

The role of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy

Analysis and recommendations

CEEWEB

2003

Table of contents

1. SUMMARY	3
2. INTRODUCTION, BRIEF HISTORY OF PEBLDS	4
3. OUTCOMES OF THE KYIV CONFERENCE	4
4. IMPLEMENTATION OF PEBLDS AND ITS KEY PROBLEMS IN THE CEE REGION	4
5. THE ROLE OF PEBLDS AND ITS RELATION TO OTHER NATURE CONSERVATION POLICIES AND INITIATIVES	7
5.1 Natura 2000	8
5.2 Convention on Biological Diversity	9
6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USING THE FULL POTENTIAL OF PEBLDS	10
6.1 Integration with other policies and initiatives	10
6.2 Increasing the visibility of PEBLDS	11
6.3 Improving the institutional structure and functioning of PEBLDS at international level	11
6.5 Enhancing effective stakeholder participation in policy making at different levels	11
6.6 Strengthening policy making toward the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of its components and the implementation of biodiversity commitments	12
6.7 Facilitating sectoral integration	13
6.8 Engaging the scientific community into reaching the goals and targets of the CBD and PEBLDS	14
6.9 Financing the implementation	15
6.10 Monitoring the implementation process	16

1. Summary

Contributing to the 'Environment for Europe process' CEEWEB has prepared a study for the 'Kyiv Conference' in which the degree of the implementation of the Pan European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy (PEBLDS) was analysed.

Our intention with this document is to give the opportunity of a better understanding of the functioning of PEBLDS in the CEE countries. Following our analysis we have come up with a wide range of recommendations. In order to use the full potential of PEBLDS, steps need to be taken in the following fields:

- Integration with other policies and initiatives
- Increasing the visibility of PEBLDS
- Improving the institutional structure and functioning of PEBLDS at international level
- Raising awareness and increasing the understanding on biodiversity issues of the public
- Enhancing effective stakeholder participation in policy making at different levels
- Strengthening policy making toward the conservation of biodiversity commitments
- Facilitating sectoral integration
- Engaging the scientific community into reaching the goals and targets of the CBD and PEBLDS
- Financing the implementation
- Monitoring the implementation process

The specific recommendations presented here aim to establish the necessary conditions for responsible decision-making that fully take account of the aims of conservation of biodiversity, sustainable use of natural resources and integrate environmental social and economic interests.

2. Introduction, brief history of PEBLDS

The emerging problems and trends that resulted in the loss of biodiversity lead to the development of numerous regional and international initiatives in the last decades in order to halt nature degradation. Among them was the Convention of Biological Diversity (1992), which provided a global framework and set the objectives of the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources. Although, through its identified principles and measures it provided a general basis for achieving the objectives, the Convention itself did not set out the strategic scheme for its implementation at regional, national and local levels. However, there have been several other initiatives enforced, that required specific legislative, administrative and policy measures as well as direct actions in the field.

The Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy – the European arm of the CBD – aimed to reinforce the implementation of existing measures and fill in the gaps by identifying additional actions that need to be taken over the next two decades under Pan-European coordination. It was initiated and endorsed within the ‘Environment for Europe’ process, at the Sofia Conference in 1995 on the initiative of the Council of Europe. In drafting the Strategy NGOs (ECNC, IUCN) took the leading role, and the UNEP and Council of Europe provide its Joint Secretariat. Since the first Action Plan for the period 1996-2000 was approved - though not fully implemented¹.

3. Outcomes of the Kyiv Conference

As PEBLDS sets the biodiversity agenda within the Environment for Europe process, it forms a valuable and indispensable part of Pan-European policy making. As the most significant nature conservation outcome of the 5th Ministerial Conference, the Ministers adopted the Kyiv Resolution on Biodiversity. It sets nine objectives with deadlines for the next five years in the field of biodiversity conservation, while at the same time through its adoption it justifies the existence of PEBLDS.

The Resolution acknowledges that for enforcing the implementation and for successful monitoring of the tasks, these deadlines are especially important. Moreover it enhances the sectoral integration in agriculture and forestry, which serves as one of the main goals of the PEBLDS Rolling Work Program.

4. Implementation of PEBLDS and its key problems in the CEE region

The report² that CEEWEB prepared for the Kyiv Conference showed the role of PEBLDS in implementing the Action Plan 1996-2000 was very weak at national levels. The relevant conventions on which PEBLDS builds upon were implemented to some extent, but their connection to PEBLDS was hardly ever

¹ Further consultations resulted in adopting a Rolling Work Programme instead of the former structure of five-year action plans in 2001.

² Implementation of PEBLDS in Central and East European countries, based on the assessments from Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia

visible, and it seems that PEBLDS did not fulfil its role as providing a coherent framework for those efforts and initiating new activities to support them. There are several reasons why the objective of PEBLDS and other nature conservation initiatives (on which PEBLDS builds) can not be implemented:

There are some general barriers for Multilateral Environmental Agreements:

- There is not any **global, overarching binding approach to sustainable development**, which would reconcile environmental, economic and social interests, albeit it has fundamental implications for the effectiveness and enforcement of international environmental policies, including biodiversity policies
- Although the international commitments PEBLDS builds upon are usually legally binding, the EU requirements are the only ones, which entails “serious” consequences in case of **infringement** (even in this situation these Directives are among the least implemented ones in the Member States) thus there are no legal consequences when neglecting PEBLDS
- There is **no effective harmonisation** among the processes related to MEAs although it should be acknowledged that some progress has been made already (Memoranda of Cooperation and Joint Work Plans between the different conventions)
- **Lack of visibility** (no publicity is attained, the results achieved under the implementation are not associated with the specific MEAs but rather with the funding institutions, and with other strategies, action plans, etc.)
- **General ignorance and lack of stakeholder involvement** in the preparation and follow-up of COP meetings (CBD) at regional and national, subnational levels (no consultations, regional preparations to develop common standpoints with the effective involvement of stakeholders and the required publicity, no feed-back and reporting back to the stakeholders), accompanied by the general lack of interest from the side of stakeholders concerning the policy making

Specific barriers for PEBLDS at international level:

- Its **role is not clearly understood** and defined
- **No stable, predictable financial resources** for the implementation (as opposite to the GEF or other grant funds connected to specific conventions), the voluntary contributions from the governments, UNEP, the Council of Europe and NGOs Core Funding are insufficient and can only cover some small-scale, selected activities

Impediments for PEBLDS at national level:

- **Ignorance, lack of visibility of and knowledge on PEBLDS** at the national and subnational levels. Despite its aim to provide a strategic framework, in a few CEE countries there is not even a reference or hardly any to PEBLDS in the official comprehensive nature conservation documents, plans and strategies
- There is a **big gap between the international initiatives and national activities**; the international outcomes (decisions, guidelines, recommendations, etc.) are not well-known and not utilised by the different sectors of the governments: there is rather a top-down approach from the international fora, without reaching the national and subnational policy, legislative and administrative levels effectively

- Generally, the Conventions and their responsible focal points within the respective Ministries of Environments **do not have a high profile** (not well known, not involved in the strategic planning appropriately), let alone in other sectors
- The officials responsible **for the different conventions are not informed** about the Strategy and do not cooperate with each other sufficiently
- The strategic **decision-makers ignore** (or not informed about) PEBLDS even in the environmental sector, let alone in other ones, thus the integration of biological and landscape considerations into sectors is not further supported by it
- Despite PEBLDS' integrative aim to provide a horizontal framework in nature conservation activities, it is rather **regarded as an additional initiative** at the same level as the other conventions and other commitments (or due to its neglect rather a subordinated one)
- According to the general assumption the Strategy will be **implemented through the different conventions without coordination**, thus no additional attention is required (an exemption is the establishment of the PEEN³, which is regarded differently and some efforts are made)
- Other obligations and processes **overshadow** it in CEE countries, e.g.: the transposition of and compliance with the nature conservation Directives of the EU by the accession
- Other **stakeholders** (NGOs, farmers, business, etc.) **are not involved** in the decision-making and implementation

- **Lack of human and institutional capacity** for implementation (deriving from the ignorance and the lack of financial capacity)
 - Although it should provide an integrating framework for nature conservation efforts there is **not any human and institutional capacity at the level of strategic planning** for the Strategy (in some countries there is not even one personnel who specifically deals with PEBLDS within the Ministry of Environment), the capacity is only enough to take part in the international decision-making, or to deal with some specific issues, first of all with PEEN
 - The officials dealing with PEBLDS are **not supported by sufficient administrative and professional capacity** (general problem regarding the Convention focal points)

- **Lack of financial capacity** for implementation
 - In general there is **no earmarked resources for implementation** at the national level specifically under PEBLDS, with the exception of establishing PEEN in some cases

- **Institutional structure**
 - The **sectoral approach** is also reflected in the institutional structure (sectoral ministries), which greatly hinders sectoral integration
 - In this environmentally pervert structure the **environmental goals are greatly subdued** oppositely to the idea of sustainable development

³ Pan European Ecological Network

- **Lack of appropriate monitoring and reporting of the implementation**, which leads to ignorance and does not strengthen the national compliance
 - Monitoring is generally **not proper at national level** and does not involve the civic community
 - **Reporting** on national results is **not obligatory neither at national nor at Pan-European level** from the national governments

The current **Rolling Work Programme does not show enough national activities** so far, more practical activities would be outmost necessary with the proper utilisation of the outcomes of international activities. Although the Rolling WP addresses more of the above-mentioned problems, it is strongly doubtful that the objectives will be effectively implemented under the current circumstances due to exactly those reasons. In addition there are several impediments that the Rolling Work Programme does not aim to tackle, and will further prevent the effective implementation.

5. The role of PEBLDS and its relation to other nature conservation policies and initiatives

PEBLDS should, as defined in its first goal, “fulfil its role as a facilitator for European biodiversity issues, in close cooperation with other strategic frameworks, in particular the European Commission biodiversity strategy, as well as facilitating CBD implementation in the Pan-European region”.

Within in this capacity it would be outmost useful if PEBLDS would:

- enhance transparency among the numerous international initiatives, conferences, cooperation, agreements, commitments, research, etc. (currently it is not possible to oversee all the parallel processes that affect biodiversity, environment, or sustainable development in the region)
- avoid duplications of efforts (several recommendations, guidelines, agreements, initiatives use the limited financial and human capacity, just they are not made good use of in most cases, what is more there are numerous obligations that are not fulfilled, while at the same time much efforts are put into agreeing on additional ones)
- increase effectiveness (with joining efforts more tangible results could be achieved)
- avoid losing capacity, results, efforts (not only the first step should be made e.g. in developing guidelines, recommendations but the required following ones as well: spreading and explaining them, facilitating the compliance, provide the feed-back into the policy making process, etc. otherwise the first steps prove to be ineffective if not even futile)
- provide a forum for the Parties, NGOs and other stakeholders (although there are several COP meetings for the different MEAs, there is not any that would provide regular meetings at the Pan-European level in a coherent biodiversity framework, moreover it can provide opportunities for more effective NGO involvement as well)
- raise the profile of the different initiatives and set a balance among them at the same time (which one by one do not cover the whole region e.g. Natura 2000 or which are not effective or functional (e.g.

the Emerald Network) or do not provide the necessary framework for nature conservation (e.g. sectoral integration)), so that they do not overshadow each other and their additional values are not wasted (e.g. the additional value of PEEN in comparison to Natura 2000)

In addition it should be able to serve as a `strategy`:

- to set the targets
- to point out tools how to reach the targets
- to define the steps on the way to reach the targets
- to define all the relevant stakeholders and their tasks
- to find the means how to engage all the relevant actors so that they perform their tasks

In other words it should find the way how to put the ideas and goals into practical responses at international but also at national level.

Now we are facing the problem, that as the practical implementation is voluntary, there is only very low national activity within this framework due to the low awareness and several other (economic, capacity, knowledge) constrains.

5.1 Natura 2000

EU issues generally enjoy great attention in the politics and policy making in the accession countries. That is why the establishment of Natura 2000 is also among the nature conservation priorities and more capacity is ensured for them than to other international initiatives. Moreover, as the establishment and maintenance of Natura 2000 is required by an EU Directive the lack of compliance can also involve an infringement procedure as well as with greater political pressure and public attention. These are the main factors that make Natura 2000 more functional than the similar Pan-European initiatives, namely the Emerald Network and PEEN. Through the provided (although relatively greater, but still seriously insufficient) capacity, the bigger political will and public attention can provide impetus and contribution to other initiatives as well. Although this contribution should be made good use of, the additive value of PEEN should not be neglected: namely that it requires a functional Pan-European ecological network, with core areas, biological corridors and buffer zones. Natura 2000 (and Emerald Network, of which sites are those of Natura 2000 in EU Member States) will not fulfil this role as although there are more references for establishing an ecological network in the Habitats Directive, the criteria and the national designation procedures do not take them into account. For this reason rather the Natura 2000 network should be best utilised in order to achieve the establishment of PEEN than letting to overshadow PEEN by Natura 2000 in Member States (or the Emerald Network). Naturally in other parts of the region this conflict of political/nature conservation interests does not prevail and they are the only and extremely valuable initiatives to reach that goal.

Consequently Natura 2000 can provide a significant input into the PEBLDS especially as a representative of the European Commission became member of the Bureau. The establishment and maintenance of Natura 2000 can provide opportunities for facilitating activities in order to reach other goals of PEBLDS as

well. These opportunities are based upon the relatively active communication between Member State governments and the European Commission DG Environment, and the EU policies and legislation (EU Biodiversity Strategy, Birds, Habitats, Environmental Assessment Directives) that set similar goals and tasks as the Rolling Work Program of PEBLDS. Among them is the integration of biological concerns into sectors (appearing as a recommendation in the Habitats Directive and supported by the tool of strategic environmental assessment required for plans and programmes by the Environmental Assessment Directive). These efforts could be more closely associated with PEBLDS and broadened to other areas as well, utilising the results connected to PEBLDS (guidelines, negotiations, etc.). In order to achieve this the DG Environment could incorporate the goals and objectives of PEBLDS into its communication and recommendations, and make the outcomes connected to PEBLDS and the Environment for Europe process more visible and available. In addition the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans could be strengthened with the support of the EC, with direct relevance of the establishment and maintenance of Natura 2000 at national level. Namely it is evident that Natura 2000 would be also greatly supported if regarded in a strategic framework not as an isolated requirement arriving from the EU. These synergies are especially enabled by the current membership of the EC in the PEBLDS Bureau.

5.2 Convention on Biological Diversity

Already at the development of PEBLDS it aimed to be the regional response to CBD to serve as a strategy to implement the Convention. For further enhancing the cooperation between PEBLDS and the CBD Memorandum of Cooperation was signed by the Joint Secretariat of PEBLDS and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity at the Conference Biodiversity in Europe in Riga, 2000. The second Conference 'Biodiversity in Europe' in Budapest 2002 served not only as a PEBLDS Council Meeting but also as the regional preparatory meeting for CBD COP-6, which was a clear connection point between the two processes and the Pan-European and global activities.

Since then the link between the policies became even more direct with the adoption of the Strategic Plan for CBD for 2002-2010 and the harmonisation of the Work Programme of PEBLDS. Now this latter is an exact Pan-European counterpart of the Strategic Plan in its goals and objectives with the difference that PEBLDS does not deal with the issue of biosafety but on the other hand emphasises landscape considerations to be integrated into the sectors. With furthering biological diversity concerns to landscape concerns as well, the Strategy itself makes a step towards the holistic approach to nature conservation with considering human and natural factors together and thus the numerous relations between the three pillars of sustainable development, too. It must be pointed out however that this goal is not effectively represented in the Rolling Work Programme.

PEBLDS should essentially serve as the regional forum for the preparation, implementation and follow-up of the CBD, its COPs and their resolutions, with also advocating landscape concerns besides biological ones. It should enable

effective stakeholder participation and provide a consulted input into the regional CBD process and contribute to its successful implementation.

6. Recommendations for using the full potential of PEBLDS

While acknowledging that the defined goals and objectives of the current Rolling Work Programme of PEBLDS are correct and proper, pointing out that PEBLDS has resulted in various results that could support policy making on different levels and stressing on one hand that it can provide an utmost necessary and helpful link to other processes that aim or are able to contribute to the conservation of biodiversity, the sustainable use of its components, as well as on the other hand that Western Europe can and must play a leading role in this process and encourage the rest of the UN/ECE region and the world, the following recommendations are made.

What could be expected from PEBLDS?

- To start a debate at the horizontal policy making level and not only in the environmental sector
- To raise understanding and awareness on biodiversity issues and their link to the broader environment, other sectors, i.e. put the problems in a sustainability context
- To gain political will and support at all levels and all sectors
- To contribute to sectoral integration
- To initiate structural changes in the institutional system and the whole society and economy that are indispensable for conserving biodiversity
- To build linkages with other economic and social processes, e.g. WTO, OECD
- To increase scientific capacity and knowledge for biodiversity and the related environmental, sustainability issues

6.1 Integration with other policies and initiatives

- Acquire an observer status in international institutions, negotiations, processes (e.g. WTO negotiations, OECD (basis provided for instance by its Environment Strategy for the first decade of 21st century), Food and Agriculture Organization on the issue of agro-biodiversity, International Environmental Governance Initiative by the UN, Environmental Programme for Europe (EPE, UN/ECE), 6th EU Environmental Action Programme, European Eco-Efficiency Initiative, etc.)
- Cooperation with the European Commission to promote the goals and objectives of PEBLDS through using the opportunities lying in Natura 2000, the EU legislation and communication between the EU DG Environment and Member States
 - Formulating recommendations and requirements towards MSs to incorporate the tasks connected to the establishment and maintenance of Natura 2000 sites into their NBSAPs and thus strengthen them
 - Formulating recommendations, guidelines and requirements towards sectoral integration, which is connected not only to

PEBLDS, but to the EU Biodiversity Strategy and 6th EU Environmental Action Programme as well

- Providing forum for regional preparation, implementation and follow-up for CBD and its COP meetings
 - regional preparatory meetings in the Western European, in the Central and Eastern European as well as in the East European, Central Asian and Caucasian regions that could develop common standpoints for the COPs
- Strengthening the integration of landscape concerns in the CBD policy making process, thus making a further step towards sectoral integration

6.2 Increasing the visibility of PEBLDS

- Appearance in other international processes (economic, social organisation, institutions, negotiations) with clear messages
- Utilising the communication and clearing-house mechanisms of the EU DG Environment, the CBD and other MEAs
- Results and projects should be more frequently and clearly associated with PEBLDS at international, regional, national and subnational levels
- Better communication of the Secretariat towards the public and decision-makers, reporting on activities, results, agendas, outcomes of Bureau and Council meetings, etc. on the Strategy Guide but also in other newsletters, magazines, etc.
- Awareness raising activities under the auspices of PEBLDS
- Establishing national NGO information points for PEBLDS

6.3 Improving the institutional structure and functioning of PEBLDS at international level

- Establishing a Task Force on sectoral integration, structural changes, financial and fiscal reform and other topics that are not dealt with and examined yet sufficiently in the biodiversity context and would contribute to reach the goals of PEBLDS
- More open Joint Secretariat towards the different levels and the public

6.4 Raising awareness and increasing the understanding on biodiversity issues of the public

- Campaigns, publications, training materials could be produced that target the general public
 - Information dissemination on the causes of biodiversity loss, and the natural resources, goods and services that nature provides
- Awareness raising through participation in other processes, where biodiversity issues have been marginalised so far (economic, trade negotiations, etc.)
- Awareness raising through making PEBLDS more visible to all sectors and all levels

6.5 Enhancing effective stakeholder participation in policy making at different levels

- Making open the PEBLDS Bureau and Council meetings for NGOs as observers without limitations

- Information, reporting, possibilities for commenting documents and providing feed-back on the comments should be ensured for effective public participation
 - Government representatives for PEBLDS should publish brief reports on the ongoing international activities and the meetings pointing out their relevance for the country concerned, as well as on the national activities and monitoring
 - Secretariat should make available documents and provide opportunities for consultations, commenting
- Preparatory and follow-up meetings for PEBLDS Council meetings and CBD COPs in the framework of PEBLDS with the wide participation of stakeholders
 - Preparatory meetings would serve the aim to consult on the agenda, priorities, common standpoints with stakeholders
 - Follow-up meetings would deal with the outcomes of the meetings pointing out the tasks of different stakeholders, agreeing on cooperation, work plan, etc.
- Establishing Joint National Committees (if do not exist yet) for CBD and PEBLDS to enhance the policy making, the implementation and monitoring of the meetings and implementation of PEBLDS and CBD
- Establishing national NGO information points for PEBLDS to enhance information exchange between the governmental and non-governmental sectors and between the international and national levels

6.6 Strengthening policy making toward the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of its components and the implementation of biodiversity commitments

- Integrating biodiversity and landscape concerns into other international, regional (environmental, economic, social) processes
- Establishing a PEBLDS Task Force to deal with the issues of sectoral integration, and the related necessary structural changes, financial incentives, etc.
- Establishing active Joint National Committees for CBD and PEBLDS to enhance policy making, the preparation and follow-up of the meetings and the implementation and monitoring of PEBLDS and CBD at national level
- Preparatory and follow-up meetings for PEBLDS Council meetings and CBD COPs in the framework of PEBLDS with stakeholder participation at regional level
 - Common standpoints developed at the preparatory meetings would enhance regional engagement and would give impetus to the Pan-European and global processes
 - Follow-up meetings would enhance the implementation through identifying the stakeholders responsible for the different tasks, agreeing on cooperation, undertaking voluntary commitments, etc.
- Facilitating good environmental governance at national and subnational levels
 - Developing good environmental governance guidelines
 - Agreeing on a resolution (protocol) to require training and exams on good environmental governance from civil servants

- Providing best practices of good environmental governance and sectoral integration
- Establishing national NGO information points for PEBLDS
 - Offering tailored information for governmental officials at the right point in decision making and intersectoral and public consultations
 - Providing information on PEBLDS and related MEAs and processes to the public and interested NGOs
 - Setting up a database (library and virtual library) on the relevant documents within the ‘Environment for Europe’ process and connected to the PEBLDS and CBD (with extending it to other relevant MEAs later as well)
 - Convention texts, guidelines, decisions, resolutions, background information, meeting agendas and reports, assessments, good practices, data on projects carried out with the support of the Biodiversity Service, etc.
 - Setting up website, providing information on telephone, if needed helping to find Hungarian materials or translating the English versions
 - Organising seminars, presentations, trainings, field symposia at national and subnational levels on own or NGO initiative and on request from the government; similar activities: field symposia, presentations can be connected to the PEBLDS Council and Bureau meetings at international level, if the meeting is held in the respective country
 - Participating in the monitoring of implementation through collecting and disseminating information
 - Raising awareness and increase visibility of PEBLDS through its communication
- Strengthening the Biodiversity Service provided by UNEP, ECNC, IUCN and REC
- Providing relevant information (guidelines and other documents developed within the Environment for Europe process or connected to the CBD and other MEAs) to the governments for reaching the targets set in the Kyiv Resolution on Biodiversity

6.7 Facilitating sectoral integration

- In addition to enhancing cooperation with the agricultural and forestry sector, biodiversity and landscape concerns should be also incorporated into tourism, transport, green-field investments, invasive alien species, climate change as well
 - Discussions should be initiated with these areas in the governmental , but also in the NGO and private sector both at national and Pan-European level, if appropriate
 - Joint meetings, conferences of ministers, joint strategies, etc.
- Integrating provisions for the implementation of PEBLDS into the main planning documents (National Development Plans and the related Operational Programmes, Programme Complements, spatial development plans with regards to the ecological network for instance, etc.)
- Preparing sectoral environmental plans at national level

- The sectors identify the problems deriving from their sectoral activities and point out the causes and alternatives to prevent them. However as this sectoral approach would still easily result in end-of-pipe solutions instead of prevention, the identified problems and causes would be analysed in cooperation with other sectors, with the Ministry of Environment and the Sustainable Development Committee (if exists) taking the lead. Placing the problems in a system and pointing out the root causes and structural problems that lead to the environmental load and biodiversity loss, an action plan with clear responsibilities of the different sectors and actors in order to tackle root causes and halt biodiversity loss should be drawn up at national level in a truly intersectoral cooperation..
- Earmarking a certain percent of the sectoral budget for awareness raising related to the environmental aspects of the sectoral activities (e.g. energy preservation campaign, promoting public transport, etc.), and/or scientific research to prevent the problems and to search for alternatives with full realisation of the principles of precaution and prevention. These activities should help the implementation of the sectoral environmental action plan.
- Identifying concrete actors and addressing them directly at national level
 - Starting debate/ consultations (seminars, workshops, conferences) with other sectors on the basis of the objectives of PEBLDS within a set framework on a regular basis
 - Involving them at the appropriate level (decision making, political, administrative) with the appropriate means (consultation or information dissemination, awareness arising, etc.)
- Involving stakeholders and other sectors into the preparation for CBD COPs and PEBLDS Council (and Bureau) meetings as well as in the follow-up meetings (workshops) at national level
 - Informing and involving the sectors could enhance their commitments for the national implementation
 - Disseminating the relevant information and raising awareness could help greening the sectoral policies
- Promoting the Sustainability Assessment, and Strategic Environmental Assessment as tools for sectoral integration in national and Pan-European decision-making and awareness raising, environmental education
- Exploring and preserving traditional knowledge and lifestyles that derive from a more sustainable way of living (e.g. farming methods that are environmentally adequate (suitable for the local environmental conditions, use the local resources and not only use, but also preserve natural resources) and enhance the integration of economic interests and social and environmental concerns

6.8 Engaging the scientific community into reaching the goals and targets of the CBD and PEBLDS

- Closer cooperation between the NGO-GO sector and the research institutions-higher education
 - The NGO-GO sector should find out and express their needs for scientific research (e.g. topics for research, MSc and PhD theses)
 - Finding means for delivering the scientific results in a processed way to the relevant officials, NGOs

- Involving scientists into producing background materials and making decisions, when appropriate, while securing the necessary financial means for that

6.9 Financing the implementation

- Providing international funding in the form of a Trust Fund, into which the contributions come from the national governments in the form of:
 - Smaller sum depending on the country's economic situation (e.g. United Nations scales of assessment)
 - An additional sum depending on their efforts in reaching the objectives of PEBLDS on national level. These efforts could be realising stakeholder participation in the related processes, disseminating and following the produced guidelines, spreading good environmental governance principles, facilitating sectoral cooperation, taking part in pilot projects, etc. It would mean that those countries that show their real commitment and make great proven efforts for implementation would be obliged to pay less, opposite to those ones, that neglect the whole process when it comes to national implementation. The emphasis would be on activities that rather require higher awareness and commitment than financial resources for implementation, and do not depend much on the level of present official environmental protection and nature conservation, or state of the environment. This system could be gradually introduced in its scope and the participation, i.e. the 'eligible' activities would be first the ones easier for implementation (e.g. stakeholder participation provided in the preparation for CBD COPs and PEBLDS Council meetings, delivering the information, results, guidelines to the relevant departments, responsible officials in other sectors) and the countries can participate in the system voluntarily. Naturally in this latter case only those countries could receive grants / co-financing for their related nature conservation activities that participate in this financing system.
 - National and regional activities would be eligible for funding from the Trust Fund in the form of grants or co-financing
- Providing international funding from voluntary contributions for national, regional activities under specific cross-compliance conditions
 - The conditions of cross-compliance would be determined on the basis of the specific needs and conditions of the country receiving the funding
- Providing national funding (in the framework of the already existing national environmental fund or similar resources) specifically for the implementation of PEBLDS, only those projects and programs would be eligible that contribute to reaching the objectives of the PEBLDS
- The European Biodiversity Resourcing Initiative should serve as a useful tool for supporting projects with clear nature conservation aims and outputs, however clear guidelines are needed in order not to shift the problems or to create additional ones. For this it is required that any kind of solution for any environmental problem should be adequate for the local environmental conditions, and not shift problems geographically or

between the different environmental elements (water, soil, air, biomass, etc.).

- Every type of funding should be clearly connected to the implementation of PEBLDS
- Finally it could be analysed how much money could be saved with the prevention of problems and the adoption of the precautionary principle for the central governmental budget, which finally could appear as a sort of ‘hidden income’ for the environmental sector

6.10 Monitoring the implementation process

- Indicators should be developed to monitor:
 - the efforts (commitment) of the Parties and stakeholders, i.e. on the sectoral cooperation, decision-making mechanisms, capacity development, etc.
 - the results (adoption and implementation of NBSAPs, appearance of the biodiversity concerns in other sectoral policy making, improvement of the state of nature, and the direct results of the specific activities)
- If possible the indicators should be able to distinguish the impact of PEBLDS from other initiatives
- All stakeholders that are involved in the process should be involved in the monitoring as well
 - The results of monitoring should be widely disseminated
 - It should provide a feed back into the process

The above mentioned recommendations do not target the improvement of the state of nature but rather developing a policy-making process and changing the institutional structure on the longer term that are suitable for realising the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of its components. In this approach the process itself is of core importance while keeping in mind the ultimate goals.

The recommendations could be first “tested” in pilot projects on national or regional level, with close follow up on the experiences by the whole process and the Pan-European region.

It must be also pointed out that none of the above-mentioned initiatives or changes can bring the sufficient improvement in policy making, financing or implementation alone, and must on the longer term contribute to fundamental changes in the present institutional, economic, and fiscal structure, as well as in the general attitude that ultimately threatens the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use. Thus the problems should be regarded and tackled in a holistic approach in an integrated way, always taking into account the local environmental conditions, the carrying capacity and striving for diversity in natural and just as much in economic systems as well.