

# Review of Progress on the Implementation of the UK Overseas Territories Biodiversity Strategy

Report on meeting at Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, London  
14<sup>th</sup> March 2013



*'The meeting called for an open, collaborative approach across HMG, NGOs and UKOT bodies to develop a new Strategy.....'*

*JNCC, September 2013*

# Meeting participants

## Facilitator

Colin Clubbe, Kew.

## Attendees

### *Overseas Territories*

Tim Austin, Cayman Islands  
Nikki Chapman, St Helena  
Alison Copeland, Bermuda  
Gina Ebanks Petrie, Cayman Islands  
Mervin Hastings, British Virgin Islands  
Karim Hodge, Anguilla  
Bryan Naqqi Manco, Turks & Caicos  
Stephen Mendes, Montserrat  
Nick Rendell, Falkland Islands  
Hamish Stewart, Ascension Island  
Stedson Stroud, Ascension Island  
Liesl Torres, Gibraltar  
Nicola Weber, Ascension Island  
Kedell Worboys, UKOTA

Mat Cottam (reporting on OT Biodiversity Strategy Survey)

### *UK Government*

Sion Griffiths, FCO  
Julian Jackson, Defra

### *Non-Government*

Keith Bensusan, Gibraltar Botanic Gardens  
Sarah Brennan, Falklands Conservation  
Liz Charter, UKOTCF  
John Croxall, Falklands Conservation  
Jonathan Hall, RSPB  
Janice Panton, UKOTA  
Mike Pienkowski, UKOTCF  
Richard Smith, Buglife  
Clare Stringer, RSPB

### *JNCC*

Peter Bridgewater  
Elizabeth Moore  
Samia Sarkis,  
Tony Weighell

### *Observer*

Chris Mahon, IUCN UK

## Contents

1. Summary
2. Background to the Kew meeting and review of progress on the Implementation of the UK Overseas Territories Biodiversity Strategy.
3. Overview for the day: Peter Bridgewater
4. Views on the scope and purpose of the UK OT Biodiversity Strategy
5. Achievements in the context of the original Strategy priorities
6. Consolidating the Strategy - implementing current priorities
7. Extending the Strategy – carrying the priorities forward
8. Roles for OT Governments, HMG, OT NGOs, and UK & International NGOs in implementing the UK OT Biodiversity Strategy:

# Summary

## Reporting

This report summarises the views expressed at the UK OT Biodiversity Strategy review meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2013 at Kew Gardens. The meeting generated ‘a very positive and forward looking discussion’<sup>1</sup> which revealed both an enthusiasm for the Biodiversity Strategy itself and for working together in the future to carry forward the Strategy’s priorities. The discussion allowed the diverse individual and collective views of the participants to be expressed and recorded.

JNCC’s role in the review was clearly laid out before the consultations began, this role being to co-ordinate the consultation process, to provide material assistance to Territory attendees to ensure maximum participation and to record the proceedings of the meeting. Although JNCC has a significant Overseas Territories Programme it chose not to actively participate in the discussions at Kew to avoid a possible conflict of interest with its role of providing a written factual summary of views expressed by participants at the meeting. This report presents this factual summary.

The report presents the views expressed at the meeting in the simplest possible form and avoids any attempt at ‘blanket’ recording of the discussions. This approach ensures that the key points made by all participants are recorded<sup>2</sup> in the appropriate context, are clearly attributable and can be easily identified both by contributors and other readers. In soliciting written submissions to the review process JNCC asked that submissions be brief to ensure clarity (and this request was generally adhered to) and the meeting report adopts the same philosophy.

## Synthesis

In keeping with JNCC’s reporting role, the report itself does not attempt any synthesis of the wide range of views expressed over and above any synthesis that emerged at the meeting. As part of the structured discussions, however, clear views did emerge as to how the Strategy’s priorities should be met in future (see Section 5).

Participants identified the following priorities to carry the Strategy forward.

### *In general*

- The Strategy should become, in the future, a ‘responsive’ and ‘interactive’ process rather than continue to take the form of a written document which is periodically revised.
- In the words of the UK Overseas Territories Conservation Forum, the strong view of the meeting was that the strategy ‘needs to have a logical flow from the overarching strategy, through general objectives to actions and priorities.’
- Shared ownership of the Strategy across Government and non-Government organisations and civil society was essential.
- Actions taken must reflect individual OT needs.

---

<sup>1</sup> UKOTCF

<sup>2</sup> Participants have had the opportunity to review and edit their contributions through early drafts of the document.

- A sense of urgency needs to be communicated in respect of actions to be taken to safeguard biodiversity in the OTs.
- Regular reviews of the Strategy, and updates on its implementation are needed.

#### *Specific actions*

- Ensure sufficient levels of funding are available to meet the OTs needs.
- Ensure environmental legislation is in place in all of the OTs and is effectively implemented.
- Make available guidance on adapting UK legislation to fit the OTs.
- Use the Joint Ministerial Council to address fundamental cross-sectoral issues, in particular climate change.
- Use the Aichi Targets to set individual and collective targets for the OTs.
- Develop National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (the principal instruments for implementing the Convention on Biodiversity at the national level) within each Territory where these do not already exist.

### **Implementation**

The original Strategy document itself stressed that effective conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Overseas Territories will be achieved only through a partnership approach involving government, NGOs, and scientific institutions within the OTs themselves and in the UK. This collaborative approach was reaffirmed by the Kew meeting and the roles of Government, in the UK and OTs, and NGOs in future implementation was discussed (see Section 6) although it was clear that these roles are complex and cross cutting in many areas.

As explained above, the role of this report is to record and attribute key points made by all participants at the meeting. The summary of key actions identified by the meeting, and the albeit tentative assignment of roles, provides the basis for identifying mechanisms and responsibilities to carry the Strategy forward but, in keeping with JNCC's role in this process, these are not explored in this document. Developing such mechanisms, identifying and assigning roles, is for the relevant Government Departments (UK and OT) and NGOs to discuss and agree.

Although JNCC's role in this review was deliberately and carefully limited to organising and reporting on the process it is worth mentioning, as a conclusion to this summary, that the organisation has already responded to the Kew discussions, and wider related consultations relevant to its own OT work. The nature of this response is summarised elsewhere<sup>3</sup> but has focused to date on strengthening the capacity of the OTs to share experience with each other and UK experts through focussed working meetings and reviewing the relevance of the Aichi targets to the OTs. JNCC's OT programme will continue to evolve to support Territory priorities in the context of a revitalised OT Biodiversity Strategy.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4374>

# Background to the Kew meeting and review of progress on the Implementation of the UK Overseas Territories Biodiversity Strategy

## 1. Background

1.1 The UK Overseas Territories support unique ecosystems and a large number of rare and threatened species, many of which are found nowhere else in the world. Effective conservation of biodiversity in the OTs is essential if the UK is to meet the 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets, as well as commitments under other relevant Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). The main threats to biodiversity in the Overseas Territories are invasive non-native species, climate change and habitat loss.

1.2 To assist the OTs address threats to biodiversity, and to provide a framework for UK Government support, Defra published, in 2009, the 'Strategy for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the UK Overseas Territories' ('the Strategy')<sup>4</sup>. The overarching objective of the Strategy is 'to enable the UK and Overseas Territory Governments to meet their international obligations for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Overseas Territories'.

1.3 The 1999 White Paper 'Partnership for Progress and Prosperity: Britain and the Overseas Territories' stressed that primary responsibility for biodiversity conservation and wider environmental management in the Overseas Territories has been devolved to the Territory governments, who, with the support of the UK Government, are responsible for developing appropriate, applicable and affordable environmental policies, legislation and standards. The Strategy itself stressed that effective conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Overseas Territories will be achieved only through a partnership approach involving government, NGOs, and scientific institutions within the OTs themselves and in the UK and elsewhere.

1.4 The Strategy identified priorities for the UK Government's support for biodiversity conservation in the Overseas Territories as follows:

- i. obtaining data on the location and status of biodiversity interests and the human activities affecting biodiversity to inform the preparation of policies and management plans (including baseline survey and subsequent monitoring);
- ii. preventing the establishment of invasive alien species, and eradicating or controlling species that have already become established;
- iii. developing cross-sectoral approaches to climate change adaptation that are consistent with the principles of sustainable development;
- iv. developing tools to value ecosystem services to inform sustainable development policies and practices;
- v. developing ecosystem-based initiatives for the conservation and sustainable use of the marine environment.

1.5 The Strategy provides the basis for the three UK Government departments (Defra, DFID and the FCO) to work collectively, and individually, with support from JNCC, to enable the UK and Overseas Territory Governments to meet their international obligations for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.defra.gov.uk/publications/files/pb13335-uk-ot-strat-091201.pdf>

the Overseas Territories. This support for the OTs involves the following priority actions:

- i. ensuring that UK Government strategies and policies for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Overseas Territories are sufficient to meet the UK's international commitments, taking account of Territories' individual legislative systems, capacity and other factors;
- ii. providing effective, co-ordinated UK Government support for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Territories;
- iii. helping Territory governments to understand and meet international commitments and support their engagement in relevant international processes;
- iv. championing, within Whitehall and more widely, the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Territories.

1.6 The Strategy identified two overarching principles to be adopted by the UK Government in addressing the priority actions:

- i. to provide financial support (within the resource limits of each department) to address the priority actions, facilitating access to other sources of funding, and helping to build capacity within the Territories;
- ii. to improve the flow of information and advice with and between the Overseas Territories, and supporting engagement with regional and international initiatives.

1.7 Defra has taken the lead in co-ordinating the work of this partnership by chairing a cross-departmental official-level group (the Overseas Territories Biodiversity Group) with responsibility for overseeing delivery of the UK Government's support for biodiversity conservation in the Overseas Territories. JNCC provides specialist support to this group.

## 2. Review of progress on implementation

2.1 The Strategy for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the UK Overseas Territories was published in 2009. Since the publication of the Strategy the importance of biodiversity, and wider environmental issues, in the EU's overseas entities has been recognised by UK and EU institutions and international organisations such as the IUCN. The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity established by the Convention on Biodiversity for 2011-2020 sets strategic goals and targets (collectively known as the Aichi Targets) which are relevant to the UK's international obligations and those of the OTs themselves.

2.2 The UK Government published, on 28 June 2012, a White Paper setting out its overall approach to the Overseas Territories. The White Paper focused on three goals: strengthening engagement between the UK and the Territories; working with the Territories to strengthen good governance, public financial management and economic planning where this is necessary; and improving the quality and range of support available to the Territories. The White Paper recognised the importance of biodiversity within the UK's OTs and highlighted measures being taken by Government and non- Government organisations to address conservation management needs in the OTs and advocated the application of 'exemplary environmental management' in the uninhabited OTs.

2.3 The UK Government has funded environmental projects in its OTs through major schemes such as the Darwin Initiative and the Overseas Territories Environmental

Programme. These have been complemented by a range of other funding streams which provide support to OT projects directly or through UK Government agencies. The Government has recently announced the new Darwin Plus: Overseas Territories Environment and Climate Fund which will exclusively support OT environmental projects.

2.4 There have been significant developments in some of the OTs since the Strategy was published, including establishment of large Marine Protected Areas in BIOT and South Georgia, a major rat eradication programme on Henderson Island, and development of action plans and strategies focussing on establishing priorities for action in individual Territories. UK Government has initiated projects in the last two years to identify priority biodiversity (Defra), climate change (DFID) and environmental (FCO) issues in the OTs. NGOs have also conducted reviews and prioritisations, such as the FIELD / RSPB review of environmental governance.

### 3. Scope and purpose of the review

3.1 The objective of the Kew meeting was to allow the three interest groups, collectively and/or individually, to:

- i. present their views on the scope and purpose of the Strategy;
- ii. examine the nature of OT biodiversity work undertaken or supported by the UK Government and its agencies since the publication of the Strategy and relate this to the original priorities identified by the Strategy (Section 1.4 of this note);
- iii. identify priorities for future action 'to enable the UK and Overseas Territory Governments to meet their international obligations for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Overseas Territories' based on priority setting exercises currently in progress or recently completed by Government and non-Government organisations within the UK and in the OTs themselves;
- iv. as far as possible reach a consensus on the extent to which actions already taken, in progress or planned, address the identified priorities for future action;
- v. as far as possible reach a consensus on the identity of those issues which on the basis of past actions and identified future priorities are not adequately addressed by the Strategy and identify options which might be implemented to remedy this.

## Overview for the day: Peter Bridgewater (JNCC)

Peter Bridgewater introduced the programme for the day and stressed the following points:

- The importance of implementing the UK OT Biodiversity Strategy (the 'Strategy') was emphasised. Creative ideas from OTs, NGOs and other parties are considered to be crucial to its development.
- Peter Bridgewater referred to a new publication, *Novel Ecosystems: Intervening in the new ecological world order*<sup>5</sup>, in relation to adaptations and changes to existing ecosystems. He asked attendees to consider to what extent the UK Overseas Territories Biodiversity Strategy is helpful in dealing with emerging environmental issues.
- The primary aims of the session were to review the OT Biodiversity Strategy's value in line with OTs needs, and discuss its future direction. In particular:
  - Assess what has or has not happened.
  - To determine what are the current OT biodiversity conservation priorities.
  - Consider if the current priorities are reflected in activities?
  - Is there a need for inclusion of measurable targets within the Strategy?
  - Discuss who owns the Strategy.
  - Recognise the importance of looking forward.
  - Recognise the need to focus on pushing forward the Strategy through OT conservation work, sustainable use of resources, and avoidance and mitigation of threats to biodiversity.
  - Use the meeting as a collective opportunity to shape the future of the Biodiversity Strategy, capturing the main issues and building consensus amongst Territories.

---

<sup>5</sup> 2013, Hobbs, R J, Higgs, E S, Hall, C M (Eds)

# **Views on the scope and purpose of the UK OT Biodiversity Strategy**

## **OT Biodiversity Strategy Survey**

**Dr Mat Cottam<sup>6</sup>**

Dr Mat Cottam undertook a remote survey aimed to gain opinions from government bodies in the Territories on the value of the Biodiversity Strategy, and the context in which it is applied, as perceived by the Territories themselves. The survey was based on 3 issues – Local Issues, the Strategy itself and Funding and Assistance. In the context of these three issues a total of 60 questions were posed with respondents invited to make positive and negative statements with a numerically rated response required.

Future surveys can build on the format applied in this survey. As the intention was to make the data relevant and transparent, the report includes the raw data as well as an interpretation of it. This offers the OTs a chance to interpret the data in their own way. The report is available on the JNCC website – see footnote.

The survey results gave useful insights into commonality and differences between the territories, with scope for improvement in these areas.

General views from survey results were:

- The UK OT Biodiversity Strategy is worth developing, but needs to be more of a working Biodiversity Strategy with measurable targets.
- The Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) offers a valuable common language for Territories and the UK to understand the unique problems posed for the territories.
- There is a strong need for political will from the UK to support the OTs in utilising the Strategy for their benefit and use of the CBD in support of local Territory and UK actions.

---

<sup>6</sup> Cottam report on JNCC website – <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4374>

## **Individual NGO views on the OT Biodiversity Strategy**

Attending representatives from each of the NGOs made written submissions<sup>7</sup> prior to the review session, and gave brief summaries on the day.

### **Buglife**

- Have only been with OTs 4 years and are helping fill gaps in conservation delivery, and with protection of endemic and threatened invertebrates. Their activity is mainly UK-based.
- They feel that OTs need to improve their evidence base and survey capacity for biological data, particularly regarding invertebrates.
- OTs not only need the capacity to gain evidence, but also to use the evidence after having gained it.
- Fewer than 10% of projects benefit invertebrates directly however most projects indirectly benefit this group.
- Statistical data is lacking.
- Positives developments include successful eradications of IASs on some islands.
- Buglife has had limited success in engaging OTs in the South Atlantic, but not Caribbean.

### **Falklands Conservation**

- There have been numerous reviews – we already know priorities in many areas and need to move forward to implementation.
- As a Birdlife partner, has access to considerable additional specialist knowledge; also strong links with the RSPB.
- Biodiversity Strategy needs to do more to implement targets in alignment with Aichi and CBD targets.
- The OTs can only move forward with resources and political will.
- Biodiversity assessment needs to be used in government policy and planning.
- IAS eradication should be improved and general awareness of invasive species raised.
- Bio-security is a priority issue, especially in relation to transshipment ports, including for cargo destined for South Georgia.
- Marine spatial planning is particularly needed.

---

<sup>7</sup> Web address to be added when documents posted to site.

- Education, capacity-building, enhancing core capacity and training should be priorities but funding (and funding sources) are lacking.
- FC felt that they should have been included in the OT Survey as they deliver much of the biodiversity work in the Falklands.
- The large number of applications for the new 'Darwin Plus' fund, and extension of the fund to a wider range of environmental issues, means funding for biodiversity actually reduced;
- The JNCC ACAP Officer, based in the South Atlantic has provided excellent support for the region and is a precedent to be emulated.

## **RSPB**

- Pleased with original direction of the Biodiversity Strategy, but it needs to be underpinned by an Implementation Plan.
- Concerned about the low level of HMG involvement (especially participation from Departments like MOD, DCMS, DECC): it's important for Defra to endorse the Biodiversity Strategy and HMG needs to take ownership of it in order for the OTs to receive resources.
- RSPB helps with capacity building via their partner organisations (both OT Governments and NGOs).
- Still need better environmental impact assessment procedures in most territories, but remoteness is an issue.
- The RSPB also lobby the UK government. Also lobbying the EU parliament for OTs to access LIFE funding.
- They feel that Defra's role is very important and are therefore disappointed that no current Defra Minister or official has visited any of the OTs on official business<sup>8</sup>.
- The JNCC advisory team has a small budget and is based too far away from the OTs. There's a need for more policy and implementation within the Biodiversity Strategy. Defra need to influence the funding direction for when more finance is available in the future.

## **UKOTCF**

- Summaries of UKOTCF's contributions to this issue are in the circulated papers supplied (and are on [www.ukotcf.org](http://www.ukotcf.org)); there is also an introduction summarising the summaries; and this presentation is a few summary points from this summary of summaries.

---

<sup>8</sup> Previous Defra officials/ministers have visited the OTs.

- The UKOTCF is a body which builds capacity in its UKOT and CD partners and pulls together their views; in this context, it has itself organised workshops (involving also Territory and HMG participation) to discuss the Strategy and these should be seen as a contribution to this debate.
- The Strategy development should involve fully NGOs as well as government bodies if it is to be successful; it should include also other appropriate government bodies
- The Strategy should have clear objectives, approaches and measurable targets embodied within it, and a mechanism for flexibility to meet changing situations.
- The Aichi targets represent a possible linkage mechanism, and the 2011 UKOTCF workshop (report available on [www.ukotcf.org](http://www.ukotcf.org)) explored with UKOT/CD bodies, HMG and other partners how this might be meshed with Environment Charter and other commitments .
- Funding is a major issue with significant competition for funds and the OTs are at a disadvantage because of the increasingly remoteness of HMG fund decision-makers from those with direct experience of UKOT conservation projects and conservation grant programme management,. It seems that the new Darwin Plus programme suffers from this and other problems.
- There is a clear need for better environmental impact assessment in the OTs, and HMG should be encouraging and monitoring this.
- Lottery funding should be made available to the OTs and their supporting bodies in Britain – not just in theory as at present, but in practice.
- Building capacity is fundamental, as is environmental education, and these have been central to UKOTCF activities.
- The exclusion of Crown Dependencies (except via UKOTCF) at this meeting is to be regretted, and every opportunity in future should be taken to engage them – to mutual benefit

## **UKOTA**

- Commended the opportunity for an informal discussion.
- They represent and protect the collective interests of the OT Governments
- There is an environmental ‘common area’ in the need to protect and conserve existing biodiversity and all aspects of the natural environment in unique island territories.
- The Overseas Territories Biodiversity Group represents a significant and valuable cross department link for OT biodiversity work;
- Recognised Eric Blencowe’s (Defra) efforts in pushing forward the Biodiversity Strategy in his previous role, and his commitment to the OTs.

- Many similar projects are being carried out across the OTs, such as work on coastal erosion and shores. UKOTA can play an important role in providing a sharing mechanism for information to be exchanged where there are information overlaps.
- They feel that Defra's commitment is currently low to zero, which is not in tune with the UK Government White Paper.
- Sustainable development in the OTs can only be possible in the context of sound environmental management.
- The OTs must be consulted in development of the Strategy but dealing with continuous requests for information is an issue.
- Funding aspirations must be realistic and UKOTA believes we are fortunate in having the Darwin Plus funding available.
- In an EU context, OCTA has a lobbying role that should be recognised.

## Summarised views from UK Government

### Defra

- Explained that the process of replacing Eric Blencowe's role is ongoing so there will be no dedicated role for the moment.
- Responded to the lack of commitment claim, explaining that the work on OT issues is currently done by several people; the perception of 'zero' commitment is inaccurate; there is just no dedicated role at the moment.

### FCO

- Progress has been made (e.g. HMG's White Paper, etc) but there is still much more work to do.
- Agreed that MOD need to be brought onboard and the environment needs to form a key and more significant part of the JMC discussions.
- FCO is committed to current spending levels over the duration of the spending review period but in these difficult times we need to be realistic. Most other budgets across Whitehall have been reduced and to be able to maintain our current levels of funding is quite an achievement.
- The current financial climate is putting increasing pressure on departmental spending and staffing levels. We are committed to ensuring that we have the mechanisms and staff in place to enable the Territories to access the resources they need from within HMG. We have to make the most of the programmes that are currently available (such as mainstreaming initiative, Darwin Plus etc) and be well positioned to take advantage of the opportunities that could arise as the economic climate improves.
- Sion Griffiths thanked Mat Cottam for his survey and report; both valid and useful as the OTs need to be listened to.
- Explained that DFID are currently recruiting for the relevant post, hence the reason for the absence of a representative.
- FCO was waiting for a new sustainable fisheries manager to start. Agreed that there is a need to communicate the importance of OT biodiversity more widely and all work together.
- Explained that they are pursuing the issue of OT access to lottery funding with the relevant departments.
- FCO will report later in the year on the progress made against the priority actions agreed in the JMC communiqué.

## **Views common to most parties on actual and potential value of the strategy**

- **Value of the Strategy:**

- The strategy is already valuable, but needs SMART targets.
- The Strategy would be more valuable if targets were linked to the CBD Aichi targets.
- The Strategy recognises that each Territory is different, despite common issues.

- **Resources – financial and human:**

*General*

- More help is needed to meet OT requirements for essential baseline environmental/biodiversity information.
- Implementation of the Strategy is dependent on OTs securing sufficient resources and sufficient political will within the Territories.
- General lack of resources has had a range of impacts.

*Information sharing, communication, capacity*

- The UKOTCF emphasised that it had organised workshops the outcomes of which could be used to further the development of the Strategy.
- OTs need more access to information and also need opportunities to exchange ideas and experiences.
- Many problems are common to all OTs; therefore OT views (both governmental and NGO) are central to the decision-making process. They need to pass on information and seek advice.
- There is a crucial need to fund capacity building in the OTs.
- More resources are needed to back up the Biodiversity Strategy and provide/share information in OTs.
- Need wider awareness of capacity constraints on OTs; some OTs perceive their limited capacity as being underappreciated by others outside the OTs.

*Funding*

- Lottery funds are available to UK bodies/NGOs but only for projects undertaken in the UK which is a situation that needs to be remedied.

- A larger fund is needed to support OT environmental work with access to UK Lottery Funding, and EU funding, especially LIFEPlus.
- Environmental funding needs to increase in the long term, but vital not to lose current levels of funding and to ensure that these require delivery in OTs with concurrent capacity-building of OT-based stakeholders.
- Darwin Plus can provide some assistance, but OTs need to also look at EU funding opportunities (though recognising that the application process is very challenging for small organisations/OTs). It may be possible to learn from other European countries' (French, Dutch, Danish) OTs and OCs.
- Biodiversity in the OTs is highly important, the lack of funding is a huge issue, however OTs need to be realistic in the current economic situation.

- **Progress:**

- In UK*

- Absence of DFID, DECC, DCMS, and MOD creates difficulty in OTs' engagement with these bodies – several OTs and NGOs criticised this absence.
    - More Defra involvement is needed in OT environmental issues.
    - A key need is the appointment of the OTs post in Defra (in progress, but will not be a dedicated role). DFID is actively recruiting to OTs post (unclear whether this will be dedicated). The MoD, DCMS and DECC need to make greater commitments.
    - Need greater engagement by UK Government with NGOs.
    - Need better links between NGOs, OT Governments and HMG.
    - HMG endorsement of the Strategy needs to be strong.
    - OTs environmental issues need to increase in importance in JMC.

- In Territories*

- In some territories the conservation message is starting to reach the politicians but more work is needed.
    - Many reviews have been completed but implementation of conclusions of these reviews is still lacking.
    - Need core capacity development in the OTs.

- Political leaders of OTs need to be proactive and bring politicians and environmental interests together.
- Many OT politicians don't make the link between environmental protection and sustainable development; it's essential to address this issue.

## **Achievements in the context of the original Strategy priorities**

### **1. UKOT Biodiversity Strategy priorities**

- i. Obtaining data on location and status of biodiversity interests (including baseline survey & monitoring).
- ii. Invasive Alien Species – prevention, eradication & control.
- iii. Cross-sectoral approaches to climate change adaptation consistent with sustainable development.
- iv. Develop tools to value ecosystem services to inform sustainable development.
- v. Develop ecosystem-based initiatives for the marine environment.

### **2. What has been done so far?**

#### **General achievements:**

- Data are becoming available through OTs working in partnership with NGOs.
- Adoption of some of the Aichi targets has been undertaken by several OTs.
- Communication between NGOs and OT governments has improved in many instances.
- A guide has been prepared to help Territories start the process of signing up to the CBD<sup>9</sup>
- Most OTs have negotiated and agreed Environmental Charters with the UK Government.

#### **Comments on extent to which Strategy priorities reflect current situation (in order of presentation)**

##### **Cayman**

- The Strategy is not particularly useful for holding Governments to account being more relevant to project level target setting.
- Integration of environmental issues into planning is important.
- Must be a requirement to have national legislation in respect of the environment.

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-6439>

- The Strategy should specify minimum requirements in the OTs.
- The goal of the Strategy should be integration of environment into all issues.

### **Bermuda**

- There is a role for NGOs to define gaps in national legislation and for Government to develop such legislation.
- The Strategy should stress the need for legislation and UK Government should take an active lead in encouraging OTs to adopt such legislation.

### **Anguilla**

- The Strategy needs to reflect and take account of OT administrative and legal structures.
- The JMC should be used to provide an annual check on progress in addressing key issues.

### **Turks and Caicos <sup>10</sup>**

- There is a need to recommit to the Environment Charters and to integrate environmental conservation into national decisions
- There is a need to secure specialist advice, as well as to share between government and NGO partners – and the need for UKOTCF-organised conferences and for HMG to resume support of these.

### **UKOTCF**

- The Strategy should be developed by a hierarchical approach with:

Strategic goals, from which:

Objectives are developed, and implemented by:

Priority actions, which could include, for example, development of legislation, implementation of these, capacity development, conservation projects, environmental education work, co-ordination and development/exchange of best practice

- The UK Government has a global responsibility to work to support biodiversity conservation through MEAs including the CBD.
- UK Government should encourage and support the OTs to join the UK in its accession to the CBD (as well as adding directly ruled UKOTs to its ratification without further delay).

---

<sup>10</sup> Text provided and verified by UKOTCF on behalf of TCI representative for final text of report

## **RSPB**

- The original purpose of the Strategy was to help the OTs meet their obligations and this should be adhered to.
- The UK Government, through the Strategy, should provide overarching support to the OTs in their work to meet international obligations. It needs to have its own vision for how these obligations are to be met.
- The UK Government should make an explicit commitment to bringing all OTs into the CBD.
- Aligning the Strategy to the Aichi targets would link UK Government and OT obligations.

## **Falklands**

- Main requirement for effective implementation of many existing priorities is appropriate legislation; capacity building, education and adequate resourcing for projects are coeval highest priorities.

## Strategy - implementing current priorities

### Individual Territory priority needs in the context of existing Strategy priorities Territory Views

Strategy Priorities	i Obtaining data on location and status of biodiversity interests (including baseline survey & monitoring).	ii Invasive Alien Species – prevention, eradication & control.	iii Cross-sectoral approaches to climate change adaptation consistent with sustainable development.	iv Develop tools to value ecosystem services to inform sustainable development	v Develop ecosystem-based initiatives for the marine environment
<b>Cayman</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regular review and assessment of data.</li> <li>2. Increase access to conservation funds;</li> <li>3. Create public/private partnerships;</li> <li>4. Identification of common biodiversity indicators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Require legislation on IAS &amp; bio-security control</li> <li>2. Increase access to conservation funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Require legislation</li> <li>2. Mainstream climate change actions</li> <li>3. Create public/private partnerships;</li> <li>4. Implement policies that are currently in draft form</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Require national sustainable development strategy</li> <li>2. Require transparent development planning process</li> <li>3. Create public/private partnerships;</li> <li>4. Implement policies that are currently in draft form</li> <li>5. Development of indicators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Require transparent development planning process</li> <li>2. Increase access to conservation funds</li> <li>3. Create public/private partnerships;</li> <li>4. Implement policies that are currently in draft form</li> <li>5. Identification of common biodiversity indicators</li> </ul>
<b>Ascension</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack long term project continuity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack long term project continuity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack long term project continuity</li> <li>2. EIAs needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack long term project continuity</li> <li>2. EIAs needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack long term project continuity</li> <li>2. EIAs needed</li> </ul>
<b>Falklands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Effective data management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overcome challenges posed by private ownership of many sensitive terrestrial sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Designation of protected sites needed</li> <li>2. Overcome challenges posed by private ownership of many sensitive terrestrial sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Effective data management needed to develop tools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Effective data management needed</li> <li>2. designation of protected sites needed</li> </ul>

Strategy Priorities	i Obtaining data on location and status of biodiversity interests (including baseline survey & monitoring).	ii Invasive Alien Species – prevention, eradication & control.	iii Cross-sectoral approaches to climate change adaptation consistent with sustainable development.	iv Develop tools to value ecosystem services to inform sustainable development	v Develop ecosystem-based initiatives for the marine environment
<b>Montserrat</b>	Upgrade of GIS biodiversity database.	1. Education and awareness raising. 2. Amendments to and enforcement of existing laws	1. Education and awareness 2. Mainstreaming Climate change into policy and planning to include a comprehensive adaptation plan.	1. Training of statisticians and economists to incorporate environmental economic evaluation into policy decision making	1. Strengthen the (Monitoring, data analysis, protected area management) of marine resources
<b>Gibraltar</b>				Waste and pollution management needed.	
<b>Anguilla</b>	1. Need to review and assess appropriateness of protected areas.	1. Need to overcome challenge posed by private ownership of most of their sensitive terrestrial sites 2. Challenge of indigenously self-declared protected areas.	1. Coastal erosion action plan; 2. need to overcome challenge posed by private ownership of most of their sensitive terrestrial sites 3. Challenge of indigenously self-declared protected areas; 4. Highlight benefits of climate change to the economy e.g. renewable energy income.		1.Coastal zone planning

**Strategy  
Priorities**

**i Obtaining data on location and status of biodiversity interests (including baseline survey & monitoring).**

**ii Invasive Alien Species – prevention, eradication & control.**

**iii Cross-sectoral approaches to climate change adaptation consistent with sustainable development.**

**iv Develop tools to value ecosystem services to inform sustainable development**

**v Develop ecosystem-based initiatives for the marine environment**

**BVI**

1. Coastal zone plan needed.

1. Waste and pollution management action required

1. Coastal zone erosion plan  
2. waste and pollution management action required

**Bermuda**

1. Economic valuation and assessment  
2. Implementation of species action plans  
3. Re-evaluate which species need plans;  
4. Environmental baselines should be established and accessible.

1. Explore accountability and transparency mechanisms (e.g. for uninhabited islands and OTs).

1. Work with NGOs  
2. Build links with civil society  
3. Explore accountability and transparency mechanisms

1. Economic valuation and assessment  
2. Implementation of species action plans

**NGO views**

**IUCN**

Make use of International standard for protected areas, 'IUCN protected areas categories'.

**Falklands  
Conservation**

1. Translate baseline data into policy and practice.

1. Improve bio-security and IAS management

1. Cross-cutting legislation required to increase capacity.

1. Develop protected areas and networks

## Extending the Strategy – carrying the priorities forward

<b>Priority issues identified by the OT Biodiversity Strategy</b>					
	<b>i Obtaining data on location and status of biodiversity interests (including baseline survey &amp; monitoring).</b>	<b>ii Invasive Alien Species – prevention, eradication &amp; control.</b>	<b>iii Adopt Cross-sectoral approaches to climate change adaptation consistent with sustainable development.</b>	<b>iv Develop tools to value ecosystem services to inform sustainable development</b>	<b>v Develop ecosystem-based initiatives for the marine environment</b>
<b>Strategic actions identified as necessary to carry priorities forward</b>	Develop National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), the principal instruments for implementing the Convention on Biodiversity at the national level.				
	Ensure environmental legislation is in place and effectively implemented <a href="http://www.rspb.org.uk/Images/EnvironmentalGovernanceReviewFeb2013_tcm9-342020.pdf">http://www.rspb.org.uk/Images/EnvironmentalGovernanceReviewFeb2013_tcm9-342020.pdf</a>				
		Provide guidance on adapting UK legislation to fit OTs.			
	Ensure actions reflect individual OT needs		Ensure actions reflect individual OT needs		
			Use Joint Ministerial Council to address this fundamental cross-sectoral issue		
	Use the Aichi Targets to set individual and collective targets for the OTs. <a href="http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4374">http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4374</a>				
	Ensure sufficient levels of funding are available				
	Communicate sense of urgency for actions to be taken to safeguard biodiversity in the OTs				
	Ensure shared ownership of the Strategy across Government and non-Government organisations and civil society				
	Ensure regular reviews of the Strategy and its implementation				

## Role of OT governments, HMG, OT NGOs, and UK & International NGOs in implementing the UK OT Biodiversity Strategy

Key Issues	OT Gov.	HMG	OT NGOs	UK/Int'l NGOs
Raise environmental awareness & communicate issues	✓		✓	
Communicate needs to UK agencies	✓			✓
Harness public/private partnerships	✓			✓
Establish & manage funds for biodiversity commitments	✓	✓		
Pass legislation	✓			
Develop processes/mechanisms for integrating environmental considerations into national decisions	✓			
Commit to environmental charter	✓	✓		
Enable local civil society	✓	✓		✓
Virtual themed 'pin-board' to share information	✓		✓	✓
Environmental education	✓		✓	✓
Ensure environmental obligations are met	✓	✓	✓	
Facilitate good communication/exchange of ideas	✓	✓	✓	✓
Provide local specialist skills & knowledge	✓		✓	
Project support & development	✓			✓
Help generate funding	✓			✓
Raise awareness of OT biodiversity issues for UK public				✓
Share specialist skills & knowledge				✓
Partner development - help build sustainable relationships and foster trust between partners				✓
Reach an agreement on the Biodiversity Strategy	✓	✓		
Provide financial support to address priority actions		✓		
Facilitate other funding sources		✓		✓
Build capacity		✓		✓
Improve flow of information and advice		✓		
Ensure UK strategies are in-line and supportive		✓		
Help OTs meet international commitments	✓	✓	✓	✓
Oversee OT environmental government structures		✓		
Assist with NBSAPs				✓
Set example in direct governance mechanism		✓		
Harnessing resources & expertise of UK agencies		✓		
Explore which Aichi targets are appropriate for OTs and develop a vision for how to meet these		✓		
Commit to environmental charter		✓		
Develop & extend indicators to OTs	✓	✓	✓	✓
Provide support for regular OT meetings		✓		