWN, Malaysia  Charles McNeill, EI/UNDP	SwedBio and Ministry of Environment	Approx. 15 part in the Swedish delegation to COP7 of the CBD (Feb. 04)

## SwedBio Annual Report 2003

### 4.1.2 Lessons learned

- The seminars and workshops in Sweden provided important spaces for sharing and exchange of information and thoughts on biodiversity, local livelihoods and poverty alleviation. They also enabled information about the activities of SwedBio, being a new programme, to be shared with a large number of individuals in different organisations. The number of participants at each seminar varied considerably.
- Co-organising seminars with other organisations was fruitful and gave added value through increased dialogue and out-reach to a wider audience. It was also fruitful and very time- and cost-effective to organise seminars with presentations from visitors to SwedBio from abroad. While the seminars and lectures SwedBio personnel held in 2003 focused broadly on biodiversity, local livelihoods and poverty alleviation, our seminars in 2004 are likely to be more thematic. A lesson learnt is that we need to further develop our invitation lists in order to reach the interested audience as widely as possible.

### 4.2 Participate in other workshops in Sweden

Participation in the two annual conference of CBM and the Swedish Species Information Center (Box 6) has broadened SwedBios contacts and understanding of BD-issues in the Swedish context.

#### Box 6. Participation in Swedish workshops 2003

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Organiser</u>
• Annual Flora and Fauna conservation conference (April). In Uppsala.	Swedish Species Information centre
• Annual CBM-conference in October – this year about the “nature protection chain” (Naturvårdskedjan). Held in Jönköping (October)	Swedish Biodiversity Centre (CBM)

### 4.3 Information and media

#### 4.3.1 Progress and results

Main activities during 2003 were the production of SwedBio information material (information folder and home page). SwedBio further contributed to articles in CBM’s newsletter “*Biodiverse*”, and was also presented in a number of articles and newsletters.

SwedBio also supported editing, printing and dissemination of a publication on “Biodiversity and Poverty alleviation” by Future Earth. The publication included a number of articles and case studies from the South, with main focus on agrobiodiversity.

#### 4.3.2 Lessons learned

- Development of the home page takes more time than anticipated originally, and continued up-dating will need to be planned for and allocated sufficient time. The home page will provide an important window for SwedBio to post relevant information, activities, references and contacts.

## SwedBio Annual Report 2003

- Extent of writing/producing own information for other newsletters etc in Sweden – as well as target audiences – need to be discussed more, and form part of a SwedBio Communication strategy to be developed 3.2, 3.3).

### 4.4 Supporting Swedish BD& livelihoods -research

#### 4.4.1 Progress & results

SAREC, SwedBio and the Environment Policy Unit at Sida has agreed to earmark 3 MSEK of SwedBio's funds to support Swedish multidisciplinary research on "biodiversity and livelihoods". This will be announced by Sida-SAREC for application early 2004, and after research proposals have been selected, disbursements will be made during 2005.

#### 4.4.2 Lessons learned

- The NRM-group at Sida-SAREC has been positive to the initiative. A specific BD-related invitation area will hopefully contribute to an increased number of Swedish applications with focus on biodiversity, livelihoods and poverty alleviation linkages.

### 4.5 Dialogue and exchange of experience with Swedish organisations

#### 4.5.1 Progress and results

During 2003, SwedBio had extensive dialogue and exchange with a number of organisations in Sweden. An annotated list of organisations is given in Annex 2. A major effort was made at the official inauguration of SwedBio in March to reach all relevant organisations in Sweden and inform them about the programme and our goals and mandate. SwedBio has also on a number of occasions been invited to give presentations and lectures (see Box 7).

SwedBio has also been part of on-going discussions and exchange within CBM, including participation in regular staff-meetings (every second week) and two occasions with personnel days - one day in March, two days in December – the latter with focus on CBMs international work. A presentation of SwedBio to the CBM Board was made in June.

**Box 7. Presentations and lectures given by SwedBio in different contexts**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Title/context</u>	<u>Organiser</u>	<u>Who</u>	<u>Participants</u>
3/3	Information seminar: Sida/Sarec/SLU's international activities related to research, natural resources and conservation -	SLU -Dep. of Cons. Biology	Karin Gerhardt Marie Byström	Approx 10 students at Dep. of Cons. Biology.
4 /4	Presentation at SLU's International Day on "Biodiversity, local livelihoods and poverty eradication"		Marie Byström	

## SwedBio Annual Report 2003

28 /5	Lecture as part of Advanced International Training Programme in EIA "Biodiversity and EIA"	SCC Natura	Marie Byström	
28/8	Lecture on "Biodiversity and development – the case of Vietnam" at a course", kurs i Hållbar Samhälls-utveckling	Stockholm University	Maria Berlekom	25-30 students
18/9	Presentation on "Capacity building for BD-information & handling in developing countries" at Swedish Global Information Facility seminar	Natural History Museum- Swedish GBIF node	Maria Berlekom	Approx 100 – researchers etc, involved in information handling and data bases
12/11	Talk on "Biodiversity loss – why does it matter"	Kungliga Vetenskaps-samhället, Uppsala	Maria Berlekom	Approx. 20 senior researchers in Uppsala

### 4.5.2 Analysis and lessons learned

- Our contacts with organisations in Sweden varied in nature. Some were brief and focused on exchange of information on objectives and activities and initial discussion on potential collaboration. Other contacts were continuous and focused on joint work or joint development of methods of assessment etc. While our contacts with organisations in Sweden 2003 were broad, it is likely that we will have somewhat fewer contacts in 2004, and that these will focus on joint work and on thematic capacity building.
- SwedBio has consciously strived to avoid being perceived as a unit separate from CBM (which could be a risk, since activities to some extent are different in scope and focus than the rest of CBM), and has during 2003 built a good platform at CBM for its continued work.

## **5. Planning, reporting and administration**

### 5.1 Progress and results

Two quarterly reports were produced during 2003 (January-March, and April-June). Six steering group meetings were held and protocols are available. Administrative routines for project handling were developed (see 2.6).

The following staff worked at SwedBio during 2003:

## SwedBio Annual Report 2003

Maria Berlekom, Programme Coordinator	100%
Marie Byström, Programme Officer	50% Jan-Aug., 60% Sep.-Dec.
Karin Gerhardt, Programme Officer	50%
Sonja Jansson, Administration Officer	40% April-August, 50% Sept-Dec.
Cecilia Erlandsson, Information Assistant	50% Feb-July
Line Boberg, Information Assistant	50%, September-December

### 5.2 Lessons learned

- Reporting routines were changed for 2004, and quarterly reporting abandoned. A more in-depth nine-month report will instead be provided as background for the next annual plan.