

Synergy of CBD and CCD

**An inventory and analysis of opportunities for collaboration
between the two Rio conventions in West-Africa**

Marie-José van Gelder
Wouter T. de Groot

CML report 158
Programme Environment and Development



Synergy of CBD and CCD

SYNERGY OF CBD AND CCD

An inventory and analysis of opportunities for collaboration

between the two Rio conventions in West-Africa

AN INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE TWO RIO CONVENTIONS IN WEST-AFRICA

For the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment

Mario-Joel van Gelder
Wouter T. de Groot

Centre of Environmental Science
Leiden University
P.O. Box 9518
3600 RA Leiden
The Netherlands

CML report 15R - Programmatic Environmental and Development

SYNERGY OF CBD AND CCD

AN INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS OF OPPORTUNITIES
FOR COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE TWO RIO CONVENTIONS
IN WEST AFRICA

Preface

Synergy of CBD and CCD

An inventory and analysis of opportunities for collaboration between the two Rio conventions in West-Africa

For the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment

Marie-José van Gelder
Wouter T. de Groot

Centre of Environmental Science
Leiden University
P.O. Box 9518
2300 RA Leiden
The Netherlands

CML report 158 - Programme Environment and Development

Copies can be ordered as follows:

- by telephone: (+31) 71 527 7485
- by writing to: CML Library, P.O. Box 9518, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands
- by fax: (+31) 71 527 74 96
- by e-mail: eroos@cml.leidenuniv.nl

Please mention report number, and name and address to whom the report is to be sent.

ISBN: 90-5191-137-8

Printed by Universitair Grafisch Bedrijf, Leiden

© Centre of Environmental Science (CML), Leiden, 2001

Preface Contents

The fifth Conference of Parties to the Biodiversity Convention (COP5-CBD, Nairobi, May 2000) adopted a work programme on drylands, stressing the need for swift implementation in close collaboration with the work programmes and actors under the Convention to Combat Desertification and Drought (CCD). The government of the Netherlands has responded to the challenge brought forward by the Conferences of Parties of both CBD and CCD to strengthen collaboration of these two global conventions. The Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment has commissioned the Centre of Environmental Science of Leiden University (CML) to carry out a study to identify main synergies between these particular conventions. Constraints and pitfalls in this collaboration were to be part of the study as well. The present report is the result of the study.

As a special focus for this study, five countries were selected in the West- and Central African region. This region, located in the arid to dry sub-humid climate zones, is particularly vulnerable and sensitive to desertification. Among the selection criteria were the already existing relationships of the Dutch government with the country, the activity of the NGO world, the country's representation of international organisations concerned with environment and development, and the knowledge of the country already present at the CML. On the basis of these criteria, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Mali and Senegal were chosen. These countries were drawn into the study through an analysis of their individual country reports (National Action Programmes and National Reports).

The study is based on literature review, interviews with some experts on each of the conventions, participation in the CCD/CBD Liaison Group (see section 2.3) and a survey of public information on the World-wide Web.

The outcome of this report is a number of recommendations that may be used as input of a workshop on synergistic implementation of CBD and CCD in these five countries.

Farmers and village in the centre of all action.

The fifth Conference of Parties to the Biodiversity Convention (COP5-CBD, Nairobi, May 2000) adopted a work programme on drylands, stressing the need for implementation in close collaboration with the work programme and actors under the Convention in Combat Desertification and Drought (CCD). The government of the Netherlands has responded to this challenge through the Conference of Parties of both CBD and CCD to strengthen collaboration of these two global conventions. The Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment has commissioned the Centre of Environmental Science of Leiden University (CML) to carry out a study to identify main synergies between these particular conventions. Constraints and pitfalls in this collaboration were to be part of the study as well. The present report is the result of the study.

As a special focus for this study, five countries were selected in the West- and Central African region. This region, located in the arid to dry sub-humid climatic zone, is particularly vulnerable and sensitive to desertification. Among the selection criteria were the already existing relationships of the Dutch government with the country, the activity of the NGO sector, the country's reputation of international organisations concerned with environment and development, and the knowledge of the country already present at the CML. On the basis of these criteria, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Mali and Senegal were chosen. These countries were drawn into the study through an analysis of their individual country reports (National Action Programmes and National Reports).

The study is based on literature review, interviews with some experts on each of the conventions, participation in the CCD/CBD Liaison Group (see section 2.3) and a survey of public information on the World-wide Web.

The outcome of this report is a number of recommendations that may be used as input for a workshop on synergistic implementation of CBD and CCD in these five countries.

Table of Contents

4.8 The CCD NAP of Benin	21
Executive Summary	1
List of abbreviations	3
Introduction	5
4.11 Conclusions for CCD/CBD synergy	23
PART I: INVENTORY	
5 Field-level projects: the GEP experience	27
1 History of the collaboration between CBD and CCD	7
PART II: ANALYSIS OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR CCD/CBD COLLABORATION	
2 Initiatives by CBD and CCD	9
2.1 Memorandum of Understanding and the need for synergy	9
2.2 The Joint Programme of Work	10
2.3 The Liaison Group	11
7.1 Shared land: the multi-functional natural vegetation	31
3 Proposals from other institutions and fora	13
3.1 UNEP and UNDP on synergy	13
3.2 Identifying and analysing synergy in workshops and meetings	14
3.3 NGO initiatives	14
3.4 Conclusion	15
8.1 Institutional elements at the international and national levels	39
4 National level: West and Central African NAPs and NRs	17
4.1 The CBD NR of Senegal	17
4.2 The CCD NAP of Senegal: Consensus building for soils and natural vegetation	18
4.3 The CBD NR of Mali	19
4.4 The CCD NAP of Mali:	
PART III: Decentralised co-ordination for the management of the natural vegetation	19
4.5 The CBD NR of Burkina Faso	20
4.6 The CCD NAP of Burkina Faso: Farmer and village in the centre of all action	20

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary
3	List of abbreviations
5	Introduction
PART I: INVENTORY	
7	1. History of the collaboration between CBD and CCD
9	2. Initiatives for CBD and CCD
9	2.1. Mechanism of Understanding and the need for synergy
10	2.2. The Joint Programme of Work
11	2.3. The Liaison Group
13	3. Progress from other institutions and fora
13	3.1. UNRP and UNDP on synergy
14	3.2. Identifying and analysing synergy in workshops and meetings
14	3.3. NGO initiatives
15	3.4. Conclusion
17	4. National level: West and Central African NAs and NRS
17	4.1. The CBD NR of Senegal
18	4.2. The CCD NAP of Senegal
18	4.3. Consensus building for soils and natural vegetation
19	4.3. The CBD NR of Mali
19	4.4. The CCD NAP of Mali
19	4.5. Decentralised co-ordination for the management of the natural vegetation
20	4.5. The CBD NR of Burkina Faso
20	4.6. The CCD NAP of Burkina Faso
20	Farmer and village in the centre of all action

4.7	The CBD NR of Benin	21
4.8	The CCD NAP of Benin:	
	Still in the process towards local empowerment	22
4.9	The CBD NR of Cameroon	22
4.10	The CCD NR (NAP chapter) of Cameroon	
4.11	Conclusions for CCD/CBD synergy	23
	Various workshops and meetings on synergy between MEAs	59
5	Field-level projects: the GEF experience	27
	Annex 3:	
PART II: ANALYSIS OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR CCD/CBD COLLABORATION		
	Dry and Sub-humid Lands (Annex I of Decision V/23)	63
6	Terminology for the review	29
	Annex 4:	
7	Review of the substantive aspects of CBD/CCD synergy	31
7.1	Shared land: the multi-functional natural vegetation	31
7.2	Conceptual issues: reconciliation at the local level	34
7.3	Shared approach: Co-management	37
7.4	Linkages to other Conventions	38
8	Review of the institutional aspects of CBD/CCD synergy	39
8.1	Institutional elements at the international and national levels	39
8.2	The report burden	40
8.3	Constraints for institutional collaboration	41
8.4	A GEF window for land degradation	42
9	Overall conclusion	43
PART III: WORKSHOP RECOMMENDATIONS		
10	Workshop recommendations	45

47	The CBD NR of Basin
48	The CCD NAB of Basin
52	Still in the process towards local empowerment
52	The CBD NR of Cameroon
510	The CCD NR (NAB chapter) of Cameroon
53	Conclusions for CCD/CD energy
57	Field-level projects: the GEF experience

PART III: ANALYSIS OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR CCD/CBD COLLABORATION

59	Terminology for the review
31	Review of the substantive aspects of CBD/CCD energy
31	7.1 Shared land: the multi-functional natural vegetation
34	7.2 Conceptual issues: recognition at the local level
37	7.3 Shared approach: Co-management
38	7.4 Linkages to other Conventions
39	Review of the institutional aspects of CBD/CCD energy
39	8.1 Institutional elements at the international and national levels
40	8.2 The report format
41	8.3 Constraints for institutional collaboration
42	8.4 A GEF window for land degradation
43	Overall conclusion

PART III: WORKSHOP RECOMMENDATIONS

45	Workshop recommendations
----	--------------------------

References 49

Annex 1:
CBD and CCD 55

Annex 2:
Various workshops and meetings on synergy between MEAs 59

Annex 3:
Key elements for CCD/CBD synergy of the CBD Programme on
Dry and Sub-humid Lands (Annex I of Decision V/23) 63

Annex 4:
Summary of the NAPs of Benin, Burkina Faso and Mali 65

40	References
45	Annex 1: [illegible]
55	CBD and CDD
60	Annex 2: [illegible]
70	Various workshops and meetings on synergy between MEAs
75	Annex 3: [illegible]
80	Key elements for CO/CBD synergy of the CBD Programme on
85	Dry and Sub-humid Lands (Annex 1 of Decision VII)
90	Annex 4: [illegible]
95	Summary of the NAPA of Benin, Burkina Faso and Mali

Executive Summary

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) are two major frameworks of global commitments and action. This report focuses on the opportunities and constraints for improved collaboration ('synergy') of the two conventions, especially for the design of concrete joint actions in five West- and Central African countries (Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Mali and Senegal).

Synthetic conclusions are drawn both on the substantive ('real world') and institutional level.

The substantive conclusions are that:

- Joint actions could focus on the areas of multi-functional natural vegetation between the arable fields on the one hand, and the protected areas and buffer zones on the other.
- Joint actions should have a clear focus on co-management of these lands by local people and the government agencies representing the supra-local interests connected to these lands. In this process, land tenure issues should be clearly settled. Our recommendation is that ownership should be defined locally, but restricted by government-controlled regulations, set in the co-management negotiations, that protect the supra-local interests.
- Justified differences between the diversity focus of CBD and the international community, and the land focus of CCD and the national governments, will always remain. Due to the local trust and political support of the land-based paradigm, linkage projects that have land degradation as a starting point, linking this with biodiversity issues and visions, are probably the most effective for both CBD and CCD objectives.

These general conclusions do not exclude that other foci for synergy projects, focusing for instance on agro-biodiversity or wetlands, may be locally optimal.

At the institutional level, the conclusions are that:

- Joint databases and joint reporting frameworks could increase co-ordination and reduce the reporting burden of the CBD and CCD National Focal Points.

- The opening of a GEF window on land degradation would enhance motivation and balance in synergy projects.

The present inventory, analysis and conclusions may form the basis of a workshop of the five countries to further discuss and implement synergy, e.g. at the project level directed towards GEF. Although it was outside the scope of the present study, the overlaps with the Climate Convention (FCCC) are briefly touched upon. The inclusion of the FCCC in the synergy process is worthy of further exploration.

List of abbreviations

CML	Centre of Environmental Science Leiden
CoP	Conference of Parties
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (also UNCCD)
CILSS	Permanent Inter-state Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel
Enda TM	Environnement et Développement du Tiers Monde
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
GBF	Global Biodiversity Forum
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GO	Governmental Organisation
IISD	International Institute for Sustainable Development
IUCN	World Conservation Union
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
NAP	National Action Programme
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans
NFP	National Focal Points
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NR	National Report
PO	Private Organisation
SEED	Sustainable Energy and Environment Division
SBSTTA	Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNSO	United Nations Office to Combat Desertification
UNU	United Nations University
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WRI	World Resources Institute
WWF	World Wildlife Fund for Nature

The report consists of two parts. The first part is an inventory of the state of art of synergy, at international, national and local levels. After a brief rationale for synergy between CBD and CCD, the initiatives by both Conventions are highlighted in chapter 2. Following, the different workshops and conferences organized on synergy, various organisations and firms involved, and pilot initiatives on synergy, are the subject of chapter 3. From this international level, we zoom in to national efforts, by describing and comparing in short the CCD National Action Programme and CBD National Program of the five countries mentioned above. Final to this first part is chapter 5 on a GEF study on biodiversity and land degradation linkage projects, which gives an insight at local level.

Introduction

This study is about the synergies that may be found between two important global environmental treaties, CBD and CCD. In 1992, the UNCED in Rio de Janeiro resulted in three global conventions, the "Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC)", the "Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)" and the "United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification" (CCD). These and other conventions were negotiated separately, but subsequently the need for collaboration emerged.

The project of which this study is part, "*Identifying main synergies, challenges and pitfalls for a coherent implementation of obligations under the CBD and CCD*", has two main objectives:

- Identifying synergies, challenges and pitfalls for a coherent and joint implementation of the obligations to draft National Action Programmes under CCD and to draft National Strategies and national drylands work programmes under CBD;
- Analysing the synergy-relevant experiences in five African countries by studying the relevant documents.

Through the identification of specific opportunities for synergy, and additionally for gaps and needs, to be discussed through a regional workshop, the project aims to assist West- and Central African countries in the implementation of the CBD programme of work in close co-ordination with the efforts under CCD.

Besides drawing on a theoretical framework that was extracted from literature, the study concentrates on five West- and Central African countries and an analysis of their national reporting to the CBD and the National Action Programmes for the CCD. These countries are Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Mali and Senegal. The study tries to give input for further implementation of synergy in the five countries.

This report consists of two parts. The first part is an inventory of the state of art of synergy, on international, national and local levels. After a brief rationale for synergy between CBD and CCD, the initiatives by both Conventions are highlighted in chapter 2. Following, the different workshops and conferences organised on synergy, various organisations and fora involved, and NGO efforts on synergy, are the subject of chapter 3. From this international level, we zoom in to national efforts, by describing and comparing in short the CCD National Action Programmes and CBD National Reports of the five countries mentioned above. Final to this first part is chapter 5 on a GEF study on biodiversity and land degradation linkage projects, which gives an insight at local level.

The second part is a review and an analysis of what the issues addressed in the first part mean for synergy in a concrete way. In chapter 6 we review the concepts and definitions used in the analysis, and we will apply these in the chapters 7 and 8. In these chapters, the substantive aspects and the institutional aspects of synergy are reviewed. This leads up to chapter 9, the overall conclusion of the study.

History of the collaboration between CBD and CCD

Part I: Inventory

After the Rio Conference, the international environmental stage has grown more and more crowded. Since then, new Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) have been signed and ratified, and duplication of efforts is a growing risk. Synergy between the various agreements is needed. The CBD and CCD both arise from the "sustainable development principle", meeting our needs while ensuring that we leave a healthy and viable world for future generations. Besides this common basis, there are links between them, e.g. through climate change and vegetation. The biodiversity of drylands is threatened by desertification and drought, which in essence prevents rehabilitation of biodiversity. But also, the loss of biodiversity can be a cause of the process of desertification in drylands. The two are inextricably linked. For a brief description of both conventions, see annex 1.

As the UNEP has already mentioned before: *"The most effective actions for preventing dryland issues are often the same actions needed to protect biological diversity"*¹. This is only one of the reasons for the CoPs of CBD and CCD to decide to co-operate with each other on the implementation of their objectives. Besides the reason of field-level efficiency, institutional efficiency and strategic efficiency are rationales as well. This study will highlight some rationales for and possibilities of synergy between CBD and CCD, as well as the pitfalls of it.

Both CBD and CCD have taken initiative to collaborate on the joint implementation of both conventions. Other institutions and fora have been taking initiatives as well. The following two chapters give an overview of these international initiatives.

¹ Klaus Torpitz in an UNEP news release of 5 December 1994: "Link desertification solutions to biodiversity, climate change, and water issues, UNEP urges." <http://www.unep.org/press/pr1994/941209.htm>.

The second part is a review and an analysis of what the literature would tell us about the role of the state in the economy. In a concrete way, in chapter 6, we review the concepts of welfare, efficiency, and equity in a concrete way. In chapters 7 and 8, in these chapters, the substantive aspects of the institutional aspects of the economy are reviewed. This leads up to chapter 9, which is the last chapter of the book.

Part II: Inventory

The first part of the book is a review of the literature on the role of the state in the economy. This is done in a concrete way, in chapter 6, where we review the concepts of welfare, efficiency, and equity. In chapters 7 and 8, the substantive aspects of the institutional aspects of the economy are reviewed. This leads up to chapter 9, which is the last chapter of the book.

The second part of the book is a review and an analysis of what the literature would tell us about the role of the state in the economy. In a concrete way, in chapter 6, we review the concepts of welfare, efficiency, and equity in a concrete way. In chapters 7 and 8, in these chapters, the substantive aspects of the institutional aspects of the economy are reviewed. This leads up to chapter 9, which is the last chapter of the book.

The first part of the book is a review of the literature on the role of the state in the economy. This is done in a concrete way, in chapter 6, where we review the concepts of welfare, efficiency, and equity. In chapters 7 and 8, the substantive aspects of the institutional aspects of the economy are reviewed. This leads up to chapter 9, which is the last chapter of the book.

The second part of the book is a review and an analysis of what the literature would tell us about the role of the state in the economy. In a concrete way, in chapter 6, we review the concepts of welfare, efficiency, and equity in a concrete way. In chapters 7 and 8, in these chapters, the substantive aspects of the institutional aspects of the economy are reviewed. This leads up to chapter 9, which is the last chapter of the book.

1

History of the collaboration between CBD and CCD

After the Rio Conference, the international environmental stage has grown more and more crowded. Since then, new Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) have been signed and ratified, and duplication of efforts is a growing risk. Synergy between the various agreements is needed. The CBD and CCD both arise from the “sustainable development principle”, meeting our needs while ensuring that we leave a healthy and viable world for future generations. Besides this common basis, there are links between them, e.g. through climate change and vegetation. The biodiversity of drylands is threatened by desertification and drought, which in essence prevents rehabilitation of biodiversity. But also, the loss of biodiversity can be a cause of the process of desertification in drylands. The two are inextricably linked. For a brief description of both conventions, see annex 1.

As the UNEP has already mentioned before: “*The most effective actions for preventing drylands issues are often the same actions needed to protect biological diversity*”¹. This is only one of the reasons for the CoPs of CBD and CCD to decide to co-operate with each other on the implementation of their objectives. Besides the reason of field-level efficiency, institutional efficiency and strategic efficacy are rationales as well. This study will highlight those rationales for and possibilities of synergy between CBD and CCD, as well as the pitfalls of it.

Both CBD and CCD have taken initiative to collaborate on the joint implementation of both conventions. Other institutions and fora have been taking initiatives as well. The following two chapters give an overview of those international initiatives.

¹ Klaus Toepfer in an UNEP news release of 9 December 1998, “Link desertification solutions to biodiversity, climate change, and water issues, UNEP urges.” (www.unep.ch/conventions/press/ccd/pr12-98.htm).

History of the collaboration between CBD and CCD

After the Rio Conference, the international environmental stage has grown more and more crowded. Since that time, new international Environmental Agreements (MEAs) have been signed and ratified, and a number of efforts are a growing link. Synergy between the various agreements is needed. The CBD and CCD both aim to the "sustainable development principle", meeting our needs while ensuring that we leave a healthy and stable world for future generations. Besides this common basis, there are links between them, e.g. through climate change and vegetation. The biodiversity of drylands is threatened by desertification and drought, which in essence prevents rehabilitation of biodiversity. But also, the loss of biodiversity can be a cause of desertification in drylands. The two are inextricably linked. For a full description of both conventions, see annex 1.

As the UNEP has already mentioned before: "The most effective means for preventing dryland desertification are those actions needed to protect biological diversity". This is only one of the reasons for the CoP of CBD and CCD to decide to co-operate with each other on the implementation of their objectives. Besides the reasons of field-level efficiency, institutional efficiency and strategic efficiency are mentioned as well. This study will highlight these efficiencies for the possibilities of synergy between CBD and CCD, as well as the details of it.

Both CBD and CCD have taken an initiative to collaborate on the joint implementation of both conventions. Other institutions and laws have been taking initiatives as well. The following two chapters give an overview of these institutional initiatives.

¹ Klaus Toepfer is an UNEP area officer in 2 December 1992. "The desertification tendency to biodiversity, climate change and water issues, UNEP report" <http://www.unep.org/press/1992/12/29.htm>

2

Initiatives by CBD and CCD

This chapter aims to give an overview of the efforts that the two conventions have done themselves to reach better collaboration. The CoPs of both CBD and CCD have emphasised the need for synergy, and have asked their Secretariats to work out specific plans for collaboration. Besides a Memorandum of Understanding between both conventions, preparations are also made to implement a Joint Programme of Work on Dry and Sub-humid Lands now. To further develop this Programme, the two Secretariats called together a Liaison Group.

2.1 Memorandum of Understanding and the need for synergy

Collaboration between conventions has been incorporated as articles within most convention texts². This resulted in a Memorandum of Understanding between the two conventions, in 1998. The Secretariat of the CCD first stressed the importance of synergy, because of the common sustainable development approach and the link through Agenda 21³. Having recognised the need for synergy, a further exploration of the ecological linkages between the two conventions was studied⁴.

For CBD, the same trend of first recognising the need for synergy and focusing the attention on this need, then to identifying the overlaps and finally filling in the options for specific collaboration between CBD and CCD, can be seen. The Secretariat and the CoP brought forward FCCC and CCD as specific

² In article 8 of the CCD, "relationships with other conventions", CBD is mentioned in particular. Also article 22 and 23 address the collaboration. For the CBD, the collaboration with other conventions is mentioned first in decision 8 of the second CoP (Jakarta, 1995). Also the Kyoto Protocol of FCCC mentions non-violation of other conventions as part of the criteria for projects such as 'sinks'.

³ ICCD/COP(2)/7: *Promotion and strengthening of relationships with other relevant conventions, collaboration and synergies among the Rio conventions for the implementation of the UNCCD.*

⁴ ICCD/COP(3)/9: *Review of activities for the promotion and strengthening of relations with other relevant conventions and relevant international organizations, institutions and agencies – collaboration and synergies among Rio conventions*. In this document, the linkages are vegetation of croplands and rangelands, climate change, forests and wetlands. Sustainable use of dryland resources is one of the starting points of the document. It also discusses the benefits arising from the CCD for other conventions. These benefits include solar energy, winter cash-crops, aquaculture and ecotourism. Other than that, it proposes a two-phased action plan for synergies in field implementation of the CCD. This action plan is based on a first phase with pilot projects and a second phase in which the success of the first phase can be repeated on a whole-country scale.

conventions to strengthen collaboration with⁵. The need for synergy was felt because of the importance of information exchange and the avoidance of unnecessary duplication of efforts. Following, a draft programme of work on the Biological Diversity of Dry and Sub-humid Lands was prepared by the CBD Secretariat in consultation with the CCD Secretariat. This programme is a more concrete filling-in of analysed linkages, and also involved the SBSTTA.

2.2 The Joint Programme of Work

The overall aim of the draft programme is to promote the three objectives⁶ of the CBD in dry and sub-humid lands. It consists of two parts, "assessments" and "targeted actions in response to identified needs". The operational objectives of these are:

- To assemble and analyse information on the state of drylands biodiversity and the pressures on it, to disseminate existing knowledge and best practices, and to fill knowledge gaps, in order to define responses needed; and
- To promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in drylands, and to combat biodiversity loss in drylands and its socio-economic consequences.

Enhanced interaction between the work programmes of the CBD and the CCD is aimed for, through, inter alia, drawing upon the elements the CBD Secretariat proposed in a note⁷. These elements include, besides the more regular CBD actions:

- The identification of overlaps and/or gaps;
- The co-ordination of co-operation between CBD and CCD National Focal Points;
- The informing of stakeholders and other interest groups on both conventions;
- The exchange of information from joint case-studies;
- And the harmonisation of formats of reporting.

The two Secretariats called together a Liaison Group to help further realisation of the objectives of CBD and CCD jointly.

⁵ Decision IV/2, IV/7 and IV/15

⁶ The conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources.

⁷ UNEP/CBD/COP/5/INF/15

2.3 The Liaison Group

The CCD/CBD Liaison group met in Bonn at the end of April 2001. At the time of writing of the present text, the official documents that resulted are not available yet.

However, the meeting resulted in a more specific filling-in of the two operational objectives formulated for the Joint Programme of Work by the CBD (see previous section). As for the first objective, the Liaison Group advises to focus on:

- Combined analyses of threats, causes (pressures) and solutions (responses) of land degradation and biodiversity loss.

The second objective can be filled in with three more advises to focus on:

- Land areas pivotal for both biodiversity and land quality maintenance, which, in the drylands, are identified under headings of natural vegetation, drylands forest, rangelands, parklands, savannahs and suchlike;
- Adaptive management and the 'ecosystem approach'⁸ as CBD products of high CCD relevance;
- Community-based management and strengthening of indigenous and co-management land management and zoning systems.

From analysing the linkages to filling-in a more specific programme of work that addresses the objectives of CBD and CCD jointly, the international community is now into the next stage, that of implementing synergy through specific projects. One concrete CCD initiative at country level is a pilot project in Mongolia, Mali and Bolivia, planned to start in 2001. The CCD Secretariat, jointly with the Secretariats of CBD and FCCC, will support country level actors to identify possible synergistic activities. Expected outputs are, inter alia, better information exchange among the National Focal Points and other stakeholders, and the development of activities that are at the interface of the three conventions (CBD, CCD and FCCC), and which can be submitted to GEF for financial support.

⁸ See the footnote of Annex 1 for a brief explanation of the ecosystem approach.

Proposals from other institutions and fora

Besides the efforts of the CBD and CCD Secretariats, other initiatives have been taken as well. These come mainly from international organisations, academic circles and a few NGOs. UNEP plays an important role in linking MEAs, and is actively involved in co-organising meetings and workshops on the theme. It is also one of the initiators of the Global Biodiversity Forum. Also UNDP is involved in synergies, *inter alia* through their subdivision UNSO and through two expert meetings on interlinkages. Finally, NGOs such as IUCN, IISD, Club du Sahel and Enda TM have something to say on the matter.

3.1 UNEP and UNDP on synergy

Following the same line, from focusing international attention on synergy, to getting national and local partners involved for implementation of synergy, UNEP initiated the discussion. Between 1994 and 1998, it has hosted eight meetings of convention Secretariats and other relevant parties to exchange information. UNEP is providing the Secretariat for, among others, the CBD. The CCD is administered by the UN, not by UNEP. The UNEP has established a Division of Environmental Conventions in 1999, tasked with identifying synergies and promoting collaboration amongst international agreements. It gives out a newsletter called "Synergies", in which the theme is explored among the numerous environmental agreements. Synergy between CBD and CCD is relatively new, and one of the latest items on the list of linkages to be explored. UNEP has no specific items on CBD/CCD synergy, their focus is either on the linkages between all biodiversity-related treaties⁹, or on the cluster of CBD, CCD, FCCC and the Forest Principles. The UNEP also convenes the Ecosystem Conservation Group, which brings together FAO, UNDP, UNESCO, the World Bank, IUCN, WWF and the WCMC to promote common strategies.

UNDP has a special division for dryland issues, the UNSO (United Nations Office to Combat Desertification). Established in 1973, UNSO focuses on improving people's livelihoods, particularly in the world's drylands. Considering dryland biodiversity as the livelihood of the population in the drylands,

⁹ With all biodiversity-related treaties, the UNEP means all treaties on biological diversity, migratory species, trade in endangered species, wetlands, and world heritage sites.

UNDP and UNSO have committed themselves to the synergy dialogue between CBD and CCD, by (co-) organising meetings and workshops and participating in them.

3.2 Identifying and analysing synergy in workshops and meetings

After the internationally stressed urge for collaboration, several workshops and meetings were called to identify linkages possible between various MEAs, more specifically between CBD, CCD, FCCC and the Forest Principles. For a more extensive description of these meetings, their objectives and specific outcomes, see Annex 2. The trend in these workshops is that they first analyse the areas of overlap, both institutionally and scientific. The next step is to see how these analysed linkages can form a basis for collaboration, and what can be the concrete actions for implementing synergy (this will be the objective of the regional workshop, for which the recommendations of this report will be used). The Global Biodiversity Forum¹⁰ addressed the specific linkage of biodiversity and drylands in its 14th session. Finally, the last inter-linkages conference in Kuala Lumpur, in February 2001, concentrated on moving from overarching principles for developing synergies to on-the-ground activities and case studies.

3.3 NGO initiatives

Corresponding with the trend of bringing synergy from the overarching principle level to the on-the-ground activity level, is the involvement of national and local actors. Synergy is not only a matter of the UN and other international organisations anymore. International, national and subregional NGOs have growing interests. At the latest CCD-CoP in Bonn, the NGOs organised an open dialogue session on synergies between conventions and the role of stakeholders. A few issues raised at this session were the importance of harmonising synergies at the national level with those at the local level, the potential areas for collaboration between international organisations and NGOs (such as gender and natural resource management), and the need for capacity building and support for NGO involvement in the CoPs work.

A few NGOs that are actively involved in both biodiversity and desertification issues are:

- IUCN, which has a drylands programme as part of the efforts to conserve biodiversity. It is also involved in the workshops and conferences around the theme, and was one of the organisations that

¹⁰ The Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF) is an initiative of the World Resources Institute (WRI), IUCN and UNEP. It is a mechanism that serves to facilitate the involvement of civil society, scientists, indigenous peoples, business and industry and other stakeholders in the biodiversity debate.

convened the workshop on ecosystem approaches to the management of biodiversity in drylands as part of GBF 14. The recommendations of this workshop have been submitted by IUCN to CBD CoP 5 and SBSTTA 5.

- IISD, the International Institute for Sustainable Development, promotes the transition to sustainable development. It is an important source of information since they cover and report on international negotiations via the so-called Linkages Information Server on the Internet. For example, they covered both interlinkage workshops in Tokyo and Kuala Lumpur.
- Another NGO that is working on the implementation of the CCD and that calls for co-operation between conventions is the Club du Sahel. This is a forum for informal exchange on development issues between North and South. Their Secretariat is located in Paris. In one of their documents on implementation of the CCD in the Sahel¹¹ they address the "*seeking of greater synergy with other international Conventions, such as those on biodiversity and climate change*" as a point for discussion. One of the Clubs partners is the CILSS, the Permanent Inter-state Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel, located in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. Food security in the Sahel is its major concern.
- Enda TM (Environnement et Développement du Tiers Monde) is a global NGO, founded in 1972 in Dakar, that is active in various domains linked to environment and development. In the past it did have projects that addressed both biodiversity and desertification. At the moment they are the only NGO in West- and Central Africa that is actively involved in the synergy discussion. Both IUCN and Enda TM have participated in the CBD-CCD Liaison Group¹².

3.4 Conclusion

Overall, the efforts of the institutions and fora outside CBD and CCD appear to have focussed first of all on the exploration of the synergy issue and the strengthening of institutional synergy commitments. More concrete indications of what CBD/CCD synergy might entail in practice are relatively new and unexplored. They appear to comprise the reduction of overhead costs (data collection, reporting etc.), the co-ordination of activities and - on the field level - the involvement of local communities and indigenous management practices. The increasing involvement of national and subregional NGOs indicates the

¹¹ Freudiger et al. 1998.

¹² Another African NGO that is participating in the Liaison Group is the Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (NEST). The West African Association for Marine Resources (WAAME), based in Senegal, is involved in leading activities on both CBD and CCD objectives, but it only concentrates on the coastal regions of Senegal.

4

National level: West and Central African NAPs and NRs

From the international level, we will now go to the analysis of synergy at the national level, by having a closer look at five West- and Central African countries, and the implementation of CCD and CBD there. These countries are Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Mali and Senegal. All five have ratified both CBD and CCD. Of all but Cameroon, the CCD National Action Programmes (NAPs) have been analysed; for Cameroon, only the CCD National Report was available. Analysed as well were the CBD National Reports of the five countries.

This chapter gives an overview of the major aspects of the NAPs and NRs relevant to CBD/CCD synergy. The Programme of Work on Drylands has been used as a comparative background. For the main characteristics of this Programme, see Annex 3. More detailed descriptions of three CCD NAPs are given in Annex 4.

4.1 The CBD NR of Senegal

The CBD National Report of Senegal makes clear that the country comprises important biodiversity, and that decline is the overall trend. Important causes of loss are the expansion of cropland and the over-exploitation of the remaining forest and pastures, exacerbated, as the NR states candidly, by weak or inconsistent regulations.

Major policy lines to remedy the situation concern (1) sustainable intensification of agriculture in order to take pressure off the open land, (2) surveillance, protection and rehabilitation of forest and biodiversity and (3) regionalisation of decision-making, devolution to the local level and improvement of land tenure security, under the state umbrella.

In all this, the term "biodiversity" is largely taken to mean natural ecosystems and wild plants and animals.

4.2 The CCD NAP of Senegal:

Consensus building for soils and natural vegetation

Senegal was one of the first countries to sign the CCD and it puts much work in this convention. It has also been the host country of CCD-CoP 2. As explained in the NAP, Senegal faces grave problems of soil degradation. Those of the largest scale concern the 'peanuts Basin' and the eastern regions (sylvo-pastoral zone, central-east and Southeast). As the NAP states candidly, Senegal's efforts to combat further desertification have not succeeded in stopping the overall decline of soil fertility and the natural resource base.

In the NAP, much hope is put on the consensus building of all actors in this field, that is to say, GO agencies, NGO groups, donors, regional councils, religious leaders and local people such as farmers, women and youth. This institutional key approach has to be strengthened by improved implementation of tenure and other laws, and by land use planning/zonation. Hesitations are visible to make a more radical devolution step; on the one side, communities are said to be "sovereign" but on the other hand, no clear framework of (co-)management by communities is established.

The NAP mentions many operational and institutional actions but the most clear-cut priorities are found in the contributions of the farmers and women to the NAP, as well as in the priorities per region. They are: (1) combat of soil fertility decline and erosion, especially in the densely populated Peanuts Basin, and (2) protection of forest and pastures especially in the less densely populated eastern regions. These choices are only logical: in the densely populated areas, with their intensive land use systems and lack of grazing area, the key of sustainability lies in the on-farm maintenance of the soils by way of composting, trees and manure, while in the extensive farming systems of the East, the key lies in the protection of the grazing/forest areas that are pivotal for the sustainability of the system as a whole.

Biodiversity is mentioned only in a few places in the NAP, mainly connected to relatively small-scale areas. Opportunities for CBD/CCD synergy are not small, however. They appear to be especially present if two NAP themes are combined:

- A further step towards clear (co-)management arrangements with local people under the NAPs general consensus-of-all-actors umbrella;
- A focus on the natural vegetation of the eastern regions (sylvo-pastoral lands, central-east and Southeast).

To these then, many smaller elements, e.g. sharing wetlands and forests in the Western parts, may be added.

4.3 The CBD NR of Mali

The CBD National Report of Mali is a brief document that describes the country's many biodiversity components, its protected areas and species. Causes of biodiversity decline are largely connected to population growth and the concurrent expansion of cropland into the (semi-)natural areas. Institutions for conservation are mentioned, with the local communities as one of them. The NR does not describe policies or actions. The described functions of biodiversity indicate that the term "biodiversity" is primarily connected to wild flora and fauna, with a secondary connotation of biodiversity as a natural resource linked to soil regeneration and agricultural sustainability.

4.4 The CCD NAP of Mali:

Decentralised co-ordination for the co-management of the natural vegetation

"[La dégradation] des terres de culture et des pâturages se confondent, tout comme le sont les pâturages et les forêts".

The CCD National Action Plan of Mali is a substantial document that emphasises two broad themes and one more special issue.

The first broad theme concerns the planning structures. Mali has built a system of thematic National Action Plans (PANs), integrated provincial action plans (PARs) and local action plans (PALs). These are set as "cadres de co-ordination" between GO, NGO, PO and donor organisations at all levels, in which the final decision-making, at least formally, is left to the local communities.

The second broad theme is the choice for the *natural vegetation* as the area of focus. This is visible not only in the national-level part of the NAP, but also in the various provincial (PAR) elaborations. This choice is connected to emphasis put on the sustainability of the agricultural system, implying (i) zoning and protection of the natural vegetation and (ii) improved integration of natural vegetation and arable land, e.g. through intensified coupling of cattle (manure) and cropping.

The more special issue is that Mali wants to build its policies and projects on the many positive experiences that have already been experienced in the field. Thus, a "real dialogue" is aimed at between supra-local (GO) and local (PO) insights and practices. See also Annex 4.

4.5 The CBD NR of Burkina Faso

As the CBD National Report of Burkina puts it, 85 percent of the country's population is a farmer and hence directly dependent on biodiversity. At the same time, the NR states that Burkina has signed the CBD convention in order to enter into a trade with the developed countries; the North is to pay (with funds and technology transfer) for Burkina's biodiversity protection. This apparent inconsistency may be explained by the in fact the concept of "biodiversity" has in fact two very different meanings in the NR. The first meaning is natural elements and processes in the broadest sense: soils, firewood forest, pastures and so on. The second meaning is, roughly, protected areas and rare species. The first is very much a part of Burkina's life and development strategy. The second is not; hence the North has to 'buy' it. The NR states that of this funding, two-thirds goes to protected areas and only 5 percent to land management.

Institutionally, local communities are mentioned here and there but the main emphasis is on the GO and NGO levels.

4.6 The CCD NAP of Burkina Faso:

Farmer and village in the centre of all action

"En conclusion, le lesson tiré de toutes ces expériences est la nécessité de placer le producteur rural au centre de tout action de développement".

The first priorities of the CCD NAP of Burkina are:

- Sustainable management of natural resources (soil, water, vegetation, fauna and fish);
- Poverty alleviation in the rural and peri-urban areas;
- Creation of a supportive political, legal and institutional environment for local community action.

The other objectives relate to capacity building, local empowerment and co-operation.

At a deeper level, three major lines run through the NAP of Burkina Faso that appear to be pivotal in order for CCD/CBD synergy to be truly possible.

- *Emphasis on local and national poverty.* The NAP delivers a coherent framework for projects and policies but no examples of self-financed actions.
- *Emphasis on multi-functional natural vegetation.* Protected areas or buffer zones do not receive substantial attention in the NAP. Neither, however, does the other side of the land use spectrum, i.e. the human habitations or the arable fields. The key to combat desertification is seen as lying in the land between the protected areas and the arable fields. This “couvert végétal”, “jachières”, “aires pastorales” or “ressources forestières are said to be in rapid decline, both in surface and in quality, due to cropland expansion and over-exploitation.
- *Emphasis on local empowerment.* The NAP explains that this key development strategy is not a participatory approach in the sense that local people are allowed to have a say in what outsiders are planning to do, but an approach in which the local level does the final decision-making, integrating all sectoral and national policies at the local level in a single whole. This is visible up to the level of national laws, such as the law on agricultural and tenure reform and the national forest code, the national environmental action plan and others. Theoretically then, the discrepancies between tenure law and local realities should be a thing of the past. It is taken into account, however, that natural resources, biodiversity and social phenomena often have *supra*-local interactions, rationalities and values as well. With respect to the national forest code, for instance, the NAP states that on the one hand the code is made to stimulate local ownership of the forest lands but that on the other hand, the code aims to define the status of protected ‘zones naturelles’ such that local communities will manage these for conservation and use. The latter implies that *supra*-local interest continue to play a role; ownership is local but at the same time restricted (much like that in Western countries, private real estate ownership is subject to zoning restrictions). In the same vein, the NAP states that on issues that surpass the local level, such as nomadic routes, rivers, larger forests etc., the *supra*-local competence prevails.

See also Annex 4.

4.7 The CBD NR of Benin

Protected areas cover 11 percent of Benin’s surface and besides these, the country has many classified and sacred forests. An interesting array of agro-biodiversity is still to be found in ‘mini-elevages non-conventionnels’. Most of this is in rapid decline, however, caused by cropland expansion and over-exploitation of the remaining natural vegetation (by ‘feux de brousse’, overgrazing, firewood extraction etc.). Important underlying causes, the NAP states, are institutional, especially the lack of tenure security, intersectoral co-ordination and a drylands product market other than cotton. Solutions are sought in (1)

improved horizontal (intersectoral, interdepartmental, GO/NGO) co-ordination as well as (2) improved vertical integration between supra-local government and local people, called 'co-management' in the NR. Overall emphasis is more on the former, horizontal co-ordination.

4.8 The CCD NAP of Benin:

Still in the process towards local empowerment

The NAP of Benin focuses on eight domains, the ones with most relevance for synergy being (a) conservation and protection of natural resources, (b) management of 'terroirs', and (c) support of community actions and indigenous practices and culture. Crucial issues such as tenure policy are mentioned often but do not seem to be resolved yet. Local communities are mentioned often but the first priority of the NAP is the strengthening of government and NGOs, and their 'horizontal' co-ordination.

The NAP delivers many 'standard' elements of appropriate rural development in general. For CCD/CBD synergy, key elements appear to be:

- The linkage of NAP to the CBD Drylands programme through the enhancement of indigenous traditions of natural resource management;
- A focus on the North of the country, where extensive land use options and biodiversity protection may potentially reinforce each other in a sustainable overall eco-agro-pastoral system;
- Active avoidance of the tenure insecurity pitfall, which means that the tenure issue (whose land is it?) needs to be resolved before collaborative action is undertaken. Amongst others, the tenure issue implies that modern law differs from traditional law on ownership of land, causing a tension that is a source of insecurities that exacerbate desertification and conflict. These, in turn, prevent people to invest in the land and in each other.

Remarkable is that this NAP is the only one that shows the annual state budget; the combat against desertification gets 11% of it. See further Annex 4.

4.9 The CBD NR of Cameroon

With so much of its biodiversity and biodiversity dramas concentrated in the rainforest, it is not surprising that the NR of Cameroon does not pay much attention to the drylands. The major policy lines for the drylands are (1) to improve markets for drylands products and (2) participation of local people in

protected area and forest management. The meaning of the term “biodiversity” varies in the report; sometimes the whole of agriculture is included, sometimes the only the forest and the protected areas, and sometimes only the areas of foreign-funded actual conservation projects.

4.10 The CCD NR (NAP chapter) of Cameroon

In its most recent NR for CCD, Cameroon states that the process of formulation is the CCD NAP is still ongoing. The NR does contain, however, a chapter on the NAP process from which a number of likely policy lines may be drawn.

- One likely policy line is a focus on the “couvert végétal”, especially the development of data and tools for land use planning in the drylands.
- Also, the combat of desertification is seen as concurrent with the participatory management of protected areas.
- For agriculture, emphasis is put on soil conservation and dry-season crops.
- For animal husbandry, emphasis is put on the solution of conflicts with (expanding) agriculture and the possible establishment of planted fodder.

A more general issue is that Cameroon is worried about the conflict between the sustainable management of natural resources and the pressures put on the country by IMF’s Structural Adjustment Programme.

4.11 Conclusion for CCD/CBD synergy

Overviewing the foregoing, this section will discuss five aspects of the NAPs and NRs that appear to be relevant in view of the CBD/CCD synergy issue.

(1) Focal points and reporting

Most of the time the focal points are housed in the same ministry (the ministry of environment) but in different departments or secretariats. Focal points in Burkina are housed in the same secretaries, but the persons in charge differ. The focal points in Mali are the only ones housed in different ministries. Thus, the Focal Points seem to be physically close and communication and co-operation between them should not be a major problem. The NAP and the NR of Benin use the same data on the status of the biodiversity and the ecosystems in Benin, and on social and economic issues. This is an example of how useful it can

¹ Except, partly, the NAP chapter of Cameroon’s CCD NR

be to have similar datasets, for use for multiple reports. According to Burke (1997), these procedural institutional overlaps should be used to mitigate double efforts.

CCD/CBD synergy is no point of attention in the reports. Several of them, however, mention a general environmental action programme that the report is part of (NR Burkina Faso, NAP and NR Mali, NAP Benin, NR Senegal).

Overall then, there appears to be a good scope for further integration of data and reporting, reducing the reporting burden. Needless to say, this hold for other conventions as well.

(2) *Degree of country-drivenness*

There appears to be a difference between the CCD and CBD reporting in terms of interest taken in issues by the reporting countries. The CBD reporting is allowed to contain more vagueness and inconsistency, while the problems and policies of the CCD documents appear more carried by national consultations, more detailed, more thought-out towards real priorities and more worried if inconsistencies remain - in short, more authentically 'country-driven'.

In all five countries, poverty alleviation has a highest priority at the national levels (and quite likely even more so at the local levels), and this corresponds better to the objectives of the CCD than those of the CBD. This has relevance for synergy; if CBD is able to add a true CCD perspective to its activities, this will bring CBD closer to the country's genuine priorities.

(3) *Priority for local people*

The CCD and CBD documents have much in common when it comes to the role of local people. Both express a sincere wish to involve local communities much stronger than used to be the case in traditional policy approaches. Differences in degree are clearly present too, e.g. between the radical choice of Burkina Faso and the much more 'multi-agent' approach visible in the NAP of Senegal. These differences of degree partly appear to be a difference in style between CCD and CBD but fortunately for synergy, this degree is gradual indeed and remaining differences appear to be variants of 'national styles' rather than differences between CBD and CCD. (This is also visible at the international levels, e.g. the ecosystem approach of CBD.)

(4) A seeming rift: no explicit overlaps between CCD livelihoods and CBD biodiversity

Sometimes biodiversity is mentioned in the CCD NAPs, mostly in the function of food security, but even then it remains it is outside all the NAPs' focus and priorities¹³. The same holds, reversibly, for land degradation and desertification is the CBD NRs. The dryland ecosystem is mentioned as one of the ecosystems of the countries, and desertification is sometimes mentioned in the CBD NRs as one of the causes of loss of biodiversity. Land degradation as such is no explicit issue of actions in the CBD NRs, however. The biodiversity that is subject of the CBD NRs is *de facto* almost completely the biodiversity of the protected areas and specific ecosystems such as wetlands. This rift would seem to make synergy impossible, due to lack of any substantive object to focus synergy on. In order to overcome this seemingly unavoidable conclusion, a deeper, more implicit aspect of the NAPs and NRs has to be identified. This is the final aspect mentioned hereafter.

(5) Multi-functional natural vegetation

In all the five NAPs analysed, natural resource management is the key substantive issue. In some (e.g. Senegal), this concept comprises both on-farm (e.g. soils) and off-farm (e.g. pastoral and forest) resources. In the other CCD documents (with many quite explicitly) these off-farm areas are the prime focus. The CBD documents often mention the off-farm land when they speak about the causes of biodiversity decline in the drylands ('cropland expansion' i.e. decline of the remaining off-farm land, and over-exploitation of these areas).

This off-farm land, carrying numerous different names in all NAPs and NRs, may be seen as a single type of land that covers vast areas in the West-African drylands: the mixtures of grasses, shrubs and trees that lie in-between the croplands on the one hand and the protected areas/bufferzones on the other. We will call it 'multi-functional natural vegetation' here. Multi-functional because of its functions in local livelihoods (grass, firewood, timber, medicine, vegetables etc.), and natural because it is still largely wild. Although not every spot of this multi-functional natural vegetation might be as pivotal for the combat against desertification or as valuable for biodiversity, analysis of the NAPs and NRs shows that the areas of this vegetation are indicated as key areas for CBD/CCD synergy.

¹³ Except, partly, the NAP chapter of Cameroon's CCD NR.

The first aspect mentioned here is the fact that the NAF party in Cameroon's CCD has
 been a failure to consider the NAF's economic and political situation in the
 context of the country and development is sometimes mentioned in the CCD NAF's
 context of fact of this party. Last degradation as such is an explicit issue of action in the CCD NAF's
 document, the evidence that is presented in the CCD NAF's document on the
 of the political area and specific economic sector, which is not to be
 impossible, due to lack of any substantive effort to form a party on. In order to overcome this
 unavoidable condition, a more, more judicial aspect of the NAF's political
 the final aspect mentioned here is

second it must be noted that in the CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's
 by the NAF party, the CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's
 conditions, which by doing so, the CCD NAF's
 to all the NAF's political and economic
 regard, the CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's
 resources. In the other CCD documents (with many other
 those, the CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's
 following, the CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's
 the CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's
 The CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's
 of fact that covers was seen in the West-African
 to be shown the evidence on the CCD NAF's
 call it "multi-functional rural vegetation"
 the CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's
 the CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's
 the CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's
 the CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's
 the CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's
 the CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's
 the CCD NAF's document, the CCD NAF's

* For more on the NAF party in Cameroon's CCD NAF

5

Field-level projects: the GEF experience

Field-level project experiences in the separate sphere of CBD and CCD are manifold. Related to the CBD/CCD synergy, special relevance is present in projects that focus on bufferzones (CBD sphere) and land management ("gestion du terroir"; CCD sphere). As stressed most emphatically in the NAP of Mali but in many other documents as well, it is crucial that these experiences are documented and diffused.

Central to the question of CBD/CCD synergy are projects that explicitly aim to link biodiversity and land degradation. This may be seen as the next step in the synergy trajectory noted in chapters 2 and 3, that started at the international policy level and moves downward to the level of field projects. It is about this level that GEF recently commissioned a study, the GEF land degradation linkage study¹⁴, to analyse the performance of 'linkage projects'. Due to the fact that GEF does not have a separate window on land degradation yet, the linkage projects had been conceptualised for three of the four other GEF focal areas. The study reviewed the results and impacts of the land degradation component of 103 of those projects that link land degradation with biodiversity, international waters and climate change. Finally, 80 projects were statistically analysed, of which 60% are in the biodiversity focal area. The report appeared in April 2001. To the present study, the conclusions for the 48 projects that link biodiversity and land degradation are relevant.

The conclusions focus on (1) the causes of the limited effects of the projects on land degradation, and on (2) the characteristics of the projects that turned out to perform best.

Starting out with the former, the causes that have limited the effect on the projects on land degradation are that projects in GEF's biodiversity focal area addressing land degradation tend to have a strong conservation priority, also when co-addressing land degradation issues. Logically then, these projects tend to focus on areas where there is much left to conserve, *i.e.* the protected areas and the buffer zones around them, and these areas are not the ones, usually, with the greatest relevance for the combat of land degradation. In the report's own words:

¹⁴ Berry, L. and J. Olson, *GEF Land Degradation Linkage Study*. GEF/C.17/Inf.7, April 2001.

- *“Projects are based on the focal area of biodiversity rather than on the linkage activities;*
- *Of the projects related to biodiversity, 3/4 is located in or near protected areas, which are not usually regions of the highest land degradation concern;*
- *Difficulty in estimating incremental costs of mitigation activities limits a strong land degradation component in the projects.”*

As for the second part of the report, the characteristics of the projects that turned out to perform best, two positive conclusions came out:

- *“The most effective linkage projects are those where land degradation is built in as an initial component of the problem;*
- *In biodiversity linkage projects, rangeland environments have created the best land degradation/biodiversity synergy”.*

The first of these conclusions may read that projects for synergy should be co-designed through the biodiversity and land degradation paradigms from the very beginning. Land degradation priorities, concepts, styles and experts should not be brought in as an ‘afterthought’. If this is not the case, *“key issues such as land tenure, policy, and gender will be poorly integrated into project activities”*, as the report puts it.

The second of the report’s conclusions may read that projects for synergy should focus on land that is of basic concern for both conventions. By and large, these are the ‘rangelands’ in terms of the GEF report, or the ‘natural vegetation’, or many other names given to it in the CCD NAPs, the CBD NRs, the Liaison Group documents and many others. Of these, the areas with high biodiversity relevance (good quality forest, natural grazing land, connective zones between protected areas etc.) and a high land degradation relevance (strongly linked with livelihoods, high potential population pressure, high degradation risk etc.) are the obvious zones of shared priority.

As said, the GEF projects were largely situated in or near protected areas. For such areas there is a certain logic to take the biodiversity objectives first and then “build in land degradation as an initial component of the problem” as a key condition for success. If we expand this conclusion to encompass also the rangeland (‘natural vegetation’ etc.) *outside* the protected areas/bufferzones, the same logic appears to prescribe to take the land degradation objective first and then build in biodiversity as an initial component of the problem. This conclusion we carry over to Section 7.2.

Terminology for the review

Part II:

In this brief chapter we define a number of terms that have been used for the review, preparing for the chapters 7 and 8.

Analysis of opportunities for CCD/CBD collaboration

According to the review, the term 'synergy' is somewhat confusing. In many documents, 'synergy' simply means collaboration. The word 'synergy' is also used as another term for overlap or interlinkage. Some authors try to avoid the word at all, and rather speak of collaboration, interlinkage, overlap or dialogues. In the present study, 'synergy' is taken to mean co-operation and collaboration (between CBD and CCD), aiming to result in more efficacy or efficiency than the separate elements could reach.

Although numerous differences can be found between the CCD and CBD conventions and practice, there are many overlaps and interlinkages between them. These overlaps and interlinkages can be put into two different categories. First, there are the substantive ones, which describe the 'real world', as we can see it around us. The second category comprises the institutional overlaps and interlinkages, meaning all reflective structures observing and working on that real world. An example of the first category is an ecosystem, the people of the drylands, or the animal world. In a particular area, CDFs, local people and National Action Programmes are examples of the second category.

We may distinguish between the substantive structures, such as ecosystems, and substantive processes, such as the process of desertification. Also the institutional category may be divided into two, distinguishing between, for instance, institutional structures such as organisations and convention texts, and institutional processes such as reporting of the CDFs' progress.

Finally, comparing real-world or institutional structures or processes, we may distinguish between such elements being *shared*, *parallel* or *aligned*. Shared elements are part of both CBD and CCD. A substantive example is a species, ecosystem or management practice that is important for both biodiversity and land quality. An institutional example is the Local Group, the Memorandum of

- *Projects are located on the focal area of biodiversity rather than on the linkage activities;*
- *Of the projects related to biodiversity, 7% is located in or near protected areas, which are not usually regions of the highest land degradation concern;*
- *Difficulty in obtaining measurement costs of mitigation activities results in a strong land degradation component in the projects.*

Part II:

As for the second part of the report, the characteristics of the projects that turned out to perform best, two positive conclusions came out.

- *The most successful projects were those that were located in areas of high land degradation as an initial component of the problem;*
- *In biodiversity linkage projects, the areas that have created the best land degradation/biodiversity synergy.*

The first of these conclusions may read that projects for synergy should be co-designed through the biodiversity and land degradation paradigms from the very beginning. Land degradation priorities, concepts, styles and experts should not be viewed in as an 'afterthought' if this is not the case, "key issues such as land tenure, policy, and gender will be poorly integrated into project activities", as the report says.

The second of the report's conclusions may read that projects for synergy should focus on land that is of basic concern for both conventions. By and large, these are the 'rangelands' in terms of the GEF report, or the 'natural vegetation', or many other names given to it in the CCD NAs, the CBD NAs, the Liaison Group documents and many others. Of these, the areas with high biodiversity relevance (good quality forest, natural grazing land, connectivity zones between protected areas etc.) and a high land degradation exposure (strongly linked with livelihoods, high potential population pressure, high degradation risk etc.) are the obvious zones of shared priority.

As such, the GEF projects were largely situated in or near protected areas. For such areas there is a certain logic as to why the biodiversity objective first and then "build in land degradation as an initial component of the problem" as a key condition for success. If we expand this conclusion to encompass also the situation of 'natural vegetation' etc. outside the protected areas/bufferzones, the same logic appears to be possible to make the land degradation objective first and then build in biodiversity as an initial component of the problem. This conclusion we carry over to Section 7.2.

6

Terminology for the review

In this brief chapter we define a number of terms that have been used for the review, preparing for the chapters 7 and 8.

According to the Oxford Dictionary, 'synergy' is: "... a combined effect ... that exceeds the sum of individual effects". In actual use, the term 'synergy' is somewhat confusing. In many documents, 'synergy' simply means collaboration or co-operation. But synergy is also used as another term for overlap or interlinkage. Some authors try to avoid the word at all, and rather speak of collaboration, interlinkage, overlap or dialogue. In the present study, 'synergy' is taken to mean co-operation and collaboration (between CBD and CCD), aiming to result in more efficacy or efficiency than the separate conventions could reach.

Although numerous differences can be found between the CCD and CBD conventions and practices, there are many overlaps and interlinkages between them. These overlaps and interlinkages can be put into two different categories. First, there are the *substantive* ones, which describe the "real world", as we can see it around us. The second category comprises the *institutional* overlaps and interlinkages, meaning all reflective structures observing and working on that real world. An example of the first category is an ecosystem, the people of the drylands, or the annual rainfall in a particular area. CoPs, focal points and National Action Programmes are examples of the second category.

We may distinguish between the substantive *structures*, such as ecosystems, and substantive *processes*, such as the process of desertification. Also the institutional category may be divided this way, distinguishing between, for instance, institutional structures such as organisations and convention texts, and institutional processes such as reporting of the CoPs rhythm.

Finally, comparing real-world or institutional structures or processes, we may distinguish between such elements being *shared*, *parallel* or *disjoint*. Shared elements are part of both CBD and CCD. A substantive example is a species, ecosystem or management practice that is important for both biodiversity and land quality. An institutional example is the Liaison Group, the Memorandum of

Understanding of a shared dataset. Parallel elements are not shared but yet have the same structure or process. Both Conventions have a Secretariat, Focal Points and a CoP rhythm, for instance. Disjoint elements, finally, are all those not shared and not parallel.

Shared elements are a basis for synergy. Parallel elements are important for synergy too, because information may easily flow between them and because they are easily 'sharable' if the need would arise. For good collaboration, both substantive and institutional shared and parallel elements are required.

7

Review of the substantive aspects of CBD/CCD synergy

Part I of this report has been an inventory of the state of art of CBD/CCD synergy at the international, national and local levels. In Part II, *i.e.* the present and the next chapter, we take this inventory one step further, by merging them and reviewing the possibilities for synergy. This review is done in two chapters. In the present one, the substantive aspects of synergy will be discussed. In the next, the institutional aspects will be focused on.

7.1 Shared land: the multi-functional natural vegetation

This section requires some preliminary technical remarks before the potential of synergy of CCD and CBD will become fully clear.

For the purpose of this report and leaving out the relatively special places such as the wetlands and mountains, the types of land in the drylands may be divided into three broad categories: (1) the croplands, (2) the protected natural areas such as national parks and forest reserves, and (3) the 'land in-between', which we will call the 'multi-functional natural vegetation' here. The multi-functional natural vegetation is often called the *brousse* in French but goes under many other names too, such as vegetation cover, natural forest, bushland, rangeland, natural vegetation, pastoral areas and so forth.

A second point to note for this section concerns the farming systems in the drylands. Again leaving aside special cases, these land use systems may be broadly divided into extensive and intensive systems. Extensive systems are characterized by an important interlinkage between the croplands and the multi-functional natural vegetation (see below); they prevail in most of the areas of the Sahel. Intensive systems are usually found in places of high population density; they are characterized by a higher input of capital, water, labour and other external inputs.

Both extensive and intensive systems may be sustainable, that is, function without soil degradation/desertification. For the extensive systems, sustainability requires a sufficient area of multi-functional natural vegetation. Increasing population densities thus result in a soil degradation risk. If

farmers just continue what they have been doing before, the simple fact of increasing numbers of farmers leads to the expansion of croplands at the expense of the multi-functional natural vegetation, and desertification sets in. Farmers may then respond in two ways.

One is that they take the road of what is often called 'agricultural involution'. This is that farmers still continue what they were doing before, but with an ever higher input of labour per hectare (e.g. ever increasing densities of peanut plants). On the longer run, this cannot prevent further soil degradation, and increasing poverty, desertification and out-migration is the result.

The second pathway that farmers may take in the process of agricultural intensification is that they innovate toward new land use systems. They may start building bunds or terraces, switch to stabled in stead of free-roaming cattle, plant trees and home gardens, start irrigation where water is available, start new ways of soil fertility management (e.g. composting) and so on. This is often called the process of 'agricultural transition'. Characteristic for all these activities is that they are investments: farmers need to spend time and/or money in order to gather the knowledge, build the terraces, plant the trees, buy the pumps and so forth. Crucial then for farmers to take the road to sustainable agricultural transition is that they still have the capacity (capital, spare labour etc.) by the time they find out that innovation is necessary. If they do not, they are caught in the well-known 'poverty trap'.

Against this background, what is the key potential for CCD/CBD synergy?

The croplands in the drylands are quite susceptible to soil degradation and this degradation directly results in lower yields. The croplands, obviously, are a logical focus for CCD. Some options for synergy with CBD objectives may be found in this land, e.g. focusing on crop varieties and other agro-biodiversity.

On the other side of the human-to-natural spectrum, the protected natural areas, due to their usually high biodiversity, are a logical focus for CBD. These lands certainly have a relevance for CCD objectives too. On a project level, for instance, local people could be allowed to profit from the protected areas one way or another, provided that they spend the money on investments in transition (sustainable cropland use).

Balanced regional land use policies should of course comprise the croplands and the protected areas. The NAPs, NRs and workshop documents studied for the present report have not indicated however, that these two types of land are the *prime* areas for CCD/CBD collaboration. Several meetings, such as the meeting of the Liaison Group, have indicated the areas of multi-functional natural vegetation as a key areas for

synergy. Also the GEF study concludes that projects that aim to link biodiversity and land degradation should concentrate on 'rangelands', which is essentially the same type of land. The CCD NAPs indicate that the key to combat desertification is lying in this land between the protected areas/bufferzones on the one hand, and the croplands on the other.

As specified in several meetings, strong scientific causalities underlie this emphasis on the multi-functional natural vegetation. We give a summary underneath.

- First of all, the multi-functional natural vegetation serves as direct economic cornerstone of local livelihoods, through the procurement of firewood, grazing for the cattle, timber and grass for dwellings construction, medicine, vitamin-rich fruit and wild vegetables, the area of spiritual 'otherness', and so on.
- Secondly, the multi-functional natural vegetation harbours a biodiversity of its own that is often different from that of the protected areas and also comprises a valuable gene pool of the wild relatives of agricultural crop species and varieties and other commercial products, actually or potentially.
- Thirdly on a larger scale, the multi-functional natural vegetation is strongly linked to the croplands. If not over-exploited, the soil fertility of these forests and grazing land has a tendency to improve, mainly through the recycling and accumulation of soil organic matter. The art of sustainable extensive agriculture in the drylands is to 'connect' this improvement capacity of the multi-functional natural vegetation to the downward soil fertility trend inherent in use of the land as cropland. Many pathways for this linkage exist, the most important of which are fallowing and the use of cattle manure on the croplands. Thus, as indicated above, the multi-functional natural vegetation is the key for the *overall* sustainability of West Africa's extensive land use systems, including the croplands.
- Fourthly on the larger scale too, the multi-functional natural vegetation is linked to the protected areas, *inter alia* because wide-ranging species use it as additional habitat and because on a larger time-scale, the protected areas will never survive if they would be reduced to biodiversity islands in an ocean of croplands.
- Fifthly, protection of the multi-functional natural vegetation will help farmers to cross over to the pathway of sustainable agricultural intensification ('transition'). As said, this transition requires investments, and it is crucial that farmers take the road of transition when they still have the capacity (capital, labour etc.) to make these investments. In other words, they should be prevented from simply

expanding the croplands until all forest and grazing land is finished and impoverishment begins to deepen. Protection of these lands, ensuring that it stops to be a *de facto* open access for all farmers and forest-exploiting outsiders, will ensure that farmers will be stimulated toward agricultural transition before they lack the means to do so. This is another quite justified background of the emphasis on 'gestion du terroir' and likewise activities mentioned in the NAP documents. A mixture of government involvement and a reinforcement of existing local land allocation traditions may work well in the necessary step from open access to locally owned and co-managed lands (see next section).

- Finally, although unmentioned in the CCD and CBD documents, several linkages exist between the multi-functional natural vegetation and climate change. First is the well-known fact that firewood burning prevents the burning of fossil fuel and hence has a preventive effect on climate deterioration at the global level; sustainable use of the natural vegetation for this purpose is therefore positively linked to climate policy. Second, most global climate models predict that the Sahel will become dryer in the decades to come; the natural vegetation then will be an important buffer to cope with this. And thirdly, as explained during the Open Science Meeting on IGBP in Amsterdam in July 2001, strong climate/vegetation coupling may exist in the Sahel. On the regional scale it may hold that if people keep the Sahel green, they will get helped by increased (or less reduced) rainfall. If people let go of the natural vegetation, drought will intensify.

In summary, it has been found that although the croplands and the protected areas do provide options for synergy of CCD and CBD, the prime focus of synergy in the drylands appears to be the areas of multi-functional natural vegetation that lie in between these fully human and fully natural extremes. Reasons for this focus are (i) the livelihood and biodiversity functions of these land *in situ*, (ii) the linkages between these lands with sustainable extensive agriculture and sustainable biodiversity on a larger, whole-dryland scale that includes the croplands and the protected areas, (iii) the linkage between management of these lands with sustainable agricultural intensification and (iv) the prevention of and adaptation to climate change.

7.2 Conceptual issues: reconciliation at the local level

In Chapter 4, it has been concluded that in the national-level documents, a rift appears to exist between the CCD focus on livelihoods and the CBD focus on biodiversity. Biodiversity is sometimes mentioned in the CCD NAPs, mostly in the function of food security, but even then it remains it is outside all the NAPs' focus and priorities. The same holds, reversibly, for land degradation and desertification is the

CBD NRs. The biodiversity that is subject of the CBD NRs is *de facto* almost completely the biodiversity of the protected areas and specific ecosystems such as wetlands. As said in Chapter 4, this national-level rift would seem to make synergy impossible (due to lack of any substantive object to focus synergy on), in spite of the obvious non-conflict and shared elements of the CCD and CBD conventions at the global level. This is the issue addressed in the present section.

The global documents of CBD put a strong emphasis on sustainable use of natural resources, agrobiodiversity, benefit sharing with local communities and so on – sometimes to the extent that one wonders if there is any place left for nature if not ‘useful’. From the *national-level* NRs of CBD of the five countries as well as in the project-level GEF study, a different picture arises. With respect to the national-level CBD NRs, our analysis has shown that the concept of biodiversity in fact functions in two different conceptualisations. From the global-level documents, the NRs take over that biodiversity is (vaguely) ‘everything’, hence *including agriculture*. In the same documents however, we see the term biodiversity also standing for forest, wetlands and other more or less *natural ecosystems*, and on top of that sometimes also one step narrower, connected to *protected areas and conservation projects*. This is also quite visible in the project-level GEF study (as well as in the field experiences of the authors).

Concerning synergy between CBD and CCD, this results in a certain disparity between CBD and CCD priorities. At the national and project levels, CBD tends to be about biodiversity and nature, while CCD tends to be about food security and people.

Would it be a solution to ‘force’ the global-level concept of biodiversity down to the national and project levels, so that these levels would become more open to connect with the CCD priorities? At first sight that might indeed be true. On the other hand, CBD itself appears to tolerate the difference between global language and national/project realities. This creates a low probability that the ‘forcing’ would ever be very successful even if desired for synergy reasons. Moreover, we may surmise that the difference between the global and lower levels is in fact based on a certain logic, being that CBD, parented as it is by the global ‘spirit of Rio’ on the one hand and the traditional – and quite justifiable – values of nature protection on the other, has to balance both worlds and does so primarily by allocating them to different sides of the global and national/projects levels divide. Forcing the global-level conceptualisation of biodiversity, if at all possible, would result in substantial risks for nature protection and its global public support.

An other, more conceptual risk of trying to reconcile the biodiversity concept and the land degradation concept is that at root, the concept of (bio)diversity is not a prime concept for land degradation issues at all. We may take agro-biodiversity as an example. Due to its agricultural focus, agro-biodiversity would seem to a prime meeting point of CCD ('agro') and CBD ('diversity') priorities. Yet, in the five CCD NAPs analysed, a concern with agro-biodiversity does not appear at all. Speaking out from a land degradation starting point, not the diversity of things is the issue, but rather the quality and quantity of the things *themselves*: food, not food diversity; land, not land diversity; forest, not forest diversity; agriculture, not agro-diversity. From there onwards, CCD-type classifications, as the NAPs show, go into food security, soil fertility, land scarcity, forest degradation and so forth, hence still not 'diversity'.

Solutions for this problem will have to be found at the local level. It is there, after all, where synergistic projects and other activities will have to take place. The local level also offers a remarkable opportunity to define the solution. In the foregoing, we have seen that at the local level, CBD activities do in fact not focus on abstract 'biodiversity' but on concrete nature protection. CCD activities at that level also focus on a concrete priority that is, very simply put, people protection. In the field, nature protection and people protection are often at odds with each other but at the same time, they are reconcilable in many places too, as many *bufferzone and community-based resource management projects* show.

With a view on synergy, therefore, the fact that CBD shows a certain unevenness in its priorities at the global and local levels may be regarded as fortunate rather than problematic. CBD's local priority for concrete nature protection is a good starting point for searching opportunities for compromise or even mutual reinforcement with CCD's overall priority for 'people protection', and practice shows that many of such opportunities exist.

On a more personal note, *i.e.* not based on the CCD and CBD documents analysed for the present project, we wish to add the following. Protected areas in the drylands do not appear as the prime focus of a search for these opportunities. In the drylands, protected areas tend to be small and fragile, and opening them up to substantial nature/people compromises would spell certain death to most of them – also to the detriment of future generations in the drylands.

The areas directly adjacent to the protected areas logically have a better position for synergy opportunities. In these areas, however, a (justifiable) priority for nature protection will tend to prevail. For reaching synergy this seems to run counter to the conclusions of the GEF study, that emphasises the need for land degradation being built in as an initial component of the problem. This is reinforced by our impression from the national-level documents (NAPs and NRs). As concluded in Chapter 4, in a

comparison of the national processes that underlie the CCD and CBD documents, the former appear to be more authentically country-driven and the latter more internationally (donor-) driven. This disparity will even be stronger at the local levels, where issues of land degradation are highly salient and biodiversity problems, usually visible on larger scales in space and time, are more abstract.

Thus, we are led back to the areas of multi-functional natural vegetation, *i.e.* the land between the areas adjacent to the protected areas and the croplands, as probably the best type of land where synergies between CCD and CBD can be built up. It is there, after all, that social priorities can be truly pursued from the design stage of projects onward, alongside with the priority for nature protection, based on a truly joint analysis of causes and solutions, as recommended by the Liaison Group. This will give to projects the political credibility and local trust needed and therefore may serve biodiversity needs quite efficiently.

7.3 Shared approach: Co-management

All CCD and CBD documents studied share a genuine concern for involving the local communities in natural resource management. Some do so quite radically, with virtually all powers devolved to the local level. Others do so with more hesitation, ending up with more mixed arrangements of land use planning by broad GO/NGO/community consortia.

Both these extremes may not be fully adequate for the multi-functional natural vegetation areas. First, because all these areas fulfil many supra-local functions (for nomadic groups, for global biodiversity, for regional river systems and even the global and regional climate, see Section 7.1), so that a mixed local/supra-local power sharing seems more logical than radical community-level control. The other extreme, however, seems to miss out on setting the crucial tenure issue; ownership must not be broad and vague but narrow and clear-cut, if people are to take real responsibility and make real investments. This problem is indicated in several national documents.

For the multi-functional natural vegetation areas, we would be inclined to opt for community property with clear government-set restrictions. These restrictions protect sustainability and supra-local interests and are set in GO/community negotiations. If necessary, NGOs can play a mediating role. This arrangement could be called, as in one of the NAPs and in much present-day literature, 'co-management'. It is connected, for instance, to the twelve 'Malawi principles' that are part of CBD's ecosystem approach

(see Annex 1). The respect for indigenous practices and culture expressed in many documents of both CBD and CCD origin, globally and nationally, also links up with this.

7.4 Linkages to other Conventions

The linkages between CBD and CCD are not isolated. Most of the time they fall within the broader discussions of the linkages between CBD, CCD, FCCC and the Forest Principles. The link of both conventions to climate change is rather strong indeed. Strange as it may seem, burning natural vegetation as firewood is good for the global climate. That is because the carbon that burns has been sequestered from the atmosphere during the tree's lifetime, thus resulting in a zero net emission of carbon dioxide, contrary to its alternative of fossil fuel. As indicated in Section 7.1, the multi-functional natural vegetation is linked to the regional climate too, through the 'buffer connection' and possibly a 'coupling connection'. And needless to say, climate change has many impacts on biodiversity as well.

Thus, in the drylands, the FCCC has strong linkages with both CBD and CCD. Considering the strong development element within FCCC¹⁵, national priorities might be well served by linking CCD and CBD to FCCC. Whereas the present report focuses on CBD and CCD it might be advisable, once synergising, to synergise fully, including FCCC in the process.

¹⁵ One of the objectives of the Clean Development Mechanism within the Kyoto Protocol (to the FCCC) is explicitly meant to stimulate sustainable economic development in developing countries, for example.

8

Review of the institutional aspects of CBD/CCD synergy

The previous chapter reviewed the substantive aspects of synergy. This chapter will review the institutional ones. Many issues and pitfalls have been analysed in the various meetings, such as the parallel institutions formed around both Conventions and the parallel processes such as reporting to the CoPs. In the previous chapter we have noted that in the substantive field, an inspiring amount of shared area of CBD and CCD appears to exist. This chapter will show that also institutionally, there are many parallel structures and processes that have good sharing potentials, and synergy could be put to work rapidly. But also, several bottlenecks and constraints can be pointed out. Finally, the issue of a separate GEF window for land degradation will be addressed.

8.1 Institutional elements at the international and national levels

Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), such as CBD and CCD, have some common institutional elements. Although these parallel institutions cannot fully merge, their visions and programmes offer good grounds for collaboration and synergy. The Secretariat and the CoPs of the CBD and CCD already share information and work together on common interests. They have started focusing attention on synergy, and now it is important that they keep sharing their information. The science and technical bodies could work more effectively if there would exist more data and information sharing, especially on programmes and projects that aim to address both CBD and CCD fields. Close collaboration from the beginning might prevent the appearance of disjoint definitions and opinions in shared work programmes (see also section 7.2). This collaboration is indicated as one of the main priorities in international conferences and workshops.

If institutional collaboration is needed at the international level, so it is at the national levels. From the NAP/NR analysis we have concluded that co-operation between national institutions responsible for the various reports is scarce. Benin is the only country that uses the same data on status and trends and social economic background in both NAP and NR, which suggests co-operation between the responsible institutions. Other than this example, no similarities can be noted in the reports, concluded from the difference in completeness, institutional framing, structure and attention given to them. Little co-

operation leads to the risk of double efforts and waste of time and money. Since the CBD and CCD Focal Points of the five countries are almost all housed within the Ministry of Environment, collaboration between these parallel institutional structures should be within reach. For Cameroon this issue is emphasised in the NR.

In section 4.4. and in Annex 3 more extensively, we have seen that in Mali, the subnational (provincial) level has been explicitly chosen as the locus of integration of CBD, CCD and suchlike environmental policies. Although more implicit, this appears to be a tendency in the other countries as well. This then could be made into a more explicit objective of policy integration: to accept that at the national level some degree of separateness of CCD, CBD and other convention institutions and reporting will remain, but to integrate them into a single policy at the provincial and lower levels.

8.2 The report burden

The National Reports are a way for the Conference of Parties to keep up with the progress of implementation in the member countries. Under the growing number of conventions, principles and other international agreements, countries have to prepare a growing number of plans and reports. For example the National Environmental Action Plans, the National Desertification Control Plans, National Plans to Conserve Biodiversity, etc. This reporting is a burden to many countries, but also to the Secretariats. For every CoP they have to prepare, so much paperwork is submitted that agenda points have to be postponed because of lack of preparation time. For the CCD notably, an Ad Hoc Working Group is established to conclude the process of reviewing all the reports submitted to the third and the fourth CoP, including the issue of synergy with CBD.

According to Dobie and Jallow¹⁶, the norm so far has been that Focal Points have concentrated on the *development* of the NAPs, which has resulted in many cases to the NAP process emerging as a stand-alone framework with its own distinct set of programmes and projects, institutional arrangements and resources. Integration of shared issues and collaboration between focal points might be quite a challenge to reach.

¹⁶ Dobie, P. and T. Jallow (1999) Some lessons and challenges of the NAP process. In: Esikuri, E. E., H. M. Hassan, G. W. Riethmacher (eds.), *Drylands, poverty, and development*. Washington DC, World Bank.

The information given in the various reports have overlapping requirements, such as information and data sets with relevance to Agenda 21, sustainable resource management and the promotion of alternative livelihoods. Also national profile data and core geographical data sets given are alike for many of the reports. To try to avoid duplication of efforts and unnecessary paperwork because of institutional fragmentation, there is a need for an integrated framework. More efficiency can be reached if these databases, which are relevant to both conventions, are available to both CBD and CCD reports and action programmes. Already, one step has been made by setting up a frame for the CBD national reporting; this beginning should be expanded. The key element of the mitigation of the reporting burden is also put forward at the national level as a priority. The exact term 'synergy' is only used twice (NR Benin and NAP Mali), both times related to the report burden.

8.3 Constraints for institutional collaboration

One might get the impression now that synergy is rather easy to achieve, but unfortunately there are quite some institutional constraints and pitfalls as well.

Although Secretariats make effort to collaborate, this might be more difficult at the national level, for example between Focal Points, for several reasons:

- Institutions supporting the various agreements might be at odds because of their mandates, although they appear to have common substantive goals;
- Ministries and offices might be at cross purposes with one another, or competing for limited resources, as well.

Often, economic conditions and objectives drive the ministries to different goals within the same issue, such as using forests for short-term financial benefit, or conserving them for long-term objectives. In the NR of Cameroon several institutional pitfalls were noted as well, such as difficulty in co-ordinating and integrating numerous stake-holders and their respective issues, poor co-ordination among government agencies and between donor project team and in-country team. Lack of awareness on the part of government agencies and the local people and lack of communication between the scientific community and policy-makers were mentioned as well. So although the parallel institutional structures offer good opportunities for synergy, further effort is needed to remove these constraints.

Capacity building is a term present in the recommendations of almost all international workshops and meetings, and also high on the national priority lists. This is because human and financial resources are inadequate. Lack of financial resources at the implementation process is addressed as a second important

pitfall. For CCD, the reason for this is that there is no central financial mechanism for projects under the convention. Although GEF is considering the options for a separate land degradation window now, this will not happen earlier than October 2002. In the next section we will go into this issue a little deeper.

8.4 A GEF window for land degradation

For CBD, the financial mechanism is the Global Environment Facility (GEF). For CCD, there is no financial mechanism. For the CCD, it is a big disadvantage not to be a focal area, hence not have a separate financing window, in GEF. Although some projects addressing land degradation issues are funded through one of the other four windows, the funding will remain minor and projects will always tend to be conceptualised through the paradigm of an other focal point. We have seen in the GEF study (Chapter 5) that projects under the biodiversity window, even if provided with a land degradation component, are based rather on the focal area itself than on linkage activities.

In May 2001, the GEF Council discussed the establishment of a separate focal point for land degradation. Quoting from the Council minutes, "the Council expressed strong support for strengthening the efforts of the GEF to finance activities addressing land degradation (desertification and deforestation), and it agreed that these activities should be enhanced while continuing the pursuit of the designation of land degradation as a focal area of the GEF. The Council fully recognised that the issue of land degradation is integral to the pursuit of sustainable development and poverty alleviation and synergies amongst the global environmental conventions."

The obvious advantage of this for CCD is that projects would no longer need to be subsumed under an other convention in order to have access to GEF funding. This will reduce the obligatory character of collaboration with CBD and others and thus will make synergy more balanced and more intrinsically motivated.

A CCD window will have advantages for CBD as well. Linking up with CCD, in fact all of the vast areas of multi-functional natural vegetation are opened up for CBD work, borrowing, so to speak, the national political credibility and local trust that come with CCD's focus on land, food and people.

9

Overall conclusion

The conclusions of this study may be divided into three substantive and two institutional aspects of synergy between CBD and CCD.

- One strong substantive aspect for synergy is the focus on multi-functional natural vegetation. Strong scientific causalities, but also international, national and local documents and priorities, indicate multi-functional natural vegetation as key area for synergy. This multi-functional natural vegetation has numerous different names in literature, such as vegetation cover, natural forest, rangelands, natural vegetation, *brousse*, pastoral areas and so forth but by and large, it includes all 'land-in-between', *i.e.* the land in between the protected areas and buffer zones on the one hand, and the arable land on the other. A focus of synergy activities on these lands will ensure the fulfilment of both land degradation and biodiversity objectives.
- Another genuinely shared element between CCD and CBD is the priority for the involvement of local people. An analysis of the various ways and means to implement this priority has viewed 'co-management' as the probably optimal arrangement. Co-management means close co-operation and negotiation of community and government agents, representing and protecting the local and supra-local visions and interests, respectively. Most CBD and CCD documents share a concern with the land tenure issue in order to reach CBD/CCD collaboration and joint action. They are more divergent and less outspoken, however, with respect to the ways the issue should be settled. Our recommendation here is to draw the consequence of the local people priority, and give full ownership to the local communities, with restrictions especially pertaining to supra-local and 'supra-present' interests (e.g. sustainability, biodiversity, nomadic rights, climate) connected to that land. These restricted regulations will often link up well with existing local traditions, but should be primarily negotiated and protected by the state during and after co-management negotiations.
- The third main substantive aspect is that of international versus national priorities, which is mixed with CBD's diversity-based paradigm versus CCD's land-based paradigm. The international documents of CBD have a focus on biodiversity. Of this concept, the 'bio' component links up well

with the CCD paradigm but the 'diversity' component much less. In this context, it may be noted that the national-level documents and project-level realities of CBD the focus is much more on relatively straightforward nature protection than it is on abstract biodiversity. This may be considered fortunate because at the local level in the multi-functional natural vegetation areas, creative compromises and win-win solutions between CCD's priority on people and CBD's priority on nature can often be designed. The major condition for this is that analyses and designs must be a joint undertaking from the very beginning.

These three general conclusions do not imply that other, locally optimal options for synergy are excluded. Another focus could for example be on agro-biodiversity preservation on arable lands, or on wetlands. From the analysed documents however, the three general conclusions came forward as the strongest.

Besides the substantive aspects of synergy, two institutional aspects and conclusions arise from this study.

- At the national level, the National Focal Points responsible for the NAPs and the Biodiversity Strategies, are parallel institutions. The process of reporting to the many conventions is a burden to member states, and integrating this process in a common framework with shared databases would both serve the co-ordination of two parallel institutions and the mitigation of double efforts and costs. The collaboration between CBD and CCD nevertheless should not exclude linkages with other conventions, especially the FCCC.
- The second institutional aspect at the international level concerns the issue of a financial mechanism for the CCD. The lack of such a mechanism is addressed as a constraint for synergy at all levels, international, national and local. The opening of a separate GEF window for land degradation would make the combined implementation of biodiversity and land degradation linkage projects less laborious and more balanced, i.e. truly synergistic.

The five overall conclusions of this report offer concrete issues for regional workshops to discuss and to implement further, e.g. in the joint formation of 'GEF-able' programmes and projects. This will be the subject of the last chapter.

Workshop recommendations

Part III:

This chapter focuses on a number of questions that may serve as discussion points for a possible workshop on CCD/CBD synergy involving the five countries studied in this report. The objectives for such a workshop could be, for instance:

- (1) to compare and discuss the findings of responding to the CCD and CBD questions;
- (2) to identify opportunities for further synergy and policy integration, internationally between the five countries but also at their own national and subnational levels; and
- (3) to arrive at a set of proposals of synergistic projects, for the GEF or other agencies.

Material to help address these objectives can be found in many pieces of the present report. For further guidance, underneath we have reiterated the conclusions of the previous chapter, followed by a number of possible workshop questions. These questions are especially geared towards objective nr. 3 (synergistic project design).

1. Between the cropped and the protected areas/bufferzones: the areas of multi-functional natural vegetation

Conclusion:

One strong substantive aspect for synergy is the focus on multi-functional natural vegetation among scientific communities, but also international, national and local documents and priorities include multi-functional natural vegetation as key area for synergy. This multi-functional natural vegetation has numerous different names in literature, such as vegetation cover, natural forest, rangelands, natural vegetation, browse, pastoral areas and so forth but by and large, it includes all 'land-in-between', i.e. the land in-between the protected areas and buffer zones on the one hand, and the fertile land on the other. A focus of synergy activities on these lands will ensure the fulfilment of both land degradation and Biodiversity objectives.

Possible workshop questions:

with the CCD paradigm but the 'diversity' component much less. In this context, it may be noted that the national-level documents and project-level realities of CBD do focus as much more on explicitly non-groundwater nature protection than it is on abstract biodiversity. This may be considered fortunate because at the local level in the multi-functional natural vegetation areas, creative compromises and win-win solutions between CBD's priority on people and CBD's priority on nature can often be designed. The major condition for this kind of design must be a joint undertaking from the very beginning.

These three general conclusions do not imply that other, locally optimal options for synergy are excluded. Another focus could be on the role of the 'ecosystem services' paradigm in the design of the wetlands. From the analysis conducted however, the three general conclusions come forward as the strongest.

Beside the substantive aspects of synergy, two institutional aspects are conclusions arise from this study:

- At the national level, the National Forest Policy responsible for the NAF's and the Biodiversity Strategies, are parallel institutions. The process of reporting to the many cooperatives is a burden to member states, and integrating this process in a common framework with shared database would both serve the co-ordination of two parallel institutions and the mitigation of double efforts and costs. The coordination between CBD and CCD governments should not exclude linkages with other conventions, especially the PCCC.
- The second institutional aspect at the international level concerns the issue of a financial mechanism for the CCD. The lack of such a mechanism is addressed as a constraint for synergy at all levels, international, national and local. The opening of a separate GEF window for land degradation would make the combined implementation of biodiversity and land degradation linkage projects less uncertain and more balanced. In Italy synergists.

The five overall conclusions of this report offer concrete issues for regional workshops to discuss and to improve further, e.g. in the joint formation of 'GEF able' programmes and projects. This will be the subject of the last chapter.

10

Workshop recommendations

This chapter focuses on a number of questions that may serve as discussion points for a possible workshop on CCD/CBD synergy involving the five countries studied in this report. The objectives for such a workshop could be, for instance:

- (1) to compare and discuss contents, styles and experiences of the countries' ways of responding to the CCD and CBD conventions,
- (2) to identify opportunities for further synergy and policy integration, internationally between the five countries but also at their own national and subnational levels, and
- (3) to arrive at a set of proposals of synergistic projects, for the GEF or other agencies.

Material to help address these objectives can be found in many places of the present report. For further guidance, underneath we have reiterated the conclusions of the previous chapter, followed by a number of possible workshop questions. These questions are especially geared towards objective nr. 3 (synergistic project design).

1. Between the cropland and the protected areas/bufferzones: the areas of multi-functional natural vegetation

Conclusion:

One strong substantive aspect for synergy is the focus on multi-functional natural vegetation. Strong scientific causalities, but also international, national and local documents and priorities indicate multi-functional natural vegetation as key area for synergy. This multi-functional natural vegetation has numerous different names in literature, such as vegetation cover, natural forest, rangelands, natural vegetation, brousse, pastoral areas and so forth but by and large, it includes all 'land-in-between', i.e. the land in between the protected areas and buffer zones on the one hand, and the arable land on the other. A focus of synergy activities on these lands will ensure the fulfilment of both land degradation and biodiversity objectives.

Possible workshop questions:

- Is this a sufficiently workable truth in general? What are the exceptions in each country?
- Is the underlying analysis in order?
- How may this principle be improved or elaborated?
- What are the possible 'hottest' areas in each country, e.g. the areas that combine high biodiversity relevance, high livelihood relevance and high pressure?
- Are selected areas in each country similar enough to indicate a joint proposal to GEF or others?

2. Co-management and land ownership

Conclusion:

Another genuinely shared element between CCD and CBD is the priority for the involvement of local people. An analysis of the various ways and means to implement this priority has viewed 'co-management' as the probably optimal arrangement. Co-management means close co-operation and negotiation of community and government agents, representing and protecting the local and supra-local visions and interests, respectively. Most CBD and CCD documents share a concern with the land tenure issue in order to reach CBD/CCD collaboration and joint action. They are more divergent and less outspoken, however, with respect to the ways the issue should be settled. Our recommendation here is to draw the consequence of the local people priority, and give full ownership to the local communities, with restrictions especially pertaining to supra-local and 'supra-present' interests (e.g. sustainability, biodiversity, nomadic rights, climate) connected to that land. These restricted regulations will often link up well with existing local traditions, but should be primarily negotiated and protected by the state during and after co-management negotiations

Possible workshop questions:

- Is it a basically workable truth that Cupertino between government and local people is a key notion for sustainable management of the multi-functional natural vegetation?
- If so, what is the role for NGOs?
- And how to arrange for inter-sectoral co-ordination?
- For each country, are national laws conducive to co-management?
- If not, do they allow, in practice, for specifically negotiated exceptions in project areas?
- Would it be advisable and possible to arrange for real but restricted ownership of the multi-functional natural vegetation for local communities?

- Are country contexts and experiences mutually relevant to a degree to indicate a joint proposal to GEF or other agencies?

3. Nature and people

Conclusion:

The third main substantive aspect is that of international versus national priorities, which is mixed with CBD's diversity-based paradigm versus CCD's land-based paradigm. The international documents of CBD have a focus on biodiversity. Of this concept, the 'bio' component links up well with the CCD paradigm but the 'diversity' component much less. In this context, it may be noted that the national-level documents and project-level realities of CBD the focus is much more on relatively straightforward nature protection than it is on abstract biodiversity. This may be considered fortunate because at the local level in the multi-functional natural vegetation areas, creative compromises and win-win solutions between CCD's priority on people and CBD's priority on nature can often be designed. The major condition for this is that analyses and designs must be a joint undertaking from the very beginning.

Possible workshop questions:

- Is this a basically workable truth?
- Is the underlying analysis in order?
- Do examples already exist in the five countries?
- What would be the institutional arrangement for truly joint analysis and design?
- At the local level, community trust and political support will probably be greater for CCD-like priorities for land, food and people than for CBD-like priorities for nature and diversity. Could it be that even the interest of nature protection might be served best if the synergistic project is somewhat biased towards the 'people priority'?

Taking these three together,

Possible workshop questions:

- Do the three principles guide the design of possible project proposals?
- If not, what other principles are needed?
- May these be agreed upon?
- May a set of projects be designed in each country such that a network for the exchange of experiences is justifiable to be included in the proposal?

- May a set of projects be defined such that they may act as a single, multi-country programme proposal?

4. Synergy of Focal Points

Conclusion:

At the national level, the National Focal Points responsible for the NAPs and the Biodiversity Strategies, are parallel institutions. The process of reporting to the many conventions is a burden to member states, and integrating this process in a common framework with shared databases would both serve the co-ordination of two parallel institutions and the mitigation of double efforts and costs. The collaboration between CBD and CCD nevertheless should not exclude linkages with other conventions, especially the FCCC.

Possible workshop questions:

- To what extent do Focal Points collaborate already?
- Do they need more integrated and streamlined reporting frameworks?
- Is collaboration with other conventions such as FCCC taking place already?
- Does this need to be explored further?

5. A land degradation GEF window ('focal area')

Conclusion:

The second institutional aspect at the international level concerns the issue of a financial mechanism for the CCD. The lack of such a mechanism is addressed as a constraint for synergy at all levels, international, national and local. The opening of a separate GEF window for land degradation would make the combined implementation of biodiversity and land degradation linkage projects less laborious and more balanced, i.e. truly synergistic.

Possible workshop questions:

- Is this true or will motivation for synergy rather decrease (e.g. temporarily)?
- May the workshop report be communicated to GEF such that the possibility of a new focal area be enhanced?

References

Berry, L. and J. Olson (2001), *GEF Land Degradation Linkage Study*. Washington DC, Global Environment Facility. GEF/C.17/Inf.7, also available at

http://www.gefweb.org/Documents/Council_Documents/council_documents.html.

Burke, L. (1997), *Reporting Requirements and Information Systems – Synergies Between the Conventions on Biological Diversity, Climate Change and Desertification and the Forest Principles*. Background discussion paper prepared for the expert meeting on synergies in Sede Boqer, Israel, 17-20 March 1997. Washington, WRI. 21 pp.

Esikuri, E.E. (ed.) (1999), *Drylands, Poverty and Development. Proceedings of the June 15 and 16, 1999 World Bank Round Table*. Washington DC, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.

Greenspan Bell, R. (1997), *A comparison of the three Rio Conventions and the Forest Principles for potential synergies: Food for thought*. Background discussion paper prepared for the expert meeting on synergies in Sede Boqer, Israel, 17-20 March 1997. 9 pp.

IUCN (January 2000), *Biological diversity of drylands and grasslands. Policy recommendations to the fifth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice*. Gland, IUCN Policy Recommendation Papers. 5 pp.

IUCN (May 2000), *Options for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in dry and sub-humid lands. Policy recommendations to the fifth meeting of the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity*. Gland, IUCN Policy Recommendation Papers. 3 pp.

Jorgensen, K. (1997), *Report of the chair*. Report of the Expert Meeting on Synergies among the Conventions on Biodiversity, Climate Change, Combating Desertification and the Forest Principles, Sede Boqer, Israel, 17-20 March 1997. 5 pp.

Mackenzie, R. (1997), *Coordinating implementation of the Rio agreements: institutional mechanisms and processes*. Background discussion paper prepared for the expert meeting on synergies in Sede Boqer, Israel, 17-20 March 1997. London, Foundation for International Law and Development. 9 pp.

Middleton, N. and D. Thomas (eds.) (1997), *World Atlas of Desertification*. Second edition. London, Arnold. Original edition: UNEP (1992) *World Atlas of Desertification*. London, Arnold.

UNDP/SEED (1997), *Synergies in national implementation. The Rio Agreements*. New York, UNDP.

UNEP (1992), *Convention on Biological Diversity*. Nairobi, United Nations Environment Programme.

UNEP (1996), *Convention on the Combat of Desertification*. Nairobi, United Nations Environment Programme.

UNEP (2000), *From policy to implementation. Decisions from the Fifth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity*. Nairobi, United Nations Environment Programme.

Van der Valk, F., M. Kriesch, J. Gupta and O. Kuik (2001), *The Climate Change Convention and other Multilateral Environmental Agreements*. Amsterdam, AIDEnvironment/IVM.

Van Gelder, M.J. (2001) *Synergy between CBD and CCD. A review of the state of the art, and an assessment for Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Mali and Senegal*. Thesis paper. Leiden, Centre of Environmental Science.

Relevant CCD documentation:

ICCD/CoP(2)/7 (17 November 1998), *Promotion and strengthening of relationships with other relevant conventions. Collaboration and synergies among Rio conventions for the implementation of the UNCCD*. Note by the secretariat. Also available at: <http://www.unccd.int/cop/officialdocs/cop2/doclist.php>.

ICCD/CoP(3)/9 (28 September 1999), *Review of activities for the promotion and strengthening of relationships with other relevant conventions and relevant international organisations, institutions and agencies. Collaboration and synergies among Rio conventions for the implementation of the UNCCD*. Note by the secretariat. Also available at: <http://www.unccd.int/cop/officialdocs/cop3/doclist.php>.

ICCD/CoP(4)/6 (1 November 2000), *Review of activities for the promotion and strengthening of relationships with other relevant conventions and relevant international organisations, institutions and*

agencies. *Collaboration and synergies among Rio conventions for the implementation of the UNCCD.* Note by the secretariat. Also available at: <http://www.unccd.int/cop/officialdocs/cop4/doclist.php>.

ICCD/CoP(4)/11/Add.1 (25 January 2001), *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its fourth session, held in Bonn from 11 to 22 December 2000. Addendum. Part two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties at its fourth session.* Also available at: <http://www.unccd.int/cop/officialdocs/cop4/doclist.php>.

ICCD/CoP(4)/AHWG/5 (27 February 2001), *Implementation of the Convention. Ad hoc working group. Provisional agenda and annotations.* Note by the secretariat. Also available at: <http://www.unccd.int/cop/officialdocs/cop4/doclist.php>.

Relevant CBD documentation:

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/5/9 (27 October 1999), *Biological diversity of dryland, mediterranean, arid, semi-arid, grassland and savannah ecosystems: Options for the development of a programme of work.* Note by the executive secretary. Also available at: <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.asp?lg=0&wg=sbstta-05>.

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/5/11 (23 October 1999), *Ecosystem approach: further conceptual elaboration.* Note by the executive secretary. Also available at: <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.asp?lg=0&wg=sbstta-05>.

UNEP/CBD/COP/5/INF/15 (26 April 2000), *Consideration of options for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in dryland, mediterranean, arid, semi-arid, grassland and savannah ecosystems. Possible elements for a joint work programme between the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Secretariat of the Convention to Combat Desertification on the biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands.* Note by the executive secretary. Also available at: <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.asp?wg=cop-05&tab=1>.

Selection of Internet documentation used:

Ecosystem approaches to the management of biodiversity in drylands. Information for the 14th session of the Global Biodiversity Forum in Montreal, 1999. Available at:

<http://www.igc.org/wri/biodiv/gbf/gbf14.htm>

Expert Meeting on Synergies among the Conventions on Biodiversity, Climate Change, Combating Desertification and the Forest Principles. Sede Boqer, Israel, March 1997. Documentation available at:

<http://www.bgu.ac.il/BIDR/events/synergy.html>.

Linking biodiversity and desertification: a strategic perspective. Workshop information for the 12th session of the Global Biodiversity Forum in Dakar, 1998, "Linking the biodiversity and desertification agendas". Available at: www.igc.org/wri/biodiv/gbf/gbf12-02.htm

National, Regional and Sub-Regional Reports submitted to the Conference of the Parties. NRs and NAPs to the CCD. Available on: <http://www.unccd.int/cop/reports/menu.php> and

<http://www.unccd.int/actionprogrammes/menu.php>

National Reporting. National Reports and Biodiversity Strategies submitted to the CBD. Available on:

<http://www.biodiv.org/world/reports.asp?lg=0>.

Synergies, UNEP's magazine on synergies between MEAs. On-line coverage at:

<http://www.unep.ch/conventions/synergies/synergies.htm>.

Synergies and Co-ordination between Multilateral Environmental Agreements. Documentation around the conference of the UNU on interlinkages in Tokyo, July 1999. Available on:

www.geic.or.jp/interlinkages/.

Workshop on Inter-Linkages, Synergies and Co-ordination among Multilateral Environmental Agreements. February 2001, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Documentation available at:

<http://www.iisd.ca/sd/interlinkages/interlink2/index.html>.

<http://www.biodiv.org>

<http://www.enda.sn/indexuk.htm>

<http://www.gbf.ch/>

<http://www.gefweb.org/>

<http://www.igc.org/wri/>

<http://www.iucn.org/>

<http://www.oecd.org/sah/about/cilss.htm>

<http://www.undp.org/seed/unsso/index.htm>

<http://www.unep.org/>

<http://www.unfccc.org/>

<http://www.wcmc.org.uk/>

<http://www.worldbank.org/>

and ecosystems is increasing every day, to the concern of many. Therefore, the United Nations Programme (UNEP) convened a working group of experts on biological diversity. This group had to explore the need for an international convention on biological diversity¹⁷. Eventually, their work resulted in the Nairobi Conference for the Adoption of the Agreed Text of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The convention, now the most important global biodiversity treaty, was open for signature at the UNCED in Rio de Janeiro (1992), and came into force on 29 December 1993. By now (April 2001), there are 189 Parties to the convention.

The convention calls on "the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources and by appropriate transfer of relevant technologies, taking into account all rights over those resources and to technologies, and by appropriate financing".

The convention identifies a problem that is global, and offers a framework for goals, policies and obligations. However, the responsibility for achieving these goals rests with the parties themselves. Biodiversity can be conserved through both "in situ" and "ex-situ" conservation. The first means focusing on conservation within the natural surroundings, for example at so-called "hot spots", the latter using ex-situ botanical gardens and gene banks to conserve biodiversity. As a framework of action the "ecosystem approach to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity" is being used. This approach follows the twelve Malawi principles, as formalised in a workshop on the ecosystem approach in Lilongwe, Malawi, in 1995¹⁸.

¹⁷ The definition of Biological Diversity: "The variability among living organisms from all sources including terrestrial, freshwater, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems" (UNEP 1992).

¹⁸ These 12 principles are: 1. The objectives of management of land, water and living resources are a matter of societal choice; 2. Management should be decentralised to the lowest appropriate level; 3. Ecosystems management should consider the effects (actual or potential) of their activities on adjacent and other ecosystems; 4. The explicit potential point from management, there is a need to understand the ecosystem in an economic context; 5. A key feature of the ecosystem approach includes consideration of ecosystem structure and functioning; 6. Ecosystems

Selection of Internet documentation used:

Ecological approaches to the management of biodiversity in drylands. Information from the 1998 Global Biodiversity Forum at Montreal, 1998. Available at: <http://www.igc.org/world/global/gb14.htm>

Expert Meeting on Synergies among the Conventions on Biodiversity, Climate Change, and Desertification and the Forest Principles. Sede Beqa, Israel, March 1997. Documentation available at: <http://www.igc.org/world/global/gb14.htm>

Linking Biodiversity and Desertification: a strategic perspective. Workshop information for the 12th session of the Global Biodiversity Forum in Dakar, 1998. "Linking the biodiversity and desertification agendas". Available at: www.igc.org/world/global/gb14.htm

National, Regional and Sub-Regional Reports submitted to the Conference of the Parties, NEAs and NAFAs to the CBD. Available on: <http://www.unep.org/cbd/cbd/cbd.htm>

National Agency, National Reports and Biodiversity Structures submitted to the CBD. Available on: <http://www.unep.org/cbd/cbd/cbd.htm>

Synergies. UNEP's magazine on synergies between MEAs. On-line version at: <http://www.unep.org/cbd/cbd/cbd.htm>

Synergies and Co-ordination between Multilateral Environmental Agreements. Documentation around the conference of the UNU on linkages in Tokyo, July 1999. Available on: www.unep.org/cbd/cbd/cbd.htm

Workshop on Inter-Linkages, Synergies and Co-ordination among Multilateral Environmental Agreements. February 2001, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Documentation available at: <http://www.unep.org/cbd/cbd/cbd.htm>
<http://www.unep.org/cbd/cbd/cbd.htm>
<http://www.unep.org/cbd/cbd/cbd.htm>
<http://www.unep.org/cbd/cbd/cbd.htm>

Annex 1:

CBD and CCD

The Convention on Biological Diversity

The threat to species and ecosystems is increasing every day, to the concern of many. Therefore, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) convened a working group of experts on biological diversity in 1988. This group had to explore the need for an international convention on biological diversity¹⁷. Eventually, their work resulted in the Nairobi Conference for the Adoption of the Agreed Text of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The convention, now the most important global biodiversity treaty, was open for signature at the UNCED in Rio de Janeiro (1992), and came into force on 29 December 1993. By now (April 2001), there are 180 Parties to the convention.

The convention calls on *“the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources and by appropriate transfer of relevant technologies, taking into account all rights over those resources and to technologies, and by appropriate funding”*.

The convention identifies a problem that is global, and offers a framework for goals, policies and obligations. However, the responsibility for achieving these goals rests with the parties themselves. Biodiversity can be conserved through both “in-situ” and “ex-situ” conservation. The first means focusing on conservation within the natural surroundings, for example at so-called “hot spots”, the latter uses zoos, botanical gardens and gene banks to conserve biodiversity. As a framework of action the “ecosystem approach to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity” is being used. This approach follows the twelve Malawi principles, as formulated in a workshop on the ecosystem approach in Lilongwe, Malawi, in 1998¹⁸.

¹⁷ The definition of Biological Diversity: *“The variability among living organisms from all sources including, inter alia, terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems”* (UNEP 1992).

¹⁸ These 12 principles are: 1. The objectives of management of land, water and living resources are a matter of societal choice; 2. Management should be decentralized to the lowest appropriate level; 3. Ecosystem managers should consider the effects (actual or potential) of their activities on adjacent and other ecosystems; 4. Recognizing potential gains from management, there is a need to understand the ecosystem in an economic context; 5. A key feature of the ecosystem approach includes conservation of ecosystem structure and functioning; 6. Ecosystems

The Conference of Parties (CoP) to the CBD meets once a year to report progress in implementation of the convention. The sixth CoP will be held in June 2002 in The Netherlands. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) functions as the funding mechanism for the CBD. Furthermore, the CoP is supported by a Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) and a permanent Secretariat.

The United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

The recognition of desertification as an important problem goes back to 1977, when a United Nations Conference on Desertification was held in Nairobi. This conference adopted the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, of which the implementation was left to the governments themselves, with the UNEP as an overall co-ordinating role. But the international efforts to combat desertification were not as expected, and so the need for a global treaty on desertification originated. The Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) was open for signature in October 1994 and came into force in December 1996. This first CCD-CoP took place in Rome in October 1997.

The objective of this convention is: *“to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought in countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa, through effective action at all levels, supported by international co-operation and partnership arrangements, in the framework of an integrated approach which is consistent with Agenda 21, with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in affected areas”*.

This convention is a convention driven mainly by the developing countries, particularly those of Africa. Emphasis lies on a “bottom-up” approach with strong local participation in decision-making. Many local NGOs are involved in the implementation of the CCD, which goes through National Action Programmes (NAPs). These NAPs are the core of the convention.

must be managed within the limits of their functioning; 7. The ecosystem approach should be undertaken at the appropriate scales; 8. Recognizing the varying temporal scales and lag-effects that characterize ecosystem processes, objectives for ecosystem management should be set for the long term; 9. Management must recognize that change is inevitable; 10. The ecosystem approach should seek the appropriate balance between conservation and use of biological diversity; 11. The ecosystem approach should consider all forms of relevant information, including scientific and indigenous and local knowledge, innovations and practises; 12. The ecosystem approach should involve all relevant sectors of society and scientific disciplines.

As of March 2001, 174 countries have ratified the CCD, with Australia and the USA as important new members in the past half year. The fourth CCD-CoP was held in December 2000 in Bonn, where the permanent Secretariat is also housed. The CoP is supported by a Committee on Science and Technology. As for funding, a Global Mechanism has been set up to promote the mobilization of financial resources. CCD has no window at GEF, although negotiations are ongoing. Affected countries depend on their own resources, as well as on bilateral assistance programmes and international organisations.

In March 1997, the first expert meeting on synergies was convened in Seix Boido, Israel. Subject of the discussions were the Conventions on biodiversity, climate change, combating desertification and the Paris Principles. The meeting was a response to the need to identify mechanisms and processes that effectively can promote synergies among many of the measures suggested by the conventions individually. The meeting was attended by representatives of all sorts of organisations and institutions.

The final outcome of this meeting was a document called "Synergies in national implementation".¹⁴ The booklet starts with the overview of issues and the identified linkages in the five instruments. The harmonisation of data collection and the co-ordinating of the reporting processes are specified in urgent needs and objective proceedings. Besides the need for support in developing country parties in the implementation (e.g. financial and technical), it also recognized the need for wider information on synergy in implementation, a "national implementation guidebook". As possible chapters or areas of interest such a document should cover, among other things, the rationale for synergy, and concrete recommendations on implementing the conventions synergistically. It should also address the issue of the reporting responsibilities, and the issue of public awareness and education.

> *CBP 12, December 1998, Dakar, Senegal*

The Global Biodiversity Forum devoted its 12th meeting to the exploration of synergies between the CCD and the various biodiversity-related conventions. This Forum was held in December 1998 in Dakar, Senegal, and was attended by 167 participants from 46 countries, representing multiple disciplines. The meeting summarized that the promotion of synergy is initiated by the Secretariat to the Conventions. But that the implementation of it is currently lacking co-ordination at all levels.

¹⁴ UNEP/SEED (1997), *Synergies in national implementation: The Five Agreements*. New York, UNEP.

with the United Nations Secretariat. The Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) was adopted on 17 June 1994 in Rome. It is the only international instrument that addresses desertification as a global environmental problem. The CCD is a legally binding instrument that provides a framework for international co-operation and partnership arrangements in the framework of an integrated approach which is consistent with Agenda 21, with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in affected areas.

The United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

The recognition of desertification as an important problem goes back to 1977, when a United Nations Conference on Desertification was held in Nairobi. This conference adopted the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, in which the implementation was left to the governments themselves, with the UNEP as an overall co-ordinating role. But the international efforts to combat desertification were not as expected, and so the need for a global treaty on desertification originated. The Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) was open for signature in October 1994 and came into force in December 1996. The first CCD-CoP took place in Rome in October 1997.

The objective of this convention is: *"to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought in countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa, through effective action at all levels, supported by international co-operation and partnership arrangements, in the framework of an integrated approach which is consistent with Agenda 21, with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in affected areas"*.

This convention is a convention driven solely by the developing countries, particularly those of Africa. Emphasis lies on a "bottom-up" approach with strong local participation in decision-making. Many local NGOs are involved in the implementation of the CCD, which goes through National Action Programmes (NAPs). These NAPs are the core of the convention.

-
1. The ecosystem approach should be based on the appropriate scales;
 2. Regarding the varying temporal scales and legacies that characterize ecosystem processes, attention for ecosystem management should be set for the long term;
 3. Management must recognize the change in availability;
 4. The ecosystem approach should seek the appropriate balance between conservation and use of biological diversity;
 5. The ecosystem approach should consider all forms of relevant information, including scientific and indigenous and local knowledge, institutions and practices;
 6. The ecosystem approach should involve all relevant sectors of society and scientific disciplines;

Annex 2:

Various workshops and meetings on the subject of synergy between MEAs

➤ *Expert Meeting on synergies, March 1997, Sede Boqer, Israel*

In March 1997, the first expert meeting on synergies was convened in Sede Boqer, Israel. Subject of the discussions were the Conventions on biodiversity, climate change, combating desertification and the Forest Principles. The meeting was a response to the need to identify mechanisms and processes that effectively can promote synergies among many of the measures suggested by the instruments individually. The meeting was attended by representatives of all sorts of organisations and institutions.

The final outcome of this meeting was a document called "Synergies in national implementation"¹⁹. The booklet starts with the overview of themes and the identified linkages in the Rio instruments. The harmonization of data collection and the co-ordinating of the reporting processes are stressed as urgent needs and concrete proceedings. Besides the need for support to developing country Parties at the implementation (e.g. financial and technical), it also recognized the need for written information on synergy in implementation, a "national implementation guidebook". As possible chapters or areas of interest such a document should cover, among other things, the rationale for synergy, and concrete recommendations on implementing the conventions synergistically. It should also address the issue of the reporting requirements, and the issue of public awareness and education.

➤ *GBF 12, December 1998, Dakar, Senegal*

The Global Biodiversity Forum dedicated its 12th meeting to the exploration of synergies between the CCD and the various biodiversity-related conventions. This forum was held in December 1998 in Dakar, Senegal, and was attended by 160 participants from 46 countries, representing multiple disciplines. The meeting summarized that the promotion of synergy is initiated by the Secretariats of the Conventions, but that the implementation of it is currently lacking co-ordination at all levels.

¹⁹ UNDP/SEED (1997), *Synergies in national implementation. The Rio Agreements*. New York, UNDP.

The Forum consisted of four workshops on the following themes: (1) Financial Innovations to Combat Desertification; (2) Linking Biodiversity and Desertification: A Strategic Perspective; (3) Traditional Knowledge and Desertification; and (4) Desertification and Climate Change.

The first workshop recommended that:

- National governments explore innovative financing mechanisms, and
- That they develop, implement and enforce legislation and regulations regarding the involvement of the private sector in desertification and biodiversity issues.

The second workshop tried to find solutions for the problem that synergy is promoted by the Secretariats, but co-ordination in implementation at global, regional, national and local levels is still limited. It recognized the importance of integrating the conventions in a legal, institutional and political framework, through:

- Remove perverse policy, legal, institutional and economic obstacles to synergy;
- Learning from case studies and best practices;
- Improve communications between stakeholders;
- Improve responsiveness of funding to grassroots participation;
- Use community empowerment.

The workshop on traditional knowledge suggested several further filling-ins for the need to involve indigenous and local knowledge, practices and innovation systems in joint implementation of CBD and CCD, such as

- The establishment of a technical unit for Traditional Knowledge within the CCD Secretariat;
- Develop linkages with CBD's working group on traditional knowledge as well as the clearing house mechanism;
- Create a database on traditional knowledge;
- Create incentives to conserve and promote traditional knowledge, like appropriate legislation and funding.

Finally, the workshop on Climate Change and Desertification found two key issues as linkages between the biodiversity, desertification and climate change agendas, namely

- How to adapt to climate change;
- The role of land use and forest activities.

The noted that the FCCC financial mechanisms (such as GEF) could assist the objectives of the CCD, and they strongly recommended the facilitation of the dialogue among the scientific and technical subsidiary bodies of the CBD, CCD and FCCC.

➤ *GBF 14, June 1999, Montreal, Canada*

A workshop on ecosystem approaches to the management of biodiversity in drylands was part of the 14th session of the GBF in Montreal, June 1999. Organised by the Green Earth Organization, IUCN West Africa, WRI and WWF Côte d'Ivoire, the workshop urged the SBSTTA to stress the need to conserve drylands biodiversity to CBD-CoP 5. Solutions were found in:

- Protected areas, monitoring systems and environmental impact assessment;
- Supporting of indigenous and local drylands natural resource management practices;
- Integration of implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions;
- Continuing support by GEF for drylands biodiversity conservation.

➤ *First interlinkages conference, July 1999, Tokyo, Japan*

The United Nations University, in co-operation with the Global Environment Information Centre (GEIC), the UNU Institute of Advanced Studies (UNU/IAS) and the UNEP, organised an international conference in July 1999 in Tokyo, Japan, called: "Inter-linkages: Synergies and Co-operation between Multilateral Environmental Agreements". It was attended by approximately 300 participants.

The objectives of the conference were comprised; inter alia, to foster discussion and interaction among international institutions, scholars and other relevant stakeholders who can co-operate to identify and examine opportunities, and to identify concrete mechanisms, next steps and feasible win-win paths forward on this important issue.

Discussions concentrated on five issues: harmonization of information systems and information exchanges, finance, issue management, scientific mechanisms, and synergies for sustainable development. A few things were stressed as the outcome of the conference, among others the placement of the synergy discussion in a larger social context, the finding of solutions in existing structures rather than in new ones, and the involvement of civil society, the private sector and the media. UNEP was pointed out as an important actor in mainstreaming the MEAs into the overall framework of development co-operation activities. Also underlined was the need for field-based examples to function as models.

➤ *Second inter-linkages conference, February 2001, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*

As a follow up of this conference, the UNU organised a second inter-linkages conference. Co-organizers were the Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment of the Government of Malaysia, the Ministry of the Environment of Japan, and the Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS) of Malaysia.

This second interlinkages initiative focussed on moving from overarching principles for developing synergies to on-the-ground activities and case studies. Several times the need for linkages between the global MEAs, the national governments, and local levels like local governments, NGOs, business and industry and the community, was emphasized. It identified that programmatic interlinkages at the global and regional scales were there, and that challenges were at the national level, including:

- Lack of government capacity;
- Separation of responsibility for MEA negotiation and implementation; and
- Lack of data and information.

Capacity building and access to information and data were noted multiple times. Some attendants repeated that the emphasis should be on the use of synergies and linkages that already exist, so that they are advantageous and effective, not counter-productive.

Annex 3:

Key Elements for CCD/CBD synergy in the CBD Programme on Dry and Sub-Humid Lands (Annex I of Decision V/23)

Underneath, an abbreviated listing is provided of relevant elements in the CBD drylands programme.

Objectives:

- promote stakeholder participation (art. 1d)
- aims at applying the 12 principles of the ecosystem approach (art. 3)
- build upon knowledge etc. of local communities (art. 3)
- assess biodiversity (art. 5)
- understand socio-economic value of biodiversity and consequences of loss (art. 6)
- understand merits of short-term, adaptive management (art. 6)
- understand appropriate water balance between people and biodiversity needs
- develop institutions for supra-individual management, e.g. (inter-)community (art. 10)
- develop institutions for conflict resolution of user groups (art. 10)
- develop alternatives and markets for responsible use of biodiversity

[Proposed] Activities

- develop indicators for biodiversity (act. 3)
- assess status of biodiversity (act. 1)
- identify areas of specific interest for biodiversity (act. 2)
- build knowledge, e.g. on grazing, agricultural expansion, ...)
- identify benefits of biodiversity and consequences of loss (act. 5)
- analyze impact of biodiversity conservation on the poor (act. 5)
- identification of best management practices of local communities (act. 6)
- establishment of additional protected areas (act. 7)
- restoration of biological diversity on degraded lands (act. 7)
- sustainable management of production systems and water (act. 7)
- apply economic valuation and instruments (act. 7)
- local training and capacity building for conservation (act. 7)
- strengthening of local institutions for resource management (act. 8)
- harmonization of sectoral policies (act. 8)

- diversify local incomes to reduce pressure on biodiversity (act. 9)
- promote current an innovative sustainable biodiversity harvesting (act. 9)
- develop markets for products derived from biodiversity (act. 9)

Additional elements from 'Possible elements for a joint work programme'

(UNEP/CBD/COP/5/INF/15), May 2000

- form a Liaison Group
- facilitate consultation and (sub)regional organisations
- facilitate an international network of demonstration sites
- prepare tools and guidelines to involve local initiatives and develop joint case studies
- facilitate joint reporting.

Annex 4:

Summary of the NAPs of Benin, Burkina Faso and Mali

Benin: Still in the process

The NAP of Benin is an ideologically much less compact document than the NAP of Burkina Faso. The NAP focuses on eight domains, the ones with most relevance for synergy being (a) conservation and protection of natural resources, (b) management of 'terroirs', and (c) support of community actions. Crucial issues such as tenure policy are mentioned often but do not seem to be resolved yet. Local communities are mentioned often but the first priority of the NAP is the strengthening of government and NGOs, not communities or POs. Often, exhaustive lists of possible actions are given in stead of choices being made. Sometimes, these enumerations do not seem to be clearly linked with drylands and desertification. Yet, with a view on possibly CCD/CBD synergy, three greater lines of analysis may be elicited from the NAP, two positive and one negative.

1. Respecting and strengthening of indigenous management practices

On page 53, it is remarked with some emphasis that many communities in Benin have traditional religion, culture, institutions, codes, rules, practices and techniques that protect that functioning of ecosystems. Examples given concern abstract belief systems that connect natural elements with proper behaviour, sacred forests, communal usufruct rights and land management techniques. Other examples that could have been mentioned concern the large-scale, inter-community hunting and fishing regulation institutions that are known from the middle and south of the country. This respect does not appear in the NAP as a formal lip service but as a genuine concern, recurring as it does on page 49 as part of the national Agenda 21 and on page 65 where, as part of the NAP proper, it is said that systematic research should be done into indigenous practices, law and customs that enhance the protection of nature, the conservation of natural resources, the regeneration of vegetative cover and the improvement of soils. Obviously, this connects well with objectives and activities in CBD's drylands programme.

2. North and South: extensive and intensive land use

The NAP displays great awareness of the strong differences between the (Sahelian) north and the (more humid) south of the country. This gradient runs parallel to a shift from very extensive land use systems in

the north to very intensive land use systems in the south. In theory as well as practice, both systems can be sustainable (desertification-free), if matched well with local circumstances and markets. In Benin, land degradation occurs at places of mismatch, especially where practices fit for extensive systems (such as using the brousse for procurement of manure, fallow, firewood and grazing) continue to be applied in situations where population densities, and hence brousse areas, necessitate more intensive land use. The NAP (35, 36) identifies these places but indicates as well that loss of forest and other natural resources is also occurring continuously overall, hence also outside the local desertification hotspots.

Actions to combat desertification are warranted in all areas, as the NAP states at many instances; these actions will be more curative in the hotspots and more preventive outside of these. Looking at options for CCD/CBD synergy more specifically, it would appear that the Northern region (roughly, the Bourgou) could be a key area for collaborative action. As the NAP indicates (e.g. 34), population densities are low, with 25 ha per household still available and conditions present for a truly extensive form of land use that may be kept sustainable, focussing especially on the prevention of further forest loss (see below). Such a collaborative action should necessarily be large-scale, embracing both the existing protected areas, the people's arable lands and the wide land 'in-between' into a single system, co-managed by the people and government together and allowing only negotiated access to external land users (see below).

3. *The tenure problem*

Whose land is this? Roughly, modern law says that a nation's land may be owned and used by all nationals, while traditional laws says that land can only be owned locally, with only locally negotiated access by outsiders. As the NAP mentions often (e.g. 11, 41, 77-79), this tension is as yet unresolved and at the same time, a source of insecurities that exacerbate desertification and conflict. At the individual farm level, for instance, a transition to sustainable intensive land use requires investments in the land, but why would a farmer invest in land that is not securely his? And at the community level, why would a community invest in forest protection, hunting regulations etc. if the forest or the wildlife may be entered or taken away any day by outsiders? As the NAP (77) states, modern and traditional law have their own limitations, but unresolved tension between the two makes matters even worse, both in terms of land use investments and in terms of land use conflicts.

For a project to be successful, people have to invest in each other, and for a project of a scale required for CCD/CBD collaboration, GOs, POs and NGOs will have great difficulty to do so if the tenure and access problem is not resolved, at least locally. As may be read from the NAP (77-79), the government is

moving only very carefully at the national level. This implies that for a collaborative action not to fall into a tenure pitfall, it will have to clarify and resolve the tenure issue before (or as part of) the action, in negotiations that involve the government and local people but also outsiders insofar their survival depends on the resources in question.

Connected to the non-resolution of the tenure problem the NAP does not make a clear choice with respect to local or supra-local decision-making in development work. The support and even "responsabilisation" of communities is mentioned often (e.g. 11, 49, 50, 65, 69), and lack of community participation is even identified as a source of problems in the implementation of Agenda 21 (52) but on the other hand, not much of this is visible in priorities or activities. As mentioned earlier, local communities are not mentioned in the NAP's general objectives (59). Another example is that the listing of activities in the "terroir" domain (66) shows that 'gestion du terroir' in Benin means something very different than in Burkina Faso; the list contains many sensible elements (such as reforestation and water points for cattle) but nothing on local empowerment. This even holds for the domain of "renforcement des capacités des communautés de base"(68).

Burkina Faso: Farmer and village in the centre of all action

"En conclusion, le lesson tiré de toutes ces expériences est la nécessité de placer le producteur rural au centre de tout action de développement". (55)

Three major lines run through the NAP of Burkina Faso that appear to be pivotal in order for synergy to be truly possible.

1. Emphasis on local and national poverty

Burkina is one of the poorest countries in the world. This well-known fact is mentioned in the NAP here and there, e.g. as a root cause of desertification (11, 24) and also connected to the need for poverty alleviation and the safeguarding of livelihoods as the first priority in project and policy implementation (e.g. of the NAP itself, p.61). This has led to the fact that in Burkina, the directly economic resource aspect of biodiversity prevails over the more basic, long-term ecosystem aspect of biodiversity and over the intrinsic value of nature conservation; the directly economic aspects are taken care of by a ministry, while the other aspects are taken care of by a broad national committee with only advisory power (37, 38). Biodiversity *strictu sensu* is mentioned in the NAP at a few places, e.g. species richness on pp. 23

and 26, but this is in a context of enumerating the decline of Burkina's resources in general, and not as a topic that requires much attention as a policy focus. Strategies aiming at CCD/CBD synergy will have to live by this fact.

At the national level, Burkina's lack of internally generated finances may explain the lack of concrete, auto-financed proposals in the NAP, in spite of the NAP's length and overall quality. 'Bring your own money' is an adage for anybody who wants to alleviate livelihood and biodiversity degradation in Burkina, and since Burkina's situation is not a result of bad governance, this is another matter that synergistic projects will have to live by. The NAP does deliver, however, a coherent framework for policy implementation (see points 2 and 3, below) and donor co-ordination (76-79).

2. *Emphasis on the 'brousse'*

In line with the foregoing, protected areas do not receive substantial attention in the NAP. Neither, however, does the other side of the land spectrum, i.e. the human habitations or the arable fields. The key to combat desertification is seen as lying in the land between the protected areas and the arable fields. This "couvert végétal", "jachères", "aires pastorales" or "ressources forestières naturelles" or "d'origine anthropique" are said to be in rapid decline (20) both in surface and in quality, due to firewood extraction (24), expansion of arable land (11, 24), overgrazing (11, 24) and bushfires (26), which in turn are linked to population growth and poverty.

The NAP does not give an analysis of the many functions the brousse has for local livelihoods, nomadic grazing, soil fertility maintenance or biodiversity. We may safely assume that this insight is present, however, because with respect to policy making, the brousse returns in the policy plan for agricultural research (33), the national forest management plan (34) and implicitly in the many references to land occupation and "gestion du terroir" at the village level, in which the natural vegetation plays an important role; the terroir, after all, is the whole village area including the brousse around it.

3. *Local empowerment*

After the 'productivistic' and 'sectoral' phases of its development paradigm, Burkina Faso has made a firm choice for local empowerment as its key development principle (40-42). Also in the NAP it is explained at length (69-76) that this is not a participatory approach in the sense that local people are allowed to have a say in what outsiders - ranging from firewood cutters to GEF project leaders - are

planning to do, but an approach in which the local level does the final decision-making, integrating all sectoral and national policies at the local level in a single whole. This is visible up to the level of national laws, such as the law on agricultural and tenure reform (39) and the national forest code (39), the national environmental action plan (33) and others. Theoretically then, the discrepancies between tenure law and local realities, cited as one cause of desertification (11, 24) should be a thing of the past.

Consequently in this approach, national laws and institutions are only a support for the local-level decision-making. Indeed the NAP states this at many instances where the national level is discussed. It is taken into account, however, that natural resources, biodiversity and social phenomena often have supra-local interactions, rationalities and values as well. With respect to the national forest code (39), for instance, the NAP states that on the one hand the code is made to stimulate local ownership of the forest lands but that on the other hand, the code aims to define the status of protected 'zones naturelles' such that local communities will manage these for conservation and use. The latter implies that supra-local interest continue to play a role; ownership is local but at the same time restricted (much like that in Western countries, private real estate ownership is subject to zoning restrictions). In the same vein, the NAP states that on issues that surpass the local level, such as nomadic routes, rivers, larger forests etc., the supra-local competence prevails (76).

All in all then, the Burkinabe development style is neatly in line with the CBD's ecosystem approach principle that management should be allocated to the lowest appropriate level.

Mali: Decentralized co-ordination for the co-management of the natural vegetation

"[La dégradation] des terres de culture et des pâturages se confondent, tout comme le sont les pâturages et les forêts". (146)

Two broad themes and one more special issue are emphasized in the CCD NAP of Mali. An institutional theme focuses on the multi-sectoral integration of objectives and frameworks, with prime decision-making at the local level. Parallel to that, a substantive theme emphasizes the need of protection and management of natural resources, especially the natural vegetation.

1. Institutional structures

Policy coherence (100), multi-sectoral approaches (63), "cadres de co-ordination" (13, 18, 66) are seen as preconditional for the solution of Mali's development problems.

This co-ordination has a horizontal aspect, for each organisational level between the international and the local. Internationally, Mali is at present working on the coherence of its implementation of CCD, CBD, FCCC and other conventions (20, 100). At the national level, the NAP contains reference to nine thematic PANs (programmes d'action nationaux), dealing, or instance, with natural resources, environmental information and renewable energy. At the sub-national level, nine PARs (programmes d'action regionaux) have been prepared, in consultation of government, NGO and donor organisations. These PARs are multi-thematic, each focusing on of the region's major environmental problem. At the local level, eight pilot PALs have been prepared.

The system of PANs/PARs/PALs also serves for the vertical integration between the three levels. The PANs set the "cadres de référence" (20) for the lower levels, and the PARs specify this framework for the regions at hand. Formal priority is given, however, to the local level because it is there that the various sectors and themes really come together, under the guidance of local administration, people's organisations and NGOs. Thus, Mali seeks to find a new equilibrium between local and national energies and rationalities.

At the background of this attention to institutional renewal is the insight that many of Mali's development problems have been caused by top-down and sectoral planning (13), which resulted in contradictions and lack of efficacy (66). This, together with the continuous decline of Mali's agricultural production has led to indifference of local populations to development proposals (8).

2. Substantive choice: natural vegetation

The consultative process to establish Mali's overall national environmental policy plan has been merged with that of preparing the CCD NAP, which underscores the priority given to the combat of desertification in Mali. Although acute desertification is visible as yet only in the arid north (climate-driven) and around the larger cities (people-driven) (13, 84), the overall decline of agricultural production is indicative of large-scale land degradation. Preventive action against acute desertification is highly necessary, however (64). With only 25 people per km² in the most densely populated south of the

country, Mali's agriculture is largely still in the extensive phase, hence highly dependent on the soil-regenerative capacity of the natural vegetation used for fallow and cattle. The ongoing decline of Mali's forest areas (13) is therefore directly linked to the agricultural problem and a cause of great worry. Overall, Mali's NAP makes a clear choice for the sustainability of its agricultural system, which implies (i) zoning and protection of the natural vegetation and (ii) improved integration of natural vegetation and arable land, e.g. through intensified coupling of cattle (manure) and cropping.

In somewhat more detail, the PARs of the various regions (excluding Bamako town) give the following picture (with the major problem between quotation marks):

- Kayes (126): "Conservation and restoration of arable land". Characterized by rapid arable land expansion and concurrent forest decline, this region opts primarily for sustainable intensification of arable land use. Forest protection is not mentioned.
- Koulikoro (130): "Preservation and management of forests". Faced by largely the same problems as Kayes, this region focuses primarily on forest protection and plantations.
- Sikasso (135): "Sustainable use of soil, forest and fauna". Although too humid to be officially classified as dryland, the overexploitation of soils and forest is as much a problem as elsewhere. Emphasis is put on transfer of knowledge for resource management and local empowerment.
- Segou (139): "Restoration of natural resources". With a population density of 25 inhabitants per km² coupled with "anarchistic" expansion of arable land and forest exploitation, all emphasis is put on local land use zoning and rational management of the agro-pastoral zones, including conflict management.
- Mopti (144): "Restoration and conservation of the agro-sylvo-pastoral space". Especially the non-wetland areas of this region suffer from the intertwined problem (see Annex) of soil, pastures and forest degradation. Emphasis is put on the interconnected improvement of the whole extensive ('agro-sylvo-pastoral') system, emphasizing arable soil conservation in the most densely populated areas and the protection of pastures and forest in the other. The wildlife resources of the region deserve special attention.
- Tombouctou (152): "Improvement of water management". This arid area survives largely on its water sources and their protection and management is the prime concern of the PAR.
- Gao (158): "Restoration of vegetative cover". The fragile natural vegetation of this arid region is its prime source and concern of sustainability.
- Kidal (162): "Water management". The as yet unexplored underground water reserves of this arid region are its major hope for the future.

3. *Special issue: building on positive experiences, and "real dialogue"*

At the national level, the "axes de le stratégique" roughly reiterate what has been brought forward already, with the exception of one element which is also the first mentioned of these "axes", namely, the preservation and diffusion of what has been accomplished already in the field (63). Soil and water conservation techniques are mentioned specifically here, but also participatory management and methodological tools to stimulate participatory research and action. Many of these positive experiences have been brought about in a "real dialogue" between outsiders' knowledge and traditional know-how. Somewhat speculatively, the image of "real dialogue" may be set as the overall paradigm of Mali's NAP: national and regional rationality and coherence are sought with fervour but local initiative and integration are put on the same priority level, thus setting the scene for a "real dialogue" between local and supra-local levels. This, in short, is co-management of natural resources.

