

Annual Report, 2005

**Swedish International Biodiversity
Programme, SwedBio**

**A Sida-funded programme at the Swedish
Biodiversity Centre**

March 31, 2006

ACRONYMS

ABN	Africa Biodiversity Network
ABS	Access- and Benefit Sharing
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AIPP	Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact
ANDES	Quechua-Aymara Association for Sustainable Livelihoods
ASP	Agriculture Support Programme
BAP-DEV	Biodiversity Action Plan – Development Cooperation
BCCI	Biodiversity Conservation Corridors Initiative
BD	Biodiversity
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBDC	Community Biodiversity development and Conservation (programme)
CBM	Swedish Biodiversity Centre
CTDT	Community Technology Development Trust
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research
COHAB	Conference of Health and Biodiversity
COP	Conference of the Parties
DFID	Department for International Development, UK
DGIS	the Directorate-General for International Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands
DNRE	Sida's Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
EEU	Environmental Economics Unit
EI	Equator Initiative
EIA	Environment Impact Assessment
ETCGroup	Erosion, Technology, Concentration Group
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FPP	Forest Peoples Programme
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GFC	Global Forest Coalition
GMS	Greater Mekong Sub-region
GRAIN	Genetic Resources Action International
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre
IFS	International Foundation for Science
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IKAP	Indigenous Knowledge and Peoples Network
IP	Indigenous Peoples
IPGRI	International Plant Genetics Resources Institute
ITP	International Training Programme
IUCN	World Conservation Union
KemI	the Swedish Chemicals Inspectorate
LPP	League for Pastoral People
MA	Millenium Ecosystem Assessment
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
ODA	Overseas Development Agencies
PCLG	Poverty Conservation Learning Group
PRATEC	Proyecto Andino de Tecnologias Campesinas
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SARDP	Sida-Amhara Rural Development Programme
SCBD	Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity
SEPA	Swedish Environment Protection Agency
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SSNC	Swedish Society for Nature Conservation
Tebtebba	Indigenous Peoples International Centre for Policy and Education
TRIPS	Trade-related Aspects of International Property Rights
TWN	Third World Network
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFF	United Nations Forest Forum
WTO	World Trade Organization
WWF-MPO	World Wide Fund for Nature – Macroeconomics Program Office

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....	2
0. Introduction and summary	4
1. The Collaborative Programme	7
1.1 Progress and results.....	7
1.2 Experiences and lessons learned	9
1.3 Challenges ahead.....	10
2. Integration of biodiversity aspects within Swedish Development Cooperation	11
2.1 Progress and results.....	12
2.2 Experiences and lessons learned	15
2.3 Challenges ahead.....	16
3. International dialogue and policy development	16
3.1 Progress and results.....	16
3.2 Experiences and lessons learned	17
3.3 Challenges ahead.....	19
4. Planning, reporting etc	20
4.1 Planning and reporting	20
4.2 Staff	20
4.3 Information and communication	20

Annexes

4. Overview of support to processes at Sida

0. Introduction and summary

This annual report from SwedBio contains summaries of the main activities, results and experiences during 2005. It includes reporting on both activities undertaken by the SwedBio staff, and the utilisation of the funds available for financial support to biodiversity-related activities, projects and programmes in the South within SwedBio's so called "Collaborative programme"¹.

During 2005, SwedBio's work was (in line with the three year plan 2005-2007) organised into the following main components:

- 1) *Financial support to strategic initiatives through the Collaborative Programme*: Direct support to capacity building in the South through collaboration with and financial support to smaller strategic initiatives and organisations (primarily NGOs and independent institutions) focussing on development of methods and policies on different aspects of "biodiversity for local livelihoods and poverty alleviation".
- 2) *Integration of biodiversity aspects in Swedish development cooperation*, including
 - a) Capacity building at the Swedish Agency for International Development Cooperation (Sida) through supporting integration of biodiversity aspects in Sida's policies, programmes and projects.
 - b) Interaction with Swedish Government, e.g. participation in the Swedish delegation at international biodiversity meetings. This is closely linked with "international dialogue and policy development" (3), and these two components are therefore reported together.
 - c) Capacity building and dialogue with other Swedish actors and organisations.
- 3) *International dialogue and policy development*: Direct involvement by SwedBio staff in relevant international policy and methods development processes.
- 4) *Planning and reporting*. This includes preparation of SwedBio programme and annual plans, SwedBio reporting, SwedBio planning meetings etc.

The total costs of SwedBio during 2005 was about 3,6 MSEK (see Annex 1), of which staff salaries constituted the largest item.

Table 1 shows how SwedBio prioritised and used its available staff time during 2005.

It could be noted that more time has been dedicated to the Collaborative Programme than planned. This is partly explained by the fact that two new staff has been introduced, and logically the first step is to take on the task with the contacts with the organizations. However, it is also a SwedBio conclusion that to maintain high quality in the processing and analysing of the proposals as well as in the dialogue with, and learning from, the partners, (and really make possible the use of the results from the Collaborative Programme as an input to SwedBio in our other roles) this must be allowed to take time. We hence believe that the level of time spent on the Collaborative Programme more or less indicates what is realistic for keeping a high quality on the portfolio and for safeguarding transfer of experiences. The proportion of time spent on Sida-related work (2a) was lower than planned, but considerably higher than during 2004. The "help-desk function" (support provided on

¹ The activities and work programme of SwedBio are financed by Sida through two main agreements: a) support to SwedBio's core budget, and b) support to biodiversity capacity building in developing countries (the collaborative programme).

demand from Sida) has even been more sought for than anticipated. A planned in-depth case study (forestry plantation in Mocambique) was delayed, but will take place during 2006.

The interest from the Swedish Government as well as other Swedish actors, remain high, and the demand was actually larger than could be met.

Planning and reporting has taken more time than planned. One reason is the introduction of new staff. Another reason is that production of general information material (e.g. work with up-dating home-page) is accounted for here.

Table 1.

Activity	Time planned	Time spent
1. COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMME	36%	45%
a) Strategic development		(16,5%)
b) Dialogue and communication		(28,5%)
c) Further develop admin routines		
2. INTEGRATION IN SWEDISH DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION	41%	32,5%
a) Integration at Sida	(26%)	(14%)
Finalise BD-inventory	5%	1,5%
Help-desk function	5%	7%
Country/regional strategies	5%	2%
In-depth case studies in different sectors	5%	1%
“Invitation area” –SAREC	1%	1,5%
Information and training	4%	1%
b) Interaction/dialogue with Swedish Government	(4%)	(4,5%)
c) Interaction/dialogue with other Swedish actors	(11%)	(14%)
Meetings, dialogue, exchange, participating in seminars	3%	4,5%
Interaction with CBM,	4%	5,5%
Interaction with SLU/UU	1%	2,5%
Organising seminars/giving lectures	3%	1,5%
3. INTERNATIONAL DIALOGUE	13%	4%
4. PLANNING & REPORTING	10%	18,5%
a) Work planning & reporting		(10,5%)
b) General administration		(5%)
c) Information material		(3%)

Key high-lights and achievements under each component include:

Collaborative Programme:

- The programme continues taking shape. The overall strategic direction has been developed and a new strategy adopted. The Collaborative Programme is also gradually broadening its scope, and during 2005 SwedBio entered into new collaborations in e.g. the fields of animal genetic resources, market based biodiversity conservation, pesticides and biodiversity, and collaborative management of protected areas. A study on biodiversity and health was initiated.
- A report with lesson learned from the first three years was produced (to be published during the first months of 2006).
- An external review was completed, which was overall very positive, and strongly recommended a continuation of the Collaborative Programme. The review also recommended that more attention be given to addressing root causes of biodiversity loss, macro-economic drivers and market-based incentives.

Biodiversity aspects in Swedish development cooperation

- Interaction with Sida: Contacts with Sida, and expertise and support provided by SwedBio, increased substantially compared with 2005, and is expected to continue increasing during 2006. However, the challenge to make SwedBio more known and used remains.
- Capacity building and collaboration in Sweden: The general interest in SwedBio remains high. SwedBio has therefore during 2005 attempted to be more targeted in dialogue and contacts with Swedish organisations, mainly focusing on those already involved in or becoming involved in, development cooperation in different ways. Further development of efficient and relevant forms for the “Swedish side” of the SwedBio work need however to be developed.

International dialogue and policy development

- SwedBio participated in a number of international meetings during the year, mainly linked to CBD-processes, and in these cases was part of the Swedish delegation. SwedBio has also provided in-puts to the Swedish government in a number of cases.
- SwedBio followed the international methods- and policy development, and have in particular found the set of publications from the Millenium Ecosystem Assessment (MA), to be of high relevance. The MA has generated substantial and important information on the linkages between biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being, and about the accelerating deterioration world-wide of ecosystem services that will in particular affect the rural poor. The shift to using ‘ecosystem services’ as the entry-point for discussions (rather than biodiversity and ecosystems per se), and analysing trends and changes of these, has also provided a very functional bridge through which to relate biodiversity to main development issues such as poverty alleviation and improved livelihoods. The findings of MA are further truly alarming and should be cause for substantial action and major policy and institutional changes world-wide.

1. The Collaborative Programme

1.1 Progress and results

1.1.1 Development of the strategic framework and overall direction

Strategic framework developed: Based on the SwedBio Strategy Workshop (December 2003), experiences and learning from the first years of the Collaborative Programme, and discussions and dialogue with a number of organisations and initiatives, a comprehensive Strategic Framework for the Collaborative Programme was developed during 2005 (see summary in Box 1).

Box 1. The new Strategic Framework for the Collaborative Programme

SwedBio supports strategic initiatives that address three – interlinked – dimensions:

- 1) The need to sustainably manage biodiversity and maintain ecosystem services to ensure human well-being and health and contribute to poverty alleviation. Aspects include a) biodiversity for food and income, b) biodiversity and vulnerability, and c) biodiversity and health.
- 2) The need to ensure equity and human rights in management and use of biodiversity and ecosystem services. Aspects include a) giving voice to civil society in international processes, b) collaborative and community-based management, and c) gender and biodiversity.
- 3) The need to support development of appropriate incentive frameworks and good governance in order to address root causes of biodiversity loss. This includes aspects such as a) addressing macro-policies, trade and international conventions, b) integrating ecosystem management goals in development and sector planning, c) communication, and d) addressing governance failures (which is strongly linked to the second dimension).

The three dimensions (and 9 aspects/themes) reflect the critical issues that SwedBio wish to see addressed, and should not be regarded as “programme areas”.

External review of the Collaborative Programme: An external review of the SwedBio Collaborative Programme was conducted in November 2005². The review was very positive, and strongly recommended a continuation of the programme. The review also recommended that more attention be given to addressing root causes of biodiversity loss, macro-economic drivers, and market-based mechanisms including role of the private sector.

1.1.2 Development of the programme

SwedBio receives funds for the collaborative programme from two sources at Sida: a) from the global environment vote³, and b) from Sida’s so called “multi-vote” annually approved allocations of 2-3 mSEK⁴. The collaborations are differentiated into three main categories:

- Programme collaborations which are more long-term.
- Shorter-term support to e.g. more focussed studies, workshops etc.
- Increasing civil society participation in international biodiversity-related processes.

² The review was conducted by Mark Halle, Head of the European office of the International Institute for Sustainable Development.

³ A three year agreement 2003-2005, in total 45 MSEK.

⁴ Annually approved allocations of 2-3 MSEK specifically aimed at encouraging developing country implementation of multi-lateral environment agreements and participation in related international processes and meetings.

A financial overview is attached in Annex 2, while results from each of the supported initiatives are summarised in Annex 3.

a) Programme collaborations:

Most of the long-term (two years or more) programme collaborations are in the range of 1mSEK-2 mSEK annually. During 2005, one of the collaborations were renewed after completion of an external review (ETC Group), one new long-term collaboration started (AIPP) and one agreed that will start in January 2006 (Global Forest Coalition, GFC). In addition, two more collaborations – that potentially could become long-term – were initiated (PANAP and LPP, both will start January 2006).

b) Studies, workshops, seed money

Four new short-term supports were provided (ANDES/IIED, PRATEC, Rhodes University and CTDT). In addition support to a conference by IFOAM on indicators and criteria for harvesting of wild biodiversity (to be held May 2006) was agreed.

c) Civil society participation in international biodiversity processes

The use of the “multi-vote” allocation to SwedBio from Sida focused on supporting a fuller and more meaningful participation and engagement from civil society in key international meetings, events and processes. During 2005, this included primarily support to enhancing Indigenous Peoples and NGOs involvement in CBD-related processes (including capacity building, development of positions, and participation in working group meetings etc). The SwedBio-support to participation of indigenous biodiversity custodians and NGOs from the South in international meetings (e.g. CBD-related processes), hence remain an important opportunity for bringing in local voices into the international debate and provide increased space for democratic dialogue in these fora.

d) Additional priority areas

The SwedBio Work Plan for 2005 identified marine issues, biodiversity and health and animal genetic resources as important areas for new collaborations. It was also recommended to give more attention to ecosystem services, and gender aspects.

- Marine issues: SwedBio participated in two workshops organized by the Swedish “Marine Initiative” (coordinated by Sida), and has developed contacts with several organisations in Sweden working internationally with marine issue. No concrete collaboration partner or relevant initiative to support has yet been identified, but this work is continuing.
- Biodiversity and health: Health linkages and aspects within on-going support have been identified. The identified examples mainly address nutrition aspects, traditional medicine and the importance of diverse agricultural systems, but e.g. the important aspect regarding the role of ecosystems in controlling spread of diseases is not addressed in any on-going support. SwedBio also participated in a United Nations (UN) Conference of Health and Biodiversity (COHAB) and continue discussions with Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) on possibilities to collaborate on forests, biodiversity and health. A study was initiated by SwedBio in December to assist in identifying possible important issues and organisations.
- Biodiversity, livestock and animal genetic resources. Collaboration with League for Pastoral Peoples (LPP) on animal genetic resources and livestock-keepers rights has been

initiated. The support and cooperation is supporting preparatory activities for different nomad and other marginalised livestock keepers groups to the International Technical Conference on Animal Genetic Resources in 2007. The project will start in 2006.

- Ecosystem services. SwedBio has increased its attention on ecosystem services, both in discussions within on-going collaborations, and in new supports identified. One example is a new collaboration with the Peruvian based organisation Proyecto Andino de Tecnologías Campesinas (PRATEC) that is focused on how local communities perceive and value ecosystem services.
- Gender. SwedBio has in several cases brought up gender issues in discussions with organisations, both on-going support and new initiatives. In many agreements regarding support to participation in meetings a clause has been added stipulating that neither sex should be represented (sponsored) with more than 65%.

1.1.3 Communication of experiences

a) Report on Lesson learned from the Collaborative Programme

A report with lessons learned so far from the supported initiatives was prepared. The report followed the themes identified in the new SwedBio Strategy for the Collaborative Programme (see Box 1), and aimed to bring out key experiences in relation to the different themes. The report will be printed and distributed first quarter of 2006, and will contribute to dissemination of experiences coming out of the SwedBio Collaborative Programme.

b) Exchange visits and field follow-up

A number of field visits and other opportunities for dialogue with supported initiatives were conducted during 2005. This included donor meetings and/or follow-up of e.g. the CBDC-programme, Tebtebba, TWN, AIPP, IKAP and ABN-GAIA. See Annex 3 (results and achievements of supported organisations).

1.2 Experiences and lessons learned

1.2.1 Lessons relating to contents of the supported initiatives

The main lessons from 2005 include:

- Reports from the organisations, the draft “lessons learned report”, as well as field follow-up and dialogue with partners confirm that the supported initiatives clearly addresses both poverty and livelihoods concern, with governance and human rights perspectives for natural resource management in focus. See also the main lessons summarised from the “lessons learned”-report, Box 2.
- “Rights issues” remain crucial aspects in the Collaborative Programme. For SwedBio this means stressing the importance of secured access by local communities to the biodiversity resources and ecosystem services (be they e.g. seeds, non-timber forest products, clean water, or safety against natural disasters etc.) that are fundamental for poverty alleviation, economic development and well-being. Hence control over and benefit-sharing from these resources, and promotion of local stakeholder involvement and participation in managing the resources are very important. The set of publications from the Millenium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) published in 2005, as well as the 2005

World Resources Report⁵, also clearly emphasise the importance of enhancing local governance, securing local rights and developing policy frameworks for decentralised management and control.

- Gender aspects are addressed within several of the supported programmes. As an example, CBDC has in its final analytical report for phase II an interesting discussion on CBDC gender work, concluding that a certain amount of analytical studies have been done, and there are some areas where they have seen notable achievements, like CBDC Africa encouraging farmers to work equally on “women’s crops and men’s crops”. However, the conclusion even in the CBDC- programme – where an explicit attempt has been made to put special attention on the issue – is that the gender work still remains a challenge. The SwedBio-support to participation in international meetings may also in practice mean that more men than women have been supported. SwedBio has therefore introduced a special clause in its standard agreement text to give increased emphasise to gender aspects in supported initiatives.

Box 2. Key generic lessons from the Collaborative Programme

- The overwhelming evidence from the supported initiatives clearly affirms that biodiversity is fundamental to human well-being and poverty alleviation. This includes e.g. provisioning aspects such as the importance of biodiversity for food and income generation, but also – and equally – maintaining healthy ecosystems to ensure human health and reduce vulnerability to hazards.
- The experiences from the Collaborative Programme also show that access and rights to biodiversity resources, and ensured ecosystem services, is a critical human rights issue. Good governance of biodiversity resources is therefore fundamental, both to ensure that the benefits reach poor people and to ensure that biodiversity itself is maintained.
- A large number of the supported initiatives also point to serious deficiencies in existing policy frameworks, the need for addressing root causes of biodiversity loss (and not just addressing immediate causes such as unsustainable land use practices and/or unsustainable harvest levels), and the lack of integration of biodiversity-livelihoods concerns in sector policies and development planning.
- Many of the organisations strongly emphasise that the maintenance of biological diversity and cultural identity are closely linked.

1.2.2 Lessons related to management and organisation of the Collaborative Programme

- Some of the SwedBio partners have a relatively low administrative capacity. For SwedBio that means that a fair amount of time is spent on dialogue with the organisations on issues such as budgets, plans, focus of reports etc. This is also one of the reasons why more time than anticipated has been spent on the Collaborative Programme.
- Some of the administrative routines of SwedBio are also perceived by several supported organisations as complicated, e.g. agreement formats. The external review also noted that many organisations find the preparation and disbursement processes to be very lengthy.

1.3 Challenges ahead

- An important challenge is to respond adequately to the recommendations in the external review, and e.g. more strongly address root causes of biodiversity loss.

⁵ WRI, 2005, *The Wealth of the Poor: Managing ecosystems to fight poverty*

- In addition, the recently concluded set of reports by the Millenium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) raises a number of concerns and puts forth several recommendations for the international community. These include support to development of more adequate economic incentive frameworks (where full value to society of ecosystem services are taken into account) as well as promoting good governance of ecosystems and biodiversity (including increased transparency in decision-making and enhanced roles and rights of local communities). This is very much in line with SwedBio's strategy for the Collaborative Programme, and also with the external review. SwedBio should therefore strive to identify and support relevant follow-up initiatives to the MA during the coming years.
- SwedBio should work pro-actively during the coming years to identify new strategic initiatives, and must further make sure that already on-going collaborations are not automatically renewed or extended unless they fully meet the overall criteria.
- Adequate time to working with the Collaborative Programme (see Table 1) must also be allocated, to allow time both for the strategic development, dialogue with the supported initiatives, as well as adequate monitoring and follow-up. The work plan for 2005 underestimated the time requirement and more time needs to be planned during 2006.
- For SwedBio it is also important to find a balance between supporting administratively "mature" organisations (e.g. produce good reports, good plans, and generally have high administrative capacity etc) and younger and/or less administratively competent, organisations that may not as easily attract donor financing but that might still be on the cutting edge of prioritized issues regarding ecosystem services and sustainable management of biodiversity. It should also be explored how SwedBio more explicitly could support organisational development and strengthen the capacity of weaker organisations and/or networks.
- SwedBio should also continue work on strengthening linkages between both supported initiatives (based of course on mutual interest) and – where appropriate – between supported initiatives and Swedish organisations. It will also remain important to continue and if possible find better forms for the work with bringing back the experiences and lessons learned from the Collaborative Programme in order to support and under-pin SwedBio's other work (e.g. resources function to Sida), and promoting international methods- and policy development.

2. Integration of biodiversity aspects within Swedish Development Cooperation

This component includes three sub-components:

- Biodiversity integration at, and support to, Sida.
- Interaction and dialogue with Swedish Government and strengthening of the development cooperation and poverty perspective in official Swedish positions in international biodiversity processes (this is reported under component 3 since there is considerable over-lap in practice).
- Capacity building of and networking with other Swedish organisations and actors.

2.1 Progress and results

2.1.1 Integration at Sida

a) Help-desk function

SwedBio has provided comments and in-puts on various documents (see Annex 4). In several cases the direct request has come from one of the other help-desks (mainly the EIA help-desk), having the overall responsibility to coordinate environmental comments to Sida. SwedBio has then been providing specific comments on the biodiversity-livelihoods aspects. A particularly large – and on-going – assignment is providing regular comments on a proposed/planned Asian Development Bank (ADB)-project on Biological corridors (the Biodiversity Conservation Corridors Initiative, BCCI) in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS).

b) Inventory of biodiversity activities at Sida

A draft report has been completed based mainly on compilation of material. Interviews with selected Sida-representatives have been initiated.

c) Country strategies

SwedBio has collaborated with the EEU particularly on developing a poverty-environment fact sheet for Tanzania. A field trip to Tanzania to follow up on the experiences from the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)-ecosystem services project in Tanzania (undertaken by WWF-MPO, and supported by SwedBio) provided a good platform for this work.

d) Invitation area on biodiversity-livelihood related research through the Department for Research Cooperation at Sida (SAREC)

1 mSEK/year of the SwedBio Collaborative Programme is managed by Sida-SAREC to support research on biodiversity-livelihood issues by Swedish scientists. The text for the invitation area was up-dated (January 2005), and comments on the eight proposals submitted to SAREC under the invitation area were provided to SAREC (July). SwedBio also provided comments to Sida-Natur (as background for their in-puts to SAREC) on an additional six proposals.

e) In-depth case studies in different sectors

An in-depth case study on natural resources-livelihoods linkages in the area of a large proposed Sida-supported forest plantation project in Malonda, Mocambique is being planned in collaboration with the EIA help-desk. The EIA help-desk coordinates this work, including contacts with the Swedish Embassy in Mocambique, and the study will be undertaken in late April 2006. SwedBio has also discussed opportunities for an interest in possible case studies in connection to the Chia Se-programme Vietnam (these discussions were held during a field visit to Vietnam in May), Agriculture Support Programme (ASP) in Tanzania, Sida-Amhara Rural Development Programme (SARDP) in Ethiopia and within the marine initiative or on coastal development, but so far without concrete results.

f) Information and training

Tentative fact sheets have been produced on “Biodiversity and Health”, “Biodiversity and Poverty Alleviation”, and “Biodiversity and vulnerability”. A presentation of SwedBio was held at the Rural Development Unit at DNRE.

2.1.2 Capacity building and dialogue with Swedish actors and organisations

SwedBio has during 2005 continued contacts and dialogue with organisations and actors in Sweden, mainly focusing on organisations involved in international development cooperation in different ways.

a) Continuous dialogue with relevant Swedish organisations

NGOs: SwedBio has maintained regular contacts with Swedish Non-Government Organisations (NGOs), in particular the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNC).

Government Agencies: There have also been several contacts with a number of Government Agencies, including e.g. the Swedish Fisheries Board (through the “Marine Initiative”), Swedish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA), and the Swedish Chemicals Inspectorate (KemI), that are involved in Swedish development cooperation. This has also included commenting on training material on “World Trade Organisation (WTO) and the Environment” to be used in training of Chinese environment staff, for Swedish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) and the Swedish National Board for Trade.

Research departments: Contacts on the research side have included discussions with the International Foundation for Science (IFS) on how to formulate/present research opportunities regarding biodiversity from a livelihood perspective, maintaining contacts with the Department of Systems Ecology at Stockholm University, and providing general comments and in-puts on two occasions to Swedish applicants (from Uppsala University and Umeå University) for SAREC-funds. See also below under b) and c).

Private sector: SwedBio has also maintained contacts with some of the Swedish consultancy companies focusing on natural resources management in developing countries, including giving lectures/sessions on biodiversity within the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) training programme of Ramboll Natura, and discussions with Orgut and field visit to the Chia Se-programme during SwedBio-travel in Vietnam.

b) Contribute to internationalisation processes and dialogue at CBM

Regular dialogue and exchange within Swedish Biodiversity Centre (CBM), including participation in CBM’s internal staff meetings and events, have remained an important part of SwedBio’s work. This has included some support to development of the specific contents of the CBM international Master of Science (MSc) programme on biodiversity management, and giving three half-day lectures. SwedBio also provided in-puts and comments on a preliminary research proposal to the Foundation for Strategic Environmental Research (MISTRA) on land use and biodiversity in an international context.

Discussions and work have further been initiated regarding the annual CBM “Biodiversity-conference” for 2006. The theme of the 2006 conference is local governance of biodiversity for rural development, and SwedBio will contribute to developing the international aspects of the programme and also invite selected organisations from the Collaborative Programme to participate.

c) Contribute to internationalisation processes and dialogue at SLU and Uppsala University

SwedBio has to some extent been engaged in dialogue within SLU and Uppsala University during 2005. This has for example included:

- Having one representative on the editorial board of “Currents”. During the period there have been two meetings of the board and several interim contacts with the editor. SwedBio has facilitated contacts with potential article writers and given comments on the framing and focussing of themes for Currents.
- SwedBio further participated in one meeting of the Seminar on Development Studies Committee at the Collegium for Development Studies at Uppsala University. During the period SwedBio representatives has participated in one meeting with the Committee.
- A representative for SwedBio has lectured at a conference arranged by the Centre for Sustainable Agriculture at SLU, in November 2005, on the issue of impact from northern consumption patterns on health and biodiversity in developing countries.
- Assisting in facilitating and promoting contacts between the Swedish Species Information Centre and IUCN & Plantlife, regarding a planned plant conservation programme being developed by Plantlife and IUCN for GEF-funding. The Swedish Species Information Centre is intended to provide key technical support (species assessments at the national level) as part of the proposal. It is hoped that a part of the Swedish contribution to IUCN (within the Sida-IUCN framework agreement) that is intended for facilitating collaboration between IUCN and Swedish actors can be used for completing the GEF-proposal, and for organising a donor conference in Sweden.
- Participating in various seminars held at different SLU-departments, e.g. Department for Rural development Studies.

d) Organising seminars, workshops, giving lectures etc.

During 2005 SwedBio staff has given lectures and seminars to a limited extent. These have included a presentation and participating in discussions in a seminar on “gene technology – a response to the hunger in the world” organised by the Council of the Church of Sweden, and a lecture on biodiversity and poverty alleviation for students at Södertörns Högskola.

In addition, SwedBio staff also gave lectures and participated in discussions at three courses for developing country participants (two of which are part of the Sida-supported Advanced International Training Programme, ITP): a) two lectures (one on “the Convention on Biological Diversity and access and Benefit Sharing”, one on “Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources – an NGO perspective) at the ITP on Genetic Resources and Intellectual Property organised by CBM. b) two lectures on Biodiversity in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), one at the ITP on Environmental Impact Assessment during April – May 2005, and one at the ITP on EIA and SEA in Sweden and China 2005, and c) one lecture on issues related to access and benefit-sharing as dealt with in CBD and FAO at the ITP on the WTO and Environmental Protection for China State Environmental Protection Administration (SEPA).

2.2 Experiences and lessons learned

2.2.1 Sida-related work

- The interaction with and support to Sida increased substantially during 2005 compared to 2004 (see Annex 4 for a complete overview). A number of potential more long-term processes have been initiated during 2005, which are likely to continue during 2006 (e.g. in-puts regarding the ADB-programme on biological corridors, support regarding position paper on biotechnology, dialogue partner on biodiversity with FAO, in-depth study in Mocambique as background for a planned forest plantation project etc). In part this is the result of earlier contacts with Sida-staff and SwedBio becoming more known, in part it is due to more structured collaboration with the two main Sida environment help-desks.
- Good contacts with both the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) help-desk (based at SLU) and the environmental economics helpdesk (the Environmental Economics Unit, EEU, based at the Gothenburg University) have hence been maintained, and more deliberate exchange has taken place. SwedBio has collaborated with both help-desks in providing advice in several specific cases, and has also regular contacts and exchange with both. Two meetings (February and August) with all help-desks (including SEI-staff involved in Strategic Environment Assessments, and vulnerability-environment linkages) were for example held.
- However, it is clear that knowledge about SwedBio at Sida is still limited. This includes both understanding and knowledge about the importance of biodiversity to poverty alleviation (i.e. biodiversity is still largely equated with `conservation`), and knowledge about the role of SwedBio and the support SwedBio can offer.
- It is also increasingly evident that it may not be adequate and relevant to primarily see the aim of the Sida-related work as “integration of biodiversity”, since this is both quite a vague concept, and also may in itself be perceived as a burden rather than as a help to Sida-staff. “Integration” is further probably most efficiently done through the SwedBio in-put to the two main environmental help-desks, where mandatory requirements already are in place (such as the requirement for EIA) or a structured process already exists (such as production of poverty-environment fact-sheets as in-put to the national and regional Collaboration Strategy processes). In all other cases, and in direct contacts with Sida-staff, the *support function* – what SwedBio can offer – should instead be stressed.

2.2.2 Capacity building and dialogue with Swedish actors and organisations

- SwedBio has during 2005 largely succeeded in being more targeted and selected in contacts with Swedish organisations. It is important to maintain contacts with Swedish organisations and initiatives, in order to remain up-dated on what others are doing and learn about other relevant experiences, to ensure complementarity (and not over-lap with others), and to facilitate linkages between supported initiatives within the Collaborative Programme and Swedish organisations and disseminate experiences from the Collaborative Programme in Sweden.
- Interaction with other initiatives within CBM (of which several have a strong international component) has also been very important, both for the direct exchange between staff and programmes and to ensure that SwedBio does not become a “project island” with limited links to CBM at large.

2.3 Challenges ahead

2.3.1 Sida-related work

- Efforts to explore good entry-points and contacts with Sida-staff should continue, focusing on SwedBio to become more known as *a resource* for desk-officers at Sida, including other departments than Sida-DNRE. One important step is to make information about SwedBio available at the Sida intra-net.
- A particular challenge is to develop contacts with the staff at Swedish Embassies, primarily those with large Sida-programmes. SwedBio should therefore attempt to inform the Embassies about on-going support in the respective country, and should also try to schedule visits to the Swedish Embassies during field trips.
- It is also important that SwedBio staff continue to follow the development of policies for Swedish international development cooperation, and that new staff members at SwedBio familiarise themselves with these.
- With increasing involvement by different Swedish Government Agencies (e.g. SEPA, KemI etc) in implementing Sida-supported programmes, SwedBio should also strive to further develop contacts and dialogue with these agencies.

2.3.2 Capacity building and dialogue with Swedish actors and organisations

- It is clear that there is interest for more contributions from SwedBio from other Swedish actors. It is also clear that many of the SwedBio partners are interested in contacts with Swedish organisations and opportunities to disseminate their experiences in Sweden, as well as lobby directly towards Swedish policy makers. For SwedBio with its limited personnel resources, and with its mandate primarily focused on what is directly relevant from a development cooperation and poverty alleviation perspective, this is a continuous challenge, and the possibility to respond to all demand is simply not there. The attempt to be selective and targeted is therefore critical, but sometimes easier said than done. During 2006, it will be important, however, to further define how the “Swedish side” of the work could and/or should be developed to become more efficient and relevant.

3. International dialogue and policy development

3.1 Progress and results

The Collaborative Programme is (as already noted above) an important way for SwedBio to remain up-dated and both support and continuously follow the international methods- and policy development relating to biodiversity and livelihoods, and the maintenance of ecosystem services for human well-being.

In addition, SwedBio is actively following the international policy and methods development in various international fora in order to maintain and update its competence and knowledge regarding relevant aspects of biodiversity management including e.g.:

- Contacts with United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), particularly the biodiversity and poverty alleviation adviser and the Equator Initiative (and providing some financial support to the “community space” initiative organised by Equator Initiative at the UN Small Island Developing States (SIDS)-meeting in January 2005).

- Contacts with some bilateral donors (e.g. the Directorate-General for International Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands (DGIS), Department for International Development, UK (DFID), particularly through meeting at international conferences (EU-meetings etc).
- Contacts and dialogue with international organisations such as the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA), the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), and the World Conservation Union (IUCN).
- Contacts with CIFOR on how to develop the theme Health and Biodiversity within the SwedBio collaborative program.
- Participation in international meetings and workshops (see 3.2 a-f below).

Closely linked to this work SwedBio has also engaged in the Swedish policy dialogue, and has participated in Swedish delegations at international meetings on three occasions (see 3.2 a-c below) and has also provided subject-matter expertise to the Swedish Government on a number of occasions (see Box 3).

Box 3. In-puts to and dialogue with Swedish Ministries

- Comments on background material for Gap Analysis to EU CBD/ABS internal meeting, requested by the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Environment.
- Comments on chapters and sections regarding biodiversity in draft Global Environment Facility (GEF) 4 programming priorities, requested by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Sida-DNRE (Environment Policy Unit, EPU).
- Comments and background material to the 1st Swedish country report to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, focusing on capacity building activities. (This was also requested through Sida, see Annex 4).
- Several in-puts regarding the development cooperation part of the planned EU Communication on Biodiversity.

3.2 Experiences and lessons learned

- The set of publications from in particular the Millenium Ecosystem Assessment (MA)⁶, but also e.g. the 2005 World Resources Report⁷, has generated substantial and important information on the linkages between biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being, and about the accelerating deterioration world-wide of ecosystem services that will in particular affect the rural poor. The shift to using *'ecosystem services'* as the entry-point for discussions (rather than biodiversity and ecosystems per se), and analysing trends and changes of these, has also provided a very functional bridge through which to relate biodiversity to main development issues such as poverty alleviation and improved livelihoods. The findings of MA are further truly alarming and should be cause for substantial action and major policy and institutional changes world-wide.
- There seem also to be an increasing disillusion with the CBD, and CBD-related processes, as a functional mechanism to address biodiversity loss and deterioration of ecosystem services. Criticism ranges from *'heavy bureaucracy'*, *'stuck in political negotiations (related to ABS and PA)'*, *'not able to move to implementation'* etc, to *'not willing/able to address real concerns and drivers behind biodiversity loss'*, *'lack of political clout internationally in relation to other international processes (e.g WTO)'*, and

⁶ SwedBio earlier (2004) supported a global MA- workshop, where experiences from all the sub-global assessments were discussed and synthesised.

⁷ WRI, 2005, *"The Wealth of the Poor: Managing ecosystems to fight poverty"*

'private sectors and economic frameworks are what matters, not international UN-processes'.

From SwedBio we are increasingly concerned about a seeming disconnect between what is happening (or what is discussed) within CBD-circles, and what is taking place in other fora – fora that many times probably affect biodiversity far more than the CBD does. At the same time, CBD remains THE international context in which biodiversity is being comprehensively addressed. This calls in many ways for a re-affirmation of CBD rather than abandonment.

- During participation in international conferences and meetings (including as official Swedish delegates at CBD-related meetings, EU-meetings etc) SwedBio staff has strongly stressed the importance of regarding biodiversity as a key resource for local communities and for poverty alleviation. SwedBio has thereby advocated for applying a rights-perspective, and ensuring that particularly poor and disadvantaged groups (e.g. local communities and indigenous people) can maintain access to and continue to benefit from biodiversity and ecosystem services. Box 4 summarises experiences from international meetings attended by SwedBio.
- In general, these points and perspectives have been very well taken up within the Swedish delegations and Ministries (e.g. in the ABS-context, and the Protected Area context), as it fits well Swedish policy in general. Experiences from EU-discussions are more mixed. It is for example notable that the two-year EU-process for developing a Communication on Biodiversity seems (regarding the development cooperation aspects) to be quite strongly dominated by a wish to leverage more ODA for conservation financing, while interest in and understanding of the broader development agenda (e.g. biodiversity as a resource for poor people, focusing on ecosystem *services* rather than conservation of biodiversity per se, the roles and rights of local communities and indigenous peoples, and the need for addressing root causes including macro-economic drivers and governance failures) appear more limited.
- Through the participation in meetings, and dialogues with a vast number of organisations and persons (and reading of relevant literature), SwedBio has also maintained a comprehensive understanding and knowledge on “what is presently moving out there” around biodiversity, ecosystem services and poverty alleviation. SwedBio is further becoming more and more known internationally, and increasingly recognised as a strategic contact.

Box 4. Experiences from international meetings

- a) *The Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) Working Group 3 (under the Convention on Biological Diversity, CBD), meeting, Bangkok, Thailand, 14 – 18 February, 2005.* Pernilla Malmer was part of the Swedish delegation at the meeting, and in particular followed issues related to indigenous peoples, farmers and local communities. A crucial point from the perspective of indigenous people and local communities in the ABS negotiations is the aspect of fulfilment of internationally agreed Human Rights laws. This view is not shared by all Parties, and there are governments (from the North as well as from the South) that strongly advocate that they should not be included in the ABS negotiations. The relationship between CBD and WTO-TRIPS came up to discussion through the introductory speech by UNEP, where the issue was presented as a conflict. This view was not controversial to either the Southern delegations nor the indigenous representatives and other SwedBio partners, whereas most of the northern Parties looked upon the intervention as a mistake by UNEP. As SwedBio - through our collaboration with the indigenous people's networks and other Southern NGOs following the negotiations - has good contacts with these groups, we

have a clear role as facilitators for mutual understanding of arguments between Sweden/EU and the Civil Society participants and platforms.

- b) *The meeting with European Union (EU) working group on Biodiversity in Development Cooperation, Brussels, Belgium, 14 April, 2005.* Maria Berlekom participates in this expert group as the representative from Sweden. A background paper on proposed actions for biodiversity in EU development cooperation was presented and discussed at the meeting. The paper was one of the in-puts for the planned EU Communication on biodiversity. The preliminary text was rather weak on making linkages between biodiversity and poverty alleviation (including benefits to local communities and poor people) and a bit too focussed on providing increased and ear-marked funds – from development cooperation budgets – for conservation financing.
- c) *The meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Protected Areas (under CBD) held in, Montecatini, Italy 13-17 June, and the donor meeting held back-to-back 20-21 June.* Susanne von Walter participated in the Swedish delegation, with Maria Berlekom joining for the donor meeting during the last two days. The PA-meeting was divided into two Working Groups. The first Working Group covered options for cooperation for the establishment of marine protected areas in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction and the second working group covered options for mobilizing adequate and timely financial resources to the implementation of the programs of work, the development of “tool kits” for establishment and management of PA and consideration of the process for the review of implementation of the programme of work. The donor meeting was primarily aimed at getting commitments from donors to finance the CBD work programme for Protected Areas. During the two days there was very little time available for discussions, since most of the time was spent on either presentations/statements, or on discussing formulations for agreed text from the meeting. Few commitments were actually made, but several countries (primarily Latin America) presented their needs and had made gap analyses. There were some discussions about on need for getting conservation priorities into PRSPs, and also on opportunities to raise the issues in up-coming international meetings (e.g. at the UN Summit in September 2005).
- d) *International Conference on “Structures of Vulnerability: Mobilisation and Resistance”, Stockholm, January 12-14, 2005.* Marie Byström participated in the conference and co-chaired one session.
- e) *Participation in the fourth Mainland Montane South East Asia (MMSEA 4) conference on “Sustainable use of natural resources and poverty dialogue”, 16-18 May, 2005.* Susanne von Walter and Maria Berlekom.
- f) *Poverty Conservation Learning Group (PCLG), Cambridge, UK, 11-13 December 2005.* Maria Berlekom participated in this workshop that was organised by IIED. The PCLG is a recent initiative funded by Ford Foundation that aim to bring together different view points and stakeholders (e.g conservation organisations, indigenous peoples, donors etc) to discuss, and – if possible – develop consensus on poverty and conservation issues. The workshop included fairly comprehensive presentations by a number of organisations and initiatives, as well as several discussion sessions to further identify and develop a possible agenda for the PCLG

3.3 Challenges ahead

- An important, and logical, challenge for SwedBio is to fully utilise the findings of MA, and the momentum created by the release of the MA-reports, and where possible try to influence international processes – as well as Swedish positions – to build on MA, and take on the challenges raised.
- It will also be very important not to get (or perceived to be) bogged down in CBD-processes and continue following other relevant processes as well, including follow-up of

MA. SwedBio should thereby also more clearly focus on sustainable management aspects⁸.

- As noted in earlier annual reports there is continuously a vast number of meetings taking place, and SwedBio will need to continue prioritising in which to participate, and make strategical decisions on what processes are the most crucial to make input if we really want to make differences.

4. Planning, reporting etc

4.1 Planning and reporting

The following plans and reports were produced (or completed) by SwedBio during 2005:

- Annual Reports (financial and narrative) for 2004
- Six-month (January-June 2005) financial report
- 9-month narrative report for January-October 2005.
- Reports from international travels
- Report on Lessons learned from the Collaborative Programme 2003-2005 (final draft)

Five Steering Group meetings were held and protocols are available.

4.2 Staff

The following staff worked at SwedBio during 2005:

Maria Berlekom, Programme Coordinator	100%
Marie Byström, Sr Programme Officer	50%
Sonja Jansson, Administration Officer	40%
Klara Jacobson, Assistant	50% 2005-01-01—07-31, 65 % from 2005-08-01
Pernilla Malmer, Sr Programme Officer	80% from 2005-02-12
Susanne von Walter, Sr Programme Officer	80% from 2005-04-04

4.3 Information and communication

The web page tool has been changed, and up-dated. The new logo has been incorporated into the layout of the web page, and the structure of the page has been rearranged to be more functional. The text to the folder presentation of SwedBio has been updated, and the new folder will be produced early 2006.

⁸ According to the external review of the Collaborative Programme this was not given enough attention by SwedBio, though it is one of three major entry-points for the Collaborative Programme and also constitutes the SwedBio objective.

Annex 4

Overview of support to processes at Sida

What	Requested by	Comment
Background paper on energy sector	EIA Help-desk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The commented document was intended as background paper for preparation of a revised Sida energy policy
Policy guidelines for Sida support to urban development	EIA Help-desk	
Tanzania: new Collaboration Strategy	EEU and Department for Natural Resources and the Environment (DNRE) (Environmental Policy Unit)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-going. EEU main contact. Extensive work in collaboration with EEU to develop fact sheet on poverty-environment linkages. Field trip made to Tanzania (March). Contacts and experiences from supported project on PRSPs-ecosystem services in Tanzania utilized. Participation in both larger general stakeholder meetings (for Swedish NGOs and researchers) at Sida. Topical discussion organised internally within Sida (EEU and SwedBio presenting our comments and recommendations)
The Swedish 3 rd national report to the CBD	Sida-DNRE (Environmental Policy Unit) & Swedish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SwedBio contributed with all text related to development cooperation in the Swedish national report Comments were also provided on the full draft (on request by SEPA).
The Swedish 1 st report on the Cartagena protocol	Sida-DNRE (Environmental Policy Unit) & SEPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SwedBio contributed with text related to capacity building. Main contacts were with SEPA.
Invitation area on biodiversity-livelihood research	Sida-SAREC, Sida-DNRE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background/information text revised Comments provided to Sida-SAREC on the proposals received under the invitation area Brief comments (scoring) on development relevance provided to Sida-DNRE on some additional proposals covering biodiversity-issues
Brief note on biodiversity-livelihood and relevance to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)-work	Sida-DNRE (Environment Policy Unit)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As background (in-put) to Sida-report on proposal for Swedish strategy regarding collaboration with FAO.
Brief note on strategic biodiversity-livelihood issues for considerations	Sida-DNRE (Environment Policy Unit)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As background (in-put) to proposal/study regarding a planned extra 1 billion to environment-related work within Swedish development cooperation
Proposed United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) project in southern Africa on biodiversity utilisation	Sida-DNRE (Environment Policy Unit)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments provided on two occasions. The project was also reviewed by the SwedBio project assessment group

Preparation of ADB-project on biological corridors in the Greater Mekong Sub-region	Sida-DNRE (Rural Development Unit)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-going. Swedish Environmental Secretariat for Asia (SENSA) (Bangkok) the main Sida-contact. Project is part of broader planned Sida-support to environmental integration at ADB • Comments have provided on several occasions. These have mainly focussed on the BCCI but have also included commenting on the linkages to the broader support to environmental integration at ADB. • Has included SwedBio participation in ADB-meeting in Bangkok. • Follow up and interviews with some of the intended stakeholders in Vietnam were undertaken during a field visit to Vietnam in May.
Support to World Bank education fund	EIA Help-desk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on Sida decision-memo, background for discussions in Sida's Project Assessment Committee
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Assistance Committee (OECD)/ DAC guidelines on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	EEU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commenting on several occasions and versions
Sida Draft position paper on PRS	EEU	
Guidelines for poverty-environment analysis at country level	EEU	
Guidelines for sharpening poverty focus in programme and projects	EIA help desk	
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) web-page on Multilateral Environment Agreements (MEA) coherence	Sida-DNRE (Environment Policy Unit) & Ministry of Sustainable Development and Environment	
Biodiversity report, Vietnam	Sida-DNRE (Environment Policy Unit) & Swedish Embassy, Vietnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report is part of a "Vietnam Environment Monitor (VEM)" series