APPENDICES
Appendix 1

Report of key findings from the stakeholder survey on decent work in Nature-based Solutions

Summary

The UN Secretary-General’s Climate Action Summit in 2019 and most recently the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) have placed decent work and Nature-based Solutions (NbS) at the forefront of sustainable development ambitions. NbS cut across the three Rio Conventions and are central to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In addition, implementing NbS presents important challenges and opportunities for certain sectors of the economy. A shift to environmentally sustainable economies will involve transition for workers and enterprises in these sectors, emphasizing the importance of ensuring a just transition.

Recognizing that shift and the resulting transition for workers and enterprises, the ILO adopted the Guidelines for a Just Transition in 2015. They are both a policy framework and a practical tool to help countries at all levels of development manage the transition to environmentally sustainable economies; the Guidelines can also help countries achieve their Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC), National Adaptation Plans and the 2030 SDGs.

---

1 The UN Definition of NbS (contained in a resolution on NbS passed at the UN environment Assembly in March 2022) defines NbS as “actions to protect, conserve, restore, sustainably use and manage natural or modified terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine ecosystems, which address social, economic and environmental challenges effectively and adaptively, while simultaneously providing human well-being, ecosystem services and resilience and biodiversity benefits”.

Despite existing literature on the subject of jobs in NbS, there is presently no systematic, long-term effort to analyse, model, forecast and track the quantity and decent work dimension of jobs generated by investments in NbS or to monitor unpaid forms of work in NbS. The International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) are co-leading the publication of a global biennial report series on decent work in NbS, in collaboration with other partners, with the aim to fill this knowledge and advocacy gap.

The first ILO-UNEP-IUCN report on decent work in NbS contains a chapter (Chapter 4) that seeks to propose a conceptual framework for defining and measuring decent work outcomes of NbS. To support the development of the framework, a survey of stakeholders was carried out during the period May–June 2022. The objective of the survey was to help understand key policy questions and concerns, as well as types of information and statistical data that could be used for policy research as well as planning, implementation, and monitoring of employment, decent work and enterprise development in NbS resulting from NbS activities in terms of direct, indirect and induced employment and decent work creation.

This report presents the key findings from the survey according to the three main sections of the survey: (1) information about the respondent and their organization, (2) policy priorities and interests, and (3) information and data needs. Some of the report highlights are presented here.

Most of the respondents are senior managers or those working in policy design and implementation, research or project delivery. They usually work either in a national government department or agency, research or educational institution, or an environmental non-governmental organization (NGO). The focus of the respondents’ organizations is mostly on environmental management, restoration and conservation, including NbS and government and community services with a regional focus on Sub-Saharan Africa or Western Europe, Eastern and Central Europe, USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The most-cited policy areas or frameworks that best reflect the main entry points to the issues related to decent work in NbS are the SDGs and sustainable development, climate change mitigation and adaptation, NbS, just transition and green jobs, and decent work.

The majority of the respondents’ organizations have either moderately high or moderate involvement in both decent work and just transition policy matters, and NbS policy issues. In addition, there is relatively high interest overall in all topics related to decent work and just transition policy matters, with the most-cited topics being employment creation, skills development, and social dialogue. Similarly, for NbS topics, there is relatively high interest in
all listed topics, with the highest being in: NbS community and stakeholder engagement; NbS and employment, income, and livelihoods; and NbS by ecosystem type. The geographical scope of the work of the respondents’ organizations is mostly at the country level.

The most common uses of data and information among the respondents are communicating trends and performance to external stakeholders, internal reporting and key performance indicators, and scenario analysis and projections. Overall, all ten topic areas presented related to decent work and/or Nature-based Solutions surveyed are of relevance for the data needs of the vast majority of the respondents.

The most relevant category related to “Employment/Forms of work” for the data needs of the respondents is employment. Regarding data needs related to “Decent work”, respondents mostly selected employment opportunities; adequate earnings and productive work, safe work environment; and equal opportunity and treatment in employment. On the topic of “Income and livelihoods”, the preferred category is wages and salaries, followed by household income and consumption.

Regarding the topic of “Economic production”, the categories of productivity and value-added are among the most relevant for the data needs of the respondents. The most-cited data needs in relation to “Enterprise development” are on the topics of sustainable enterprise development and/or enterprise development in NbS, followed by occupational employment and skills needs.

Considering the topic of “Environmental outcomes and sustainability of outcomes”, environmental, social and economic sustainability of outcomes of policy interventions, investments, etc. are the most relevant in terms of data needs. Among the listed topics related to “Environmental activities”, the most relevant for the respondents’ data needs are expenditure on environmental protection and restoration, and distributional impacts related to costs and benefits of environmental activities.

Regarding the topic of “Social data, including gender, Indigenous and youth statistics”, women and gender statistics are highly relevant, as are population data, followed by data on income inequality and education. Among the “Governance-related data” topics, “legislative measures” is the most relevant.

Broad, non-exhaustive categories of the types of data or information concerning “Finance and investment” in support of decent work and Nature-based Solutions of most importance to respondents provided valuable insights. These included categories of NbS financing ecosystem actors (including regulators and capital providers); demand, supply and use of funds (e.g.
available investment options and according to type of NbS-aligned activity, green finance availability, activities financed, and geographical distribution; the cost of funds (cost of action and inaction); financing conditions; and impacts of the funds and the efficiency of their use in addressing decent work deficits and other sustainable development goals.

Furthermore, all ten of the above-mentioned key information topics related to decent work and/or NbS are characterized as having data or indicator gaps according to the survey respondents. The topic of environmental outcomes and sustainability of outcomes was the highest ranked. More than half of the respondents find data and indicators gaps related to social data, including gender, Indigenous and youth statistics, and governance-related data. Slightly less than half of the respondents reported data gaps in employment/forms of work, decent work, finance and investments. The least cited topic is economic production.
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Introduction

Nature-based Solutions (NbS) have gained international attention since the UN Secretary-General’s Climate Action Summit in 2019 and most recently in the context of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). They cut across the three Rio Conventions and are central to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Increased investment in NbS will have important implications for certain sectors of the economy, notably among workers and enterprises in those sectors.

Recognizing that a shift to environmentally sustainable economies will involve a transition for workers and enterprises, the ILO adopted the Guidelines for a Just Transition in 2015. They are both a policy framework and a practical tool to help countries at all levels of development manage the transition to environmentally sustainable economies, and they can also help them achieve their Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), National Adaptation Plans and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The Paris Agreement on climate change, adopted later in 2015, notes the imperatives of a just transition, with the objectives of ensuring that workers and firms affected by the transformation to carbon-neutral and resilient economies are adequately supported, and that opportunities for the creation of decent and green jobs are fully captured. NbS will form an integral part of such a transition, and it is therefore essential that employment implications are better understood and captured.

ILO, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) are co-leading the publication of a global biennial report series on decent jobs and work in NbS,

---

2 The UN Definition of NbS (contained in a resolution on NbS passed at the UN Environment Assembly in March 2022) defines NbS as "actions to protect, conserve, restore, sustainably use and manage natural or modified terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine ecosystems, which address social, economic and environmental challenges effectively and adaptively, while simultaneously providing human well-being, ecosystem services and resilience and biodiversity benefits".
in close collaboration with other partners, including the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration Finance Task Force (led by the World Bank), and the Green Jobs Assessment Institutions Network (GAIN). This biennial report will address the knowledge gap regarding how investments in NbS can create decent work in support of a Just Transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all.

Much has already been published on the subject of jobs in NbS, including by ILO and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), (e.g. Nature Hires in 2020), UNEP (Green Recovery, 2021), and the World Economic Forum (2020). However, there is presently no systematic, long-term effort to analyse, model, forecast and track the quantity and decent work dimension of jobs generated by investments in NbS or to monitor unpaid forms of work in NbS. This report series aims to fill this knowledge and advocacy gap. In doing so, the series will gradually increase in depth and scope over time, as better data become available. Another gap is that most existing studies are focused on NbS across terrestrial ecosystems, while a systematic stock-take of green job opportunities in freshwater, marine and coastal ecosystems is lacking. This report aims to address this gap.

**Survey objectives and scope**

The ILO-UNEP-IUCN report on decent work in NbS contains a chapter (Chapter 4) that proposes a conceptual framework for defining and measuring decent work outcomes of NbS. To support the development of the framework as well as inform the development of the report, a survey of stakeholders was carried out during the period May–June 2022. The objective of the survey was to help understand key policy questions/concerns and types of information or data that could be used for policy research as well as planning, implementation, and monitoring of employment, decent work and enterprise development in NbS resulting from NbS activities in terms of direct, indirect and induced employment and decent work creation.

The survey targeted key NbS stakeholders, representing different world regions and population groups. The scope of the survey considered how the data collected on the basis of the conceptual framework are to be used (e.g., for reporting purposes, designing NbS, stakeholder engagement, investment prioritization, etc.) and what scale data will be required (e.g., project level, landscape scale,
There was an explicit intention to obtain information from stakeholders regarding the policy and information needs concerning potential at-risk population groups such as women, youth, and Indigenous populations, and to include such groups in the survey sampling frame. There was also the intention to cover a range of policy topics on decent work, just transition and NbS and related data/information topics that could appeal to different stakeholders and allow survey respondents the freedom to add additional information.

This report presents and analyses the results of the survey to inform the development of the conceptual framework in the ILO-UNEP-IUCN report on decent work in NbS, as well as to support the overall drafting of the report by providing a summary of the policy priorities and data needs of selected stakeholders with respect to decent work and NbS.

The report first presents the methodology used including the questionnaire design, survey participants sample selection, data collection and limitations/challenges faced. The survey results are then presented according to the three main sections of the survey: (1) information about the respondent and their organization, (2) policy priorities and interests, (3) information and data needs.

Methodology

The survey planning, implementation and analysis was carried out during the period May–June 2022. The survey was conducted in three languages (English, Spanish and French) using SurveyMonkey as the data collection software tool. This software facilitated the sending of questionnaires to selected survey participants via email and provided initial summary tabulations and graphs of responses for each survey question (jointly for the three languages) which had been formulated using both predefined and open-ended response categories.

The methodology consisted of three main phases as follows: (1) questionnaire development, (2) sample development, and (3) data collection and analysis. The overall survey development process is depicted in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Survey development process

Questionnaire development

The questionnaire\(^3\) was developed according to the scope and objectives of the survey, as outlined in the section above. The survey’s global coverage and broad range of stakeholders of different professional or work-related backgrounds within the realm of decent work and Nature-based Solutions was an equally important consideration in the development of the survey.

The introductory section of the questionnaire provided information regarding the responsible institutions (ILO, UNEP and IUCN) and the objectives of the survey, and explained why the respondent had been selected to participate. It contained definitions of three key reference concepts used in the survey, namely, decent work, Just Transition, and Nature-based Solutions. It provided information about the three main sections of the questionnaire, as follows:

1. **Information about the respondent** and their organization: seeking summary information about the respondent and their organization.

---

\(^3\) Please refer to Appendix 1 for a full version of the questionnaire in the three languages.
2. Policy priorities and interests: seeking to understand the respondent organization’s entry point into the discussion of decent work and Nature-based Solutions, its level of involvement with the policy issues, and its main priorities and areas of focus.

3. Information and data needs: seeking to identify the types of information and data about decent work and Nature-based Solutions that the respondent requires in their current role.

Respondents were given information about the types of question responses – that is, options from a predefined list and short written responses.

The survey contained a total of 27 questions and took each respondent on average 25 minutes to complete. The sets of predefined response categories were developed, wherever possible, according to international standard categories, for example, based on classifications used in policy or indicator frameworks (e.g., Just Transition, decent work and Nature-based Solutions) or abridged international statistical standard classifications (e.g., the International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities, ISIC). Open-ended response options allowed respondents to provide short written responses in their own words.

The questionnaire was cognitively tested, and the feedback was incorporated to improve the question formulation and the content. The questionnaire was then translated from English into Spanish and French and uploaded to the SurveyMonkey software. All three language versions were tested in the SurveyMonkey software to address any technical issues.

Survey participant selection/sample development

The sampling method involved a network sampling approach. Specifically, developing the list of target survey participants involved identifying the types of target groups of stakeholders whose contact details could be provided via professional networks of the core ILO-UNEP-IUCN team coordinating the report on decent work in Nature-based Solutions.
The types of target stakeholders included the following groups:

- Workers’ organizations
- Employers’ organizations
- Ministries of Labour
- Ministries of Environment
- Ministries of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
- Research community (including climate adaptation, green jobs assessment)
- Construction/infrastructure/public works
- Representatives of NbS engagement (including at national, subnational level, urban/rural and project/site level)
- Indigenous Peoples stakeholders
- Women stakeholders
- Volunteer workers
- Youth workers

A key objective of the sampling approach was to obtain contact and language information for a set of potential participants (including potential at-risk populations) from a range of countries in different world regions, particularly from developing countries.

Members of the core ILO-UNEP-IUCN team used professional networks to obtain contact information (email addresses) and language preferences (English, Spanish or French) for the targeted number of 200 potential survey participants. An official invitation letter was sent to the potential survey participants informing them that they had been selected to participate in the survey, of the survey’s purpose, and confidentiality of the responses. The participants’ contact information was uploaded to the SurveyMonkey software along with language preferences in order to receive the questionnaire in English, Spanish or French.

### Data collection and analysis

The data collection took place in the period 12 May – 8 June 2022. It was administered via the online survey tool SurveyMonkey. In total, three reminders

---

While this was the target sampling population, the team was unable to obtain contact information for some of these groups which were, therefore, excluded from the final survey sample. Among those not explicitly included in the sample were representatives from Ministries of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries; volunteer workers; and youth workers. The results suggest that some of the topics represented by these groups (for example, agriculture, forestry and fishing or youth) were nonetheless of interest to actual survey respondents included in the survey sample.
for the completion of the survey were sent to the English-speaking participants who represented the biggest proportion of the respondents (70%). The Spanish (19%) and French-speaking (11%) respondents received two reminders due to technical issues that delayed sending the survey in these languages.

The survey was closed on the 8th of June and the analysis of the results and report writing took place in the period 9–23 June.

**Limitations and challenges**

Certain limitations/features of the Survey Monkey software imposed a slight adaptation of the original questionnaire, specifically questions 13–23, which were originally conceived as one multiple-choice question but had to be split into separate questions.

Similarly, given the specificities of the upload of the French and Spanish translations, the timeline for sending out these questionnaires had to be adjusted which slightly limited the time allotted to the French and Spanish speaking respondents. Nonetheless, response rates were quite good among these language groups as can be observed in the next section.

**Survey results**

The survey was sent to a total of 201 eligible survey participants, and in total, 69 respondents fully or partially completed the survey, thus, yielding a response rate of 34%. These included 47 English-speaking participants (out of 141 eligible, or 33% response rate), 11 Spanish-speaking participants (out of 38 eligible, or 29% response rate), and 11 French-speaking (out of 22 eligible, or 50% response rate).

**Summary of survey results**

A summary of the survey results is presented below according to the three main sections of the survey: (1) Information about the respondent and their organization, (2) Policy priorities and interests, (3) Information and data needs.

---

5 Eligible survey participants refer here to those from the selected survey sample with a valid email address.
1. Information about the respondent and their organization

Just over half of the respondents are male. Most of the respondents are senior managers, followed by respondents working in policy design and implementation, research or project delivery. Most respondents work either in a national government department or agency, research or educational institution, or NGO with an environmental focus. A small proportion of the respondents represent workers’ organizations/trade unions, Indigenous/First Nations group, local community, or gender equality/women’s organizations. In terms of the sector the respondents’ organization focuses on, the main ones are environmental management, restoration, and conservation, including NbS, and government and community services, while about a fifth of the respondents indicated that their organization focuses on all sectors. Most of the survey respondents’ organizations’ regional focus is on Sub-Saharan Africa or Western Europe, Eastern and Central Europe, USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Ten percent of the respondents represent an organization that focuses on all regions.

2. Policy priorities and interests

The most cited policy areas-frameworks best reflecting the respondents’ organizations’ main entry point to the issues related to decent work in NbS are the SDGs and sustainable development, climate change mitigation and adaptation, NbS, just transition and green jobs, and decent work. There is high focus also on ecosystem and landscape restoration, biodiversity conservation, sustainable enterprise development, and women/gender. Indigenous Peoples and First Nations, and humanitarian work represented the least cited policy topic entry points among the survey respondents.

The majority of the respondents’ organizations have either moderately high or moderate involvement in decent work and just transition policy matters. In addition, there is overall relatively high interest in all topics related to decent work and just transition policy matters with the most cited topics being employment creation and skills development, and social dialogue. These are topics that were also reinforced by respondents when asked to provide additional details at the end of the survey.

Similar to decent work and just transition policy matters, most of the respondents’ organizations have either moderately high or moderate involvement in Nature-based Solutions (NbS) policy issues. Likewise, when examining the NbS topics or areas of highest interest among the respondents’ organizations, there is relatively
high interest in all listed topics with the highest being in NbS community and stakeholder engagement; NbS and employment, income, and livelihoods; and NbS by ecosystem type, followed by NbS policy influencing, and NbS-related activities (e.g., restoration) including costs and expenditures.

Regarding the geographical scale of greatest interest, the vast majority of the respondents’ organizations focus on country level. This is followed by sub-national administrative areas (e.g., provincial, city-level); urban and rural areas; community/village level; regional (multiple country) level; and coastal and marine areas.

3. Information and data needs

The most common uses of data and information among the respondents are: communicating trends and performance to external stakeholders; internal reporting / key performance indicators; and scenario analysis and projections, with a relatively high proportion also using data for risk assessments. The least common use is for investment decision and trade-off assessment.

The most relevant category related to “Employment/Forms of work” for the data needs of the respondents is employment, reported by the vast majority of the respondents. Slightly more than a quarter of respondents consider all categories equally relevant for their data needs. The least relevant among the listed categories is unpaid trainee work.

The most relevant categories related to “Decent work” for the data needs of the respondents are: employment opportunities; adequate earnings and productive work; safe work environment; and equal opportunity and treatment in employment. Slightly more than a third of the respondents consider all categories equally relevant for their data needs. The least relevant category for the data needs among the survey respondents is work that should be abolished.

When considering the topic of “Income and livelihoods”, slightly less than half of the respondents indicated that all categories are of high relevance for their data needs. Among the preferred categories on this topic, wages and salaries ranked highest, followed by household income and consumption. Consumer prices are the least relevant.

Regarding the topic of “Economic production”, the categories of productivity and value added are among the most relevant for the data needs of the respondents, while asset ownership represents a topic of somewhat lesser importance. About a third of all respondents consider all topics as most relevant for their data needs.

Regarding “Enterprise development”, nearly half of the respondents consider sustainable enterprise development and/or enterprise development in NbS among the most relevant topics for their data needs, with slightly less than half
considering occupational employment and skills needs as among the most relevant. A quarter of respondents find all topics to be relevant for their data needs.

Considering the topic of “Environmental outcomes and sustainability of outcomes”, slightly less than half of the respondents find all topics presented relevant for their data needs. An equal proportion indicated environmental, social and economic sustainability of outcomes of policy interventions, investments, etc. as highly relevant.

All listed topics related to “Environmental activities” are considered relevant for the data needs of slightly less than half of the respondents. Among the listed topics, the most relevant for the respondents’ data needs are expenditure on environmental protection and restoration, and distributional impacts related to costs and benefits of environmental activities.

Regarding the topic of “Social data, including gender, Indigenous and youth statistics”, women and gender statistics are highly relevant for half of the respondents. Nearly half find population data among the most relevant, followed by data on income inequality and education. More than a third consider all listed social data to be among the most relevant for their data needs.

Among the “Governance-related data” topics, legislative measures are among the most relevant, as indicated by more than half of the respondents. More than a third of the respondents consider all topics to be relevant for their data needs. Results were similar for property rights, land tenure and ownership data.

Broad, non-exhaustive categories of the types of data or information concerning “Finance and investment” in support of decent work and Nature-based Solutions of most importance to respondents provided valuable insights. These included categories of NbS financing ecosystem actors (including regulators and capital providers), demand, supply and use of funds (e.g. available investment options and according to type of NbS-aligned activity, green finance availability, activities financed, and geographical distribution) the cost of funds (cost of action and inaction), financing conditions, and impacts of the funds and the efficiency of their use in addressing decent work deficits and other sustainable development goals.

Overall, all topics related to decent work and/or Nature-based Solutions surveyed are of relevance for the data needs for the vast majority of the respondents. Furthermore, all ten of the above-described key information topics related to decent work and/or NbS are characterized as having data or indicator gaps according to the survey respondents. The topic of environmental outcomes and sustainability of outcomes was the highest ranked in this regard. More than half of the respondents report data and indicators gaps related to social data, including gender, Indigenous and youth statistics, and governance-related data.
Slightly less than half of the respondents reported data gaps in employment/forms of work, decent work, finance and investments. The least cited topic was economic production.

Detailed analysis of survey results

This section presents more detailed analysis of the survey results for the three main sections of the survey: (1) information about the respondent and their organization, (2) policy priorities and interests, (3) information and data needs. Within each of these sections, question numbers and corresponding questions are presented with the results of each question.

1. Information about the respondent and their organization

Question 1. What is your sex?

(Percent of total responses)

Total responses: 69 out of 69

There is a 10-percentage-point difference in the disaggregation by sex among the respondents, with just over half being male respondents and just under half female.
Question 2. **What is your main role within your organization?**

(Percent of total responses)

```
Other role | 2.9
Capacity building | 4.3
Communications and outreach | 5.8
Project delivery | 11.6
Policy design and implementation | 18.8
Research | 18.8
Executive/senior management | 37.7
```

**Total responses: 69 out of 69**

Most of the respondents are senior managers (38%), followed by respondents working in policy design and implementation (19%), research (19%) and project delivery (12%). About 6% indicated their role is in communications and outreach, and 4% are engaged in capacity building. It should be noted that research included the associated role of “statistics”, which was noted among the survey responses. Among the text responses provided in “other role”, one of the roles highlighted is in planning of NbS projects, which needs to be distinguished from project delivery. None of the respondents selected the role option of “community and stakeholder engagement”.
Question 3. Which group does your organization or workplace best fit into?

(Percent of total responses)

Total responses: 69 out of 69

Most respondents work either in a national government department or agency (25%), research or educational institution (17%) or NGO with an environmental focus (13%). About 9% are in a subnational or city government, and an equal proportion are in the private sector. About 7% of all respondents represent employers’ organizations, while 4% represent workers’ organizations/trade unions, and an equal share (4%) are representatives of an Indigenous/First Nations group. About 3% are affiliated with the local community, and an equal proportion are involved in gender equality/women’s organizations. The remaining 6% of the respondents are equally split among representatives of youth organizations, international organizations, NGOs with a labour focus or other roles, e.g., an NGO associated with the private sector. There were no representatives of volunteer organizations or representatives of landowner’s associations among the respondents.
Question 4. Which sector is the primary focus of your organizations’ activities?

(Percent of total responses)

Environmental management, restoration, and conservation, including NbS (29%), and government and community services (17%) are among the main sectors in which the work of the respondents’ organizations is focused. About 19% of respondents indicated that their organizations focus on all sectors. Education and agriculture are each the focus of 7% of the respondents’ organizations. About 6% have a primary focus on construction and infrastructure, while 4% are focused on professional, scientific and technical activities. The least represented sectors are manufacturing (3%), forestry, fisheries, and information and communication (1% each). None of the represented organizations has a primary focus on water supply, waste management and remediation activities, financial and insurance activities, or real estate. Among the other sectors identified by the respondents, it is important to highlight the energy sector.
Question 5. Which region is the primary focus of your organizations’ activities?

(Percent of total responses)

Total responses: 69 out of 69

Most of the survey respondents’ organizations’ regional focus is on Sub-Saharan Africa (27%); Western Europe, Eastern and Central Europe, USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand (22%); followed by Latin America and the Caribbean (19%); and Asia-Pacific (16%). 10% of the respondents represent an organization that focuses on all regions, while only 6% of the survey participants work in an organization with a regional focus on the Middle East and North Africa.
2. Policy priorities and interests

Question 6. In your understanding, which of the following policy areas/frameworks best reflect your organization’s entry point to the issues associated with decent work in Nature-based Solutions?

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

Total responses: 69 out of 69

The most cited policy areas/frameworks best reflecting the respondents’ organizations’ main entry point to the issues related to decent work in NbS are the SDGs and sustainable development more generally (55%), climate change mitigation and adaptation (52%), NbS (46%), just transition and green jobs (45%), as well as decent work (43%). There is also a high focus on biodiversity conservation (37%), ecosystem and landscape restoration (37%), sustainable enterprise development (36%) and women/gender (33%). In the middle range are the policy areas related to youth (28%), industry/sector level sustainability (24%), circular, green or bio-economy (22%) and disaster or risk reduction (19%). Access to government and community services (15%), sustainable finance (15%), and human rights (12%) are cited somewhat less frequently as entry points, while Indigenous Peoples and First Nations (9%) and humanitarian work (3%) represented the least cited policy entry points for issues related to decent work in NbS among respondents’ organizations.
Question 7. In your understanding, what is your organization’s level of involvement in decent work and just transition policy matters?

(Percent of total responses)

Total responses: 67 out of 69

The majority of the respondents’ organizations have either moderately high (37%) or moderate involvement (28%) in decent work and just transition policy matters. 15% of the respondents indicated high involvement of their organizations. About a fifth of the respondents’ organizations has either low or no involvement.
**Question 8.** Please indicate the decent work and just transition policy topics of most interest to your organization.

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

The decent work and just transition policy topics of greatest interest to the respondents’ organizations were employment creation and skills development (each 46%), followed by social dialogue (38%). The responses indicate a somewhat more moderate level of interest when it comes to social protection and occupational safety and health (each 30%), industrial and sectoral policies (27%), and rights at work, and macroeconomic and growth policies (each 26%). Enterprise policies corresponded to a slightly lower level of interest (23%). Similarly, 23% of the respondents indicated all the listed decent work and just transition policy topics to be of interest to their organizations.
Question 9. In your understanding, what is your organization’s level of involvement in Nature-based Solutions (NbS) policy issues?

(Percent of total responses)

Total responses: 66 out of 69

About 11% of the represented organizations have high involvement in NbS policy issues, while most of the organizations have moderately high (44%) or moderate involvement (26%). About 17% have low involvement and 3% have no involvement.
Question 10. Please indicate the NbS topics/areas of most interest to your organization.

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

Total responses: 65 out of 69

The NbS topics or areas of highest interest among the respondents’ organizations is in NbS community and stakeholder engagement (62%); NbS and employment, income, and livelihoods (59%); and NbS by ecosystem type (59%). Among 48% of the respondents’ organizations, the topic of NbS policy influencing is also of high interest and among 45%, the topic of NbS-related activities (e.g., restoration) including costs and expenditures is of highest interest. Thirty-one percent of the respondents indicated that their organization’s interest lies in NbS investments and “bankable” solutions and/or environmental markets. Only 3% indicated their organization has no interest in NbS topics corresponding to the proportion of respondents indicating no involvement in NbS in the previous question.
Question 11. In your understanding, what geographical scale/area does your organization’s interest primarily relate to?

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

Total responses: 66 out of 69

Regarding the geographical scale of greatest interest, the vast majority of the respondents’ organizations (65%) focus on the country level. 43% have primary interest in sub-national administrative areas (e.g., provincial, city-level), 40% in urban areas, 39% in rural areas, 35% in community, village level, 32% on regional (multiple country) level and 31% in coastal and marine areas. About 28% express interest in both site/project level and watershed/catchment scale. Landscape scale (20%) and global level (22%) represent the geographical scale or areas of relatively least interest for the organizations of the surveyed participants.
3. Information and data needs

**Question 12. In your current professional role, what do you most commonly use data and information for?**

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

- Communicating trends and performance to external stakeholders: 69.2%
- Internal reporting / key performance indicators: 60.0%
- Scenario analysis and projections: 55.4%
- Risk assessments: 40.0%
- Investment decision and trade-off assessment: 27.7%
- Other types of analysis or other uses: 7.7%

**Total responses: 65 out of 69**

The most common uses of data and information among the respondents are communicating trends and performance to external stakeholders (69%), internal reporting / key performance indicators (60%), and scenario analysis and projections (55%). A relatively high proportion (40%) also use data for risk assessments. The least common use is for investment decision and trade-off assessment (28%). Eight percent of the respondents indicated other uses of data or types of analysis, such as impact assessment and monitoring to inform decision making and data-driven decision making; academic research and teaching; and research publications to improve the state of the art.
**Question 13.** Please select the categories below related to “Employment / Forms of work (including unpaid forms of work)” most relevant for your data needs.

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

![Bar chart showing the percentage of responses for each category.]

---

**Total responses: 65 out of 69**

The most relevant category related to “Employment/Forms of work” for the data needs of the respondents is employment, indicated by 60% of the respondents. About 28% consider all categories equally relevant for their data needs. Twenty-two percent indicated own-use production activities as most relevant, while volunteer work – whether organization-based or direct – is considered relevant by 17% and 15% respectively. The least relevant among the listed categories is unpaid trainee work (12%). Six percent of the respondents consider that none of the categories is relevant for their data needs.
Question 14. Please select the categories below related to “Decent work” most relevant for your data needs.

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

Total responses: 665 out of 69

The most relevant categories related to “Decent work” for the data needs of the respondents are employment opportunities, as indicated by 48% of the respondents, adequate earnings and productive work (39%), safe work environment (36%), and equal opportunity and treatment in employment (36%). Thirty-six percent of respondents consider all categories equally relevant for their data needs. Moderately relevant categories among respondents are stability and security of work, social security, and social dialogue, ranging between 28% and 33%. The least relevant category for data needs among survey respondents is work that should be abolished (6%). Only 3% of the respondents consider that none of the categories is relevant for their data needs.
Question 15. Please select the categories below related to “Incomes and livelihoods” most relevant for your data needs.

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

Total responses: 66 out of 69

When considering the topic of “Income and livelihoods”, 44% of the respondents indicated that all categories are of high relevance for their data needs. For respondents that preferred selected categories on this topic, wages and salaries ranked highest (41%) followed by household income and consumption (30%). Consumer prices are the least relevant, selected by 13% of the survey participants. About 8% consider none of the listed categories relevant for their data needs.
Question 16. Please select the categories below related to “Economic Production” most relevant for your data needs.

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

Total responses: 63 out of 69

Regarding the topic of “Economic production”, the categories of productivity (51%) and value added (44%) are among the most relevant for the data needs of the respondents. Output (including output by industry) and input costs are of equal relevance among the respondents (33%). Asset ownership represents a topic of somewhat lesser importance (21%). Thirty percent of all respondents consider all topics as most relevant for their data needs, while 6% find no relevance in any of these topics.
Question 17. Please select the categories below related to “Enterprise development” most relevant for your data needs.

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

Total responses: 63 out of 69

Regarding “Enterprise development”, nearly half of the respondents (49%) consider sustainable enterprise development and/or enterprise development in NbS the most relevant topic for their data needs. Second highest in relevance is occupational employment and skills needs (46%), while 40% of the respondents expressed interest in hours and labour cost and 35% in technology. Business environment and labour productivity are considered equally relevant by 33% of the respondents. Occupational safety and health was considered relevant among 29% of respondents. A quarter of the respondents find all topics to be relevant for their data needs, while about 5% indicated that none of the topics is relevant for them.
**Question 18.** Please select the categories below related to “Environmental outcomes and sustainability of outcomes” most relevant for your data needs.

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem condition (quality/health/integrity)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resource stocks (e.g., timber, fish, soil, mineral and ‘energy resources)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental flows (e.g., water use, energy use, greenhouse gas emissions, solid waste, air pollution, wastewater)</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use and land cover</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem services</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental, social and economic sustainability of outcomes of policy interventions, investments etc.</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All categories</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total responses: 63 out of 69**

Considering the topic of “Environmental outcomes and sustainability of outcomes”, 46% of the respondents find all topics presented relevant for their data needs. An equal proportion indicated environmental, social and economic sustainability of outcomes of policy interventions, investments, etc. as highly relevant. Ecosystem services as well as land use and land cover are relevant for the data needs of 27% of the respondents, while environmental flows and biodiversity are relevant for 24%, and ecosystem condition and natural resource stocks, among 22% each. About 2% indicated no relevance in these topics for their data needs.
Question 19. Please select the categories below related to “Environmental activities” most relevant for your data needs.

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

Total responses: 63 out of 69

All listed topics related to “Environmental activities” are considered relevant for the data needs of 44% of the respondents. Thirty-seven percent identify expenditure on environmental protection and restoration as highly relevant, and 35% note the importance of distributional impacts related to costs and benefits of environmental activities. Production of environmental goods and services (EGSS) is of data relevance for 30% of the respondents, while slightly more than a fifth indicate the topic of environmental taxes, subsidies and related payments as most relevant. About 2% find no relevance to these topics for their data needs.
Question 20. Please select the categories below related to “Social data, including gender, Indigenous and youth statistics” most relevant for your data needs.

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

![Bar chart showing the percentage of responses for each category.]

**Total responses: 63 out of 69**

Regarding the topic of “Social data, including gender, Indigenous and youth statistics”, women and gender statistics are highly relevant for half of the respondents. Nearly half (47%) find population data most relevant, followed by data on income inequality and education (44%). Thirty-seven percent consider all listed social data to be most relevant for their data needs. Youth statistics are most relevant for 36% of the respondents, while 31% considered health data most relevant. From the set of categories presented, Indigenous Peoples and First Nations statistics are the least relevant for the data needs of the respondents. None of the categories related to social data are of relevance for the data needs of about 2% of the respondents.
Question 21. Please select the categories below related to “Governance-related data” most relevant for your data needs.

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

Among the “Governance-related data” topics, legislative measures are the most relevant, as indicated by more than half of the respondents (53%). Thirty-six percent consider all topics to be relevant for their data needs. Property rights, land tenure and ownership data are highly relevant for 34% of the respondents. Only 11% find relevance in fishing rights and access to marine resources. Three percent of the respondents consider none of the governance-related data topics as relevant for their data needs.
Question 22. In your current professional or working role, what are the specific data or information categories concerning “Finance and investment” in support of decent work and Nature-based Solutions of most importance?

The respondents referred to the following types of data or information categories concerning “Finance and investment” in support of decent work and Nature-based Solutions of most importance to them:

- **NbS financing ecosystem actors**
  * Regulators
  * Sources of finance

- **Demand for funds/investment needs and/or actual use of funds**
  * Investment options available
  * By activity financed
  * By geography

- **Supply of funds**
  * Green finance availability and the share it represents in global investment
  * Geographical distribution

- **Cost of funds**
  * Cost of action (costs to finance NbS-driven projects)
  * Cost of inaction
    - Costs of ecosystem services that should be included in project budgets
    - Benefits from the NbS that should be included in project budgets

- **Financing conditions**
  * Financing mechanisms
  * Levels of financing
  * Application

- **Indicators related to impact produced**
  * Problems to address and vulnerable/target populations
  * Impact/efficiency of use of funds
    - Social cohesion, health and wellbeing, environment
    - Particular indicators related to decent work (e.g. quantity and quality of jobs and other decent work parameters)

- **Other**
  * NbS business models
This classification of responses highlights the diverse set of answers to this open-ended question, reflecting the diverse set of respondents. A total of 28 responses were received to this question, and as such the categories should not be seen as exhaustive.

The category of **NbS financing ecosystem actors** refers to regulators and different types of capital providers. Responses focused on actors representing the sources of funds, quoting in particular public sources (e.g., government budgets, international finance institutions, climate funds). Respondents did not refer to private sector actors (e.g. companies, private sector financial institutions, or philanthropy).

The **demand, supply and use of funds** is another set of categories noted by respondents. Demand for funds included responses regarding available investment options and according to type of NbS-aligned activity. Supply of funds responses identified green finance availability and its share in global investments, as well as the geographical distribution (e.g., country/region/international/emerging or developed economy). Use of funds responses considered the activities financed, as well as the geographic disaggregation; for example, level and type of investment by country/region in different sectors of nature-based economic activity (green buildings, ecosystem restoration, regenerative agriculture, etc). While not specifically noted by respondents, these activities could be further classified, for example by the type of the recipient.

Respondents referred to the **cost of funds**, both in terms of cost of action (to finance the NbS-driven projects) and the cost of inaction (biodiversity loss costs, carbon costs) that should be included in project design so that the project adequately reflects the associated costs and benefits for efficient financial decision making, as well as to address any negative externalities of the project. In order to better capture the costs of funds landscape, the classification could have included the categories by activity, geography, source of funds, or type of financial instruments; however, such responses were not captured in the survey.

**Financing conditions** were noted, relating to the levels and sources of financing, financing mechanisms, and application criteria and processes.

Data and information needs further include indicators concerning the **impacts of the funds and the efficiency of their use** in addressing decent work deficits and other sustainable development goals. They included reference to identification of vulnerable/target populations, as well as the impact of the projects financed on quantity and quality of jobs and other decent work parameters.

Finally, NbS business models were mentioned among responses for information needs, suggesting a need to know more about the existing, viable and investable business models in this area.
Question 23. In your current professional or working role, please describe any other data and information topics related to decent work and Nature-based Solutions (not listed above) which are relevant for your current or future needs.

The respondents pointed out the following other data and information topics related to decent work and Nature-based Solutions that are not listed in the previous questions (13–22) that are relevant to their current or future needs. These are categorized according to their thematic relevance as pertaining to employment/decent work or environment/NbS, or, when relating to both thematic areas, as crosscutting/contextual. They are additionally disaggregated according to whether they are not at all covered in the categories listed in the previous questions (13–22) or have some level of overlap with certain categories.

- **Employment/Decent work**
  - **New (not listed previously):**
    - Green jobs assessment modelling
    - Green jobs skills training
  - **Existing (overlap with listed categories):**
    - Informal sectors (waste particularly)
    - Self-employment in rural areas
    - Job creation
    - Sustainable work life
    - Youth employment
    - Skills deficits
    - Number of green jobs and pay scale as compared to other sectors

- **Environment/NbS**
  - **New (not listed previously):**
    - Agricultural diversification based on ancestral knowledge
    - Use of natural resources by the local and Indigenous population to improve their lives
    - NbS categories in the environmental sector
    - Influence from conservation bodies
    - Elitism in conservation work
    - Meteorological and Climate Data
**Existing (overlap with listed categories):**
- Reforestation

**Crosscutting/Context**
- Legal security on the lands of the communities
- Sustainable markets
- Health and wellbeing data – cause and effect
- Movement tracking/migration by gender and age
- Contribution of Nature-based Solutions to GDP
- Household data at subnational level
- Cooperation between private, public sector and civil society (e.g., youth groups)
- Industry specific data on nature-based activities (e.g., numbers employed by city, region, country, in the EU, in different sectors of nature-based economic activity such as green buildings, ecosystem restoration, regenerative agriculture)
- Institutions/workers not relaying information to communities (lack of transparency)
- Job creation or loss by Nature-based Solutions, by type of solutions, by country/location, by time
- National accounts
- Digital economy measures
- Political factors and political stability
- Legal issues (not following set policies)
- Inflation
- Climate-smart value chain for NbS in decent work
- Small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)’s interest in and contribution to maintaining NbS
- NbS contribution to boosting local economies (SMEs)
- Value of ecosystem services for the payment of environmental services, including the monetary costs and benefits related to work benefiting from ecosystem services
- Sharing of existing methodologies across countries on tarifa hidrica to support risk management
- Reporting on agriculture inspection reports (local by law)
Question 24. For the 10 broad data topics listed in the previous set of questions (13–23), please identify those topics for which you have identified data or indicator gaps.

(Multiple choice question, percent of responses per answer option out of total responses)

![Bar chart showing data gaps by topic]

**Total responses: 61 out of 69**

According to the survey respondents, all ten of the key information topics related to decent work and NbS are characterized as having data or indicator gaps. The topic of environmental outcomes and sustainability of outcomes was identified by 74% of the respondents. More than half of the respondents find data and indicators gaps related to social data, including gender, Indigenous and youth statistics (56%) and governance-related data (54%). Slightly less than half of the respondents reported data gaps in employment / forms of work (48%), decent work (46%), and finance and investments (46%). Data or indicator gaps were identified for the topics of environmental activities (44%), incomes and livelihoods (44%), and enterprise development (40%). The least cited topic is economic production, identified by 28% of the respondents.
Question 25. If you wish, please provide additional details about data and indicator gaps on the topics you have identified in the previous set of questions (13 to 23). Otherwise, proceed to the next question.

The respondents provided some additional details about data and indicator gaps on the topics from the previous set of questions (13–23), categorized by their thematic relevance or generally in terms of data quality or availability, listed below:

- **Thematic data or indicator gaps**
  - **Employment/Decent work**
    - New (not listed previously):
      - Licensing and registration of HBB and medium and small enterprises (MSMEs)
      - Specific vocational training and curricula
    - Existing (overlap with listed categories):
      - Local SMEs
      - Number of persons in self-employment and MSMES
  - **Environment/NbS**
    - New (not listed previously):
      - Choice of technology and the use of natural resources for development
      - Data on the linkages between ecosystem restoration and climate change adaptation and mitigation
      - Benefits of NbS (impact, benefits translated in financial terms)
    - Existing (overlap with listed categories):
      - Environmental Accounting details in National Accounts
      - Natural capital accounting and economic value of ecosystem
      - Data gaps identified in EC expert publication on vital role of NBS in nature-positive economy
      - Environmental services that households and the industrial sector consume
  - **Crosscutting/Context**
    - Decentralization and community organizations
• Evaluation of climate-related activities that involve multiple stakeholders and youth
• Human resource development
• Implementation costs
• Food security, food production strategies
• Ecosystem and livelihood resilience
• Food production strategies, including decision making and capacity by producers

■ Overarching data quality/availability gaps
• Data linkages
• Data coordination among stakeholders
• Spatial data (GIS)
• Current data
• Lack of access to data
• Transparency
• High cost of existing data not produced by NSO
• Nationally appropriate social indicators and priorities
• Country and institutional objectives and operational outcomes related to SDGs

Question 26. To support our project and to ensure we have identified as much relevant material as possible, we invite you to share links to relevant reports and information on decent work and/or Nature-based Solutions (up to 10 links).

In total, 32 links were shared, most of which are research/articles/reports in the areas of NbS/environment with a few focused on decent work. Links to tools, platforms, organizations/institutions, and handbooks/guidance were also shared. For more information and the links provided, please refer to Appendix 5.
Question 27. If you wish, please share any additional comments or observations that you may have concerning decent work in Nature-based Solutions. Otherwise, proceed to the end of the survey.

This question allowed respondents to add any observations they may have in relation to decent work in Nature-based Solutions, in addition to what is captured in the questionnaire.

The importance of certain priorities outlined in the questionnaire was reinforced by the respondents to this section, such as social dialogue, social protection, dignity at work and social integration. Employment and macroeconomic impact from Nature-based Solutions was also identified as a central priority.

The need for and importance of data was also reinforced, especially when linking it to the environment. For example, it was suggested that information on “Social data, including gender, Indigenous and youth statistics” is essential for NbS projects. However, implementation of such projects requires information from the other topic areas, in which there are many data gaps that require standardized information that is transparent and reliable.

Furthermore, information about the skills necessary for policymakers, employees and employers to implement NbS is essential.

Observations around NbS include:

- NbS is not just about environment preservation; it is also about the synergy between people and the ecosystem for a better and more sustainable life.
- NbS are adaptation measures that allow for sustainable development.
- NbS is dynamic and changes alongside environmental challenges, therefore it requires ongoing research and analysis.

Regarding decent work, the importance of ensuring decent jobs when creating a green economy was emphasized. It was suggested that NGOs are at the forefront working in this area and, given their limited funding for such activities, it is a challenge for them to offer job security and good wages to their employees despite existing labour laws protecting the rights of the employees. This results in a lot of volunteering, which, despite offering the opportunity for those passionate about the topic to contribute to it, is not a sustainable career option.
Conclusion

For the first time, stakeholders representing different types of institutions and mandates in different world regions – but nonetheless aligned in their engagement or interest in the topic of decent work in Nature-based Solutions (NbS) – participated in a global survey regarding policy priorities and information needs on this topic. The survey was conducted in three languages (English, Spanish and French) during the period May–June 2022. The overall survey response rate (34%) among the 201 survey recipients was considered quite favourable, especially considering the 25-minute average completion time; this suggests there is a serious interest in the topic among stakeholders across world regions. The survey results provided valuable insights into the policy priorities and data needs of stakeholders with respect to decent work and NbS. It will be useful not only as a key input to the development of the first ILO-UNEP-IUCN report on decent work in NbS, including the conceptual framework, but also should serve to provide future guidance regarding priority topics in the global biennial report series on decent work in NbS.
### Annex A.1 Number of survey participants by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>N OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eswatini</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex A.2

**Question 26:** Links to relevant reports and information on decent work and/or Nature-based Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>NbS/Environmental</td>
<td><a href="https://co-impact.app/">https://co-impact.app/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>NbS/Environmental</td>
<td><a href="https://connectingnature.eu/">https://connectingnature.eu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform</td>
<td>NbS/Environmental</td>
<td><a href="https://treesasinfrastructure.com/#/">https://treesasinfrastructure.com/#/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform</td>
<td>NbS/Environmental</td>
<td><a href="https://www.naturebasedenterprise.eu/page/about-us">https://www.naturebasedenterprise.eu/page/about-us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/report</td>
<td>NbS/Environmental</td>
<td><a href="https://open.uct.ac.za/handle/11427/30334?show=full">https://open.uct.ac.za/handle/11427/30334?show=full</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/report</td>
<td>Decent work</td>
<td><a href="https://www.greengrowthknowledge.org/research/green-jobs-assessment-mauritius">https://www.greengrowthknowledge.org/research/green-jobs-assessment-mauritius</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform</td>
<td>Decent work</td>
<td><a href="https://www.greengrowthknowledge.org/">https://www.greengrowthknowledge.org/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 1 REPORT OF KEY FINDINGS FROM THE STAKEHOLDER SURVEY ON DECENT WORK IN NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Crosscutting</td>
<td><a href="https://www.inec.go.cr/content/01-como-se-obtiene-informacion-nivel-de-barrios-caserios-comunidades">https://www.inec.go.cr/content/01-como-se-obtiene-informacion-nivel-de-barrios-caserios-comunidades</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Crosscutting</td>
<td><a href="https://snitcr.go.cr/">https://snitcr.go.cr/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Crosscutting</td>
<td><a href="https://sajjil.gov.jo/">https://sajjil.gov.jo/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Crosscutting</td>
<td><a href="https://hemayeh.jo/">https://hemayeh.jo/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 1 REPORT OF KEY FINDINGS FROM THE STAKEHOLDER SURVEY ON DECENT WORK IN NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Crosscutting</td>
<td><a href="http://dosweb.dos.gov.jo/">http://dosweb.dos.gov.jo/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/report</td>
<td>Decent work</td>
<td><a href="https://sprcugu.org/sprc-highlights/new-study-to-explore-creation-of-decent-work-for-youth-women/">https://sprcugu.org/sprc-highlights/new-study-to-explore-creation-of-decent-work-for-youth-women/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/report</td>
<td>NbS/Environmental</td>
<td><a href="https://www.journals.elsevier.com/nature-based-solutions?gl=1*1ml5d5x*ga*NzMzE5MzczLTlE2NTUxOTM2NDC*ga_4RS7DM8F7*MTYyTE5MzYON6XLIeUMTYyTE5MzYOC4w">https://www.journals.elsevier.com/nature-based-solutions?gl=1*1ml5d5x*ga*NzMzE5MzczLTlE2NTUxOTM2NDC*ga_4RS7DM8F7*MTYyTE5MzYON6XLIeUMTYyTE5MzYOC4w</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

Cambridge Econometrics’ global E3ME model provides an economic framework with which to evaluate the effects of a wide range of policies. Behavioural relationships in the model are estimated using econometric time-series techniques applied to a database that covers the period from 1970 onwards, on an annual basis. A core feature of the model is its treatment of technology, which will be key to meeting many of the world’s policy challenges. E3ME extends its treatment of the economy to cover physical measures of energy, food and material consumption. The main data sources for European countries are Eurostat and the International Energy Agency (IEA), supplemented by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) STAN database and other sources where appropriate. For regions outside of Europe, additional sources for data include the United Nations, OECD, World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), ILO and national statistics. Gaps in the data are estimated using custom software algorithms.

E3ME’s theoretical underpinning is that economic activity undertaken by persons, households, firms and other groups in society has effects on other groups (possibly after a time lag), and the effects may persist into future generations. But there are many actors, and the effects – both beneficial and damaging – accumulate in economic and physical stocks.

The effects are transmitted through the environment, through the economy and the price and money system (via markets for labour and commodities), and through global transport and information networks. The markets transmit effects in three main ways: through the level of activity creating demand for inputs of materials, fuels and labour; through wages and prices affecting incomes; and through incomes leading in turn to further demands for goods and services. In E3ME the determination of output comes from a post-Keynesian demand-driven accounting framework, and it is possible to have spare capacity in the economy (Figure A.1). It is not assumed that prices always adjust to market clearing levels, with the behaviour estimated based on historical data. For each region and sector, a set of behavioural equations are estimated. E3ME uses a system of error correction, allowing short-term dynamic (or transition) outcomes, moving towards a long-term trend. The dynamic specification is important when considering short and medium-term analysis (e.g. up to 2025) and rebound effects, which are included as standard in the model’s results.
The demand-Driven Structure of E3ME

This annex sets out the main assumptions used in estimating the employment in NbS. The sections that follow set out, in turn, the assumptions that entered the E3ME model: data sources, assumptions related to public expenditure, treatment of direct employment from ILO Public Employment Programmes (PEPs), employment results, and voluntary employment.

Current employment estimation is not linked to any particular year. The dynamics in E3ME mean that it takes time for the full impact of sustained NbS expenditure to be realized. The E3ME econometric equations estimate a short-run and a long-run equation with an error-correction mechanism. Under this specification, the direct response of employment to change in gross output is likely to be different in the short-run and the long-run. The induced impacts of NbS expenditure also take time to be fully realized in E3ME, given the short-run and long-run dynamics of, for example, change household consumption expenditure to real income changes.

The methodological approach is summarized in Figure A.2.
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Figure A.2  Summary of the methodological approach

There are three main data sources used in the estimation of current employment in NbS: the State of Finance for Nature (SFN) report; the IUCN Restoration Barometer; and ILO PEP data. These three sources collectively give the annual expenditure on NbS.

From the SFN data, six series of data are used: IMF Classification of the Functions of Government (COFOG) from 2016, OECD COFOG from 2018, OECD ODA from 2018, CBD Financial Reporting Framework analysis from 2018 (China data), USA Spending Budget Functions from 2018, and private expenditure. Data from the IMF in 2016 is compiled with the other public spending flows from 2018; this is because the latest data from IMF is from 2016 and, in order to get a comprehensive figure for 2018 NbS spending, it is assumed that this annual spending data remained constant through to 2018. Public spending flows are disaggregated by region, and therefore are easily mapped to E3ME regions. However, the SFN database does not provide equivalent disaggregation for private expenditure, so the percentage of public expenditure in each region is used as a proxy for private expenditure regional disaggregation. The ODA data had different sectoral disaggregation to the
COFOG data; thus the ODA sectors were mapped to COFOG sectors to allow the data to be compiled. The expenditure data is deflated using the 2010 USD World Bank data on consumer prices before it is used in the modelling. Table A.1 summarizes the mapping.

**Table A.1** Mapping ODA sectors to COFOG sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>ODA SECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting | Agricultural development  
Agricultural land resources  
Agricultural water resources  
Forestry development  
Forest industries |
| Wastewater management         | Water sector policy and administrative management  
Water resources conservation (including data collection) |
| Pollution abatement           | Forestry policy and administrative management  
Agricultural policy and administrative management |
| Protection of biodiversity and landscape | River basins development  
Biosphere protection  
Biodiversity  
Site preservation |
| Environmental protection n.e.c. | Environmental education/training  
Environmental research |

The SFN database did not provide sectoral disaggregation for private expenditure. For certain private expenditures, these could be mapped to a specific NbS archetype. For remaining categories, public expenditure shares by NbS archetype are used as a proxy to allocate private expenditures to each NbS.

Table A.2 details the private expenditure categories used; “General” indicates where no archetype is inferred and the proxy shares are used.
Table A.2  Mapping private expenditure categories to NbS archetype

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIVATE EXPENDITURE CATEGORY</th>
<th>NBS ARCHETYPE (COFOG SECTOR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity offsets</td>
<td>Protection of biodiversity and landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality trading and offsets</td>
<td>Wastewater management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PES (watersheds)</td>
<td>Wastewater management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation non-governmental organizations</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity impact investing</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private finance mobilized by DAC</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private finance leveraged by GEF</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private finance leveraged by GCF</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SFN data is supplemented with data from the Restoration Barometer and from ILO PEP data. These expenditure data are used additionally, or in place of SFN data, where expenditure values are higher than those reported in the SFN dataset.
Modelling current NbS expenditure

The public expenditure is split across three modelling pathways for current expenditure, investment expenditure, and compensation of government employees. The share of public expenditure for each of them is based on OECD COFOG data (for the United States it is based on US Spending data\(^1\)). Where data are not available for a country in the OECD COFOG data, then the average for the euro area countries is used.

For investment and current expenditure, assumptions for the NbS supply chain for each of the five NbS archetypes were developed across current and investment expenditure. Table A.3 details the assumptions by NbS archetype and indicates the E3ME sector that expenditure on each NbS archetype is directed to across current and investment expenditure categories.

Table A.3  NbS archetype supply chain assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NbS archetype</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>E3ME sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Crop production (0.4)</td>
<td>Forestry (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Electronics (0.5)</td>
<td>Construction (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wastewater management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Sewerage and waste (0.4)</td>
<td>Construction (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Construction (0.84)</td>
<td>Machinery, equipment n.e.c. (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pollution abatement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Sewerage and waste (0.8)</td>
<td>Other professional services (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Electronics (0.75)</td>
<td>Construction (0.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) USA Spending. n.d. [https://www.usaspending.gov/](https://www.usaspending.gov/)
### Protection of biodiversity and landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crop production (0.4)</td>
<td>Electronics (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry (0.4)</td>
<td>Construction (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R&amp;D activities (0.2)</td>
<td>Computer services (0.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental protection n.e.c.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction (0.5)</td>
<td>Construction (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R&amp;D activities (0.5)</td>
<td>Electronics (0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Machinery, equipment n.e.c. (0.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NON-EUROPEAN DEVELOPED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NbS archetype</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>E3ME sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Agriculture, fishing and hunting (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional services (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Electronics (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater management</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Miscellaneous services (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional services (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Construction (0.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical engineering (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electronics (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution abatement</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Miscellaneous services (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional services (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Electronics (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction (0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer services (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of biodiversity and landscape</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Agriculture, fishing and hunting (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional services (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Electronics (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer services (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection n.e.c.</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Construction (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional services (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Construction (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electronics (0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical engineering (0.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### NON-EUROPEAN DEVELOPING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NbS archetype</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>E3ME sector</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Agriculture, fishing and hunting and Forestry (0.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemicals (0.24); Wood and paper (0.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional services (0.41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for private expenditure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public administration and defence (0.41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Chemicals (0.55)</td>
<td>Forestry (0.25);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood and paper (0.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal products (0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional services or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public administration and defence (0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater management</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Miscellaneous services (0.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction (0.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional services (0.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Construction (0.84)</td>
<td>Mechanical engineering (0.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electronics (0.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution abatement</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Miscellaneous services (0.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional services (0.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Agriculture, fishing and hunting and Forestry (0.22)</td>
<td>Chemicals (0.24); Wood and paper (0.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional services (0.41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for private expenditure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public administration and defence (0.41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of biodiversity and landscape</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Chemicals (0.55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry (0.25);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood and paper (0.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal products (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional services or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public administration and defence (0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection n.e.c.</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Construction (0.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional services (0.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Electronics (0.5)</td>
<td>Construction (0.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer services (0.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Construction (0.8)</td>
<td>Electronics (0.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical engineering (0.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Values in parentheses indicate share of the NbS expenditure/investment allocated to the sector. Numbers in bold are provided by ILO and are based on forestry NbS project expenditure.
To model government expenditure on compensation of employees, employment is added exogenously to the public administration sector (ISIC Code O). The number of jobs created is calculated using E3ME data for employment cost (average wage and employer social security contributions) in the public administration sector.

In GDP accounting in the modelling:

1. Government current expenditure on compensation of employees contributes directly to GDP.
2. Government current expenditure on NbS contributes directly to GDP.
3. Investment expenditure on NbS – both private and public – contributes directly to GDP.
4. Current expenditure by the private sector does not contribute directly to GDP. This is intermediate consumption.

The modelling methodology does not account for the source of private expenditure; the cost of intermediate consumption is not attributed to any sector. There are no impacts on production costs, and therefore on sectoral prices. This dynamic is appropriate where private finance is sources from philanthropy or spent by conservation non-governmental organizations. Where private expenditure should be accounted as a cost to production, the methodology does not model the cost and price implications of NbS expenditure.

Public Employment Programmes (PEPs)

The direct employment under PEPs is not modelled within E3ME, so the figures reported in Chapter 3 are added exogenously. The induced impacts of the PEPs expenditure are included within the E3ME modelling, generating further employment in the economy. The expenditure within the PEP is included in household income; that is, modelled as a transfer to households. Where financial data are missing for programmes, the methodology underestimates induced impacts of PEPs.
Modelling future NbS expenditure

Future NbS expenditure was available by type of project: forestry, silvopasture, peatlands and mangroves. Slightly different treatments have been applied to each project category, based on data available in the assumption file.

Forestry NbS allocation

Forestry NbS expenditure information was available in the assumption file by expenditure type (CAPEX/ OPEX) and MagPie region. CAPEX expenditure was treated as investment expenditure in the E3ME model, OPEX expenditure was assumed to be current expenditure. The expenditure allocation by MagPie region (Table A.4) was further disaggregated to E3ME regions using current activity shares in Forestry.

Table A.4 MagPie Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAGPIE REGIONS</th>
<th>E3ME REGIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada, Australia and New Zealand</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Middle east and North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EU Member States</td>
<td>Other Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforming countries (i.e. Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and FSU countries in central Asia)</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CAPEX and OPEX Forestry expenditure was further allocated to E3ME sectors as follows:

1. For EU regions, and non-EU developed regions, the sectoral allocation is consistent with that presented for Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting in Table A.3.

2. For non-EU developing regions the allocation is consistent with the numbers provided by ILO and presented in Table A.5.

### Table A.5 Sectoral allocation for Forestry CAPEX and OPEX

**Sources:** Nello et al. (2019); Raes et al. (2022); Najera et al. (forthcoming).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CAPEX</th>
<th>OPEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and defence</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal products</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood and paper</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Silvopasture NbS expenditure allocation**

Silvopasture NbS expenditure was only available for CAPEX/OPEX at global level. The allocation to E3ME regions of the expenditure is done using the regional shares from the Forestry expenditure, as described by the E3ME model. For EU and non-EU developed countries, the sectoral allocation of expenditure is in line with Table A.3 above for Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, while for developing countries the allocation in Table A.6 was used, with the added assumption that 15% of the Forestry expenditure would be reallocated to Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting.
Table A.6  Silvopasture sectoral shares for developing countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>CAPEX</th>
<th>OPEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal products</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood and paper</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Chemicals n.e.s.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and defence</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCES: Nello et al. (2019); Nello et al. (2017); Raes et al. (2017); Togo, Ministère de l’Environnement, du Développement Durable et de la Protection de l’Environnement (2021).

Peatlands NbS expenditure allocation

Peatlands NbS expenditure was also only available at global level for CAPEX and OPEX. The allocation of the expenditure to E3ME regions was done using information on peatland area in global total (UNFCCC 2009), that is, countries with the largest peatland are also had the largest proportion of the expenditure.

The sectoral allocation follows the one presented in Table A.3 for Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting, with non-EU developing countries having the same allocation as non-EU developed countries.

Mangroves NbS expenditure allocation

Mangroves NbS expenditure was also only available at global level for CAPEX and OPEX. The allocation of the expenditure to E3ME regions was done using information on mangrove area in 2020, as given by FAOSTAT. For sectoral allocation, the EU and non-EU developed countries follow the same allocation as presented in Table A.3 above for Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, with non-EU developing countries following the allocation in Table A.7 below, as given by ILO.
Table A.7  Developing countries mangrove expenditure sectoral allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public administration and defence</th>
<th>CAPEX</th>
<th>OPEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Modelling employment

The direct employment in NbS presented in Chapter 6 is a result of:

- Direct employment exogenously added from PEPs.
- Government employees in NbS work or administering NbS work.
- E3ME estimation from government and private current and investment expenditure on NbS.

The indirect employment effects result from the private and public expenditure on NbS. Induced effects accrue through income effects from direct and indirect employment.

Voluntary employment

Voluntary employment in NbS is calculated using the ILO volunteer employment database and an average share of volunteers who worked on protecting/preserving nature. In most of the databases used for employment data in E3ME, voluntary employment is not captured. In the case of Eurostat data, the National Accounts employment data includes “unpaid voluntary workers […] if their volunteer activities result in goods; […]. But if their volunteer activities result in services, for example caretaking or cleaning without payment, they are not included under employment, because those
volunteer services are excluded from production” (EU 2013). Thus, in the case of European countries, voluntary employment in NbS is considered as part of the E3ME employment results. For all other countries, it is added additionally to the E3ME employment results.
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Appendix 3
Detailed case studies

A strategy for urban forests in Melbourne, Australia

At a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity description and type of NbS</th>
<th>Urban and peri-urban forestry to restore, sustainably manage and protect ecosystems in cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Societal challenge(s)</td>
<td>Climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners (identifying main implementers and partners, if any)</td>
<td>City of Melbourne Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several business partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing (source, amount)</td>
<td>The public sector, developers, businesses and wider community play a key role in financing tree maintenance in the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>2012-2032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of context and rationale for interventions

After more than a decade of drought, severe water restrictions and periods of extreme heat, combined with an aging tree stock, Melbourne's city trees are under immense stress, and many are now in accelerated decline. Several of Melbourne's landscapes were created over 100 years ago in a different climatic and social environment. A significant number of trees are nearing the end of their lives and landscapes are struggling to adapt to a changing climate. Combined with these problems, Melbourne's urban forest faces significant future challenges: climate change and urban sprawl.

The City of Melbourne's Urban Forest Strategy aims to address these issues and protect against future vulnerability by providing a robust strategic framework for the evolution and longevity of Melbourne's urban forest. In developing this strategy, the city recognizes the importance of a holistic "whole forest" approach to understanding and managing this invaluable resource.

The strategy also focuses on designing and planting the ‘forest of the future’ in a way that respects Melbourne's unique character, responds to climate change and urban sprawl, and supports the health, and well-being of the city’s residents and the city’s liveability in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical focus</th>
<th>The strategy is focused on the city of Melbourne, Australia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits</td>
<td>Create and connect ecosystems within the city and outside, Promote urban biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment effects</td>
<td>Job creation, Funds/grant opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target beneficiaries (# people reached) – employment beneficiaries</td>
<td>11 people are employed as part of this strategy. At least 700 citizens have volunteered to carry out essential advocacy, monitoring and research tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target beneficiaries (# people reached) – beneficiaries of services provided by the NbS</td>
<td>Residents, visitors and workers who live within or visit the City of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with public policies</td>
<td>The Tree Policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specifically, the strategy aims to support:

- **Human health**: Urban forests in the city are creating inclusive and walkable places that support citizens with cultural ecosystem services such as aesthetic design, space for recreation, and improved health through lower air pollution and stress reduction.

- **Climate change adaptation**: Climate change projections for Melbourne forecast an increasingly warm and dry climate that is liable to flooding and more frequent extremes of heat, including an increase in the urban heat island effect. One of the important functions of the urban forest is to provide shade and cooling. Canopy coverage throughout the city has increased to 25% since it began and it is minimizing the urban heat island effect by improving street-level comfort.

- **Climate change mitigation**: The benefits of the trees and the structural values of the urban forest have been calculated using a tool called i-Tree Eco to measure aspects such as air pollution control, carbon storage and sequestration, and energy savings.

- **Water security**: Drought and water restrictions can trigger irreversible decline for many trees. The city is addressing these changes directly by examining ways to keep existing trees alive while also planning the urban forest of the future through smart species selection, improving soil moisture retention, reducing stormwater flows, improving water quality and re-use, increasing shade and canopy cover, and reducing conflicts over infrastructure.

- **Biodiversity and ecosystem restoration**: A 2009 study by the Victorian Environmental Assessment Council identified ten major threats to biodiversity in Melbourne, including fragmented landscapes, connectivity loss due to major roads, pollution, human impacts (e.g. rubbish and trampling), predation from cats and dogs, and competition from introduced species. With the potential for urban areas to encroach on brown- and greenfield sites, the likely loss of biodiversity from these threats becomes even greater. Urban ecosystems can provide opportunities for protecting and enhancing vulnerable species, as they give rise to new habitat types such as green roofs and walls, gardens, reserves and parks.
Objective

The overall objective is to make the urban forest more resilient, healthy and diverse, while also contributing to the health and well-being of the community. Its motto is to create a city within a forest rather than a forest within a city.

The strategy has set the following objectives:

- Increase the canopy cover from 22% to 40% by 2040. This would require planting an average of 3,000 trees per year (Jaluzot 2018)
- Increase forest diversity so that the urban forest population will be composed of no more than 5% of one tree species, 10% of one genus, and 20% of one family
- Improve the health of tree populations by 90% by 2040
- Improve soil moisture
- Improve biodiversity
- Inform and consult with the community

Description of intervention/activities

The main activity is urban forestry, which includes actions to restore, sustainably manage and protect urban ecosystems in the city. Priority implementation actions include:

- Review and update tree precinct plans
- Develop boulevard master plans
- Implement urban forest diversity guidelines
- Assess the value of the urban forest (see below)
- Develop a ‘growing green’ guide for Melbourne
- Develop community engagement programmes
- Maintain and develop a register of exceptional trees
Outcomes achieved

- The city developed a scientific formula for calculating the amenity value of trees, based on factors such as tree condition, species type and growth rate, aesthetic value and locality values. A rough estimate of the city’s urban forest amenity value is around $700 million.

- The value of environmental benefits of 982 trees in selected parks around the city were calculated through a tool called i-Tree Eco, as follows:
  - Removal of 0.5 metric tonnes of air pollution per year, at a benefit of $3,820
  - Sequestration of 838 metric tonnes of carbon, at a dollar value of $19,100
  - Sequestration of 24 metric tonnes of carbon each year, at a value of $548 per year
  - Savings of $6,370 in energy costs each year through shading of buildings in summer and provision of solar access in winter
  - Avoided carbon emissions through a reduction in energy use by $114 per year

- Extrapolating these numbers to the entire population of 70,000 trees gives a clear indication of the high value of the urban forest.

- Based on extensive community consultation between 2012 and 2015, each of the 10 precinct plans designed a planting schedule for each street up to 2024. Streets with a high density of vulnerable people are prioritized in the plan.

- Between 2012 and 2021, 34,950 trees were planted in the city.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE TITLE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>■ Coordination and leadership of the Urban Forest and Ecology team&lt;br&gt;■ Connection with networks and industry&lt;br&gt;■ Setting strategic direction&lt;br&gt;■ Urban Forest and Ecology advocacy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Urban Forester</td>
<td>■ Implementation of the Urban Forest Strategy&lt;br&gt;■ Management of the tree planting programme&lt;br&gt;■ Implement the Urban Forest Precinct Plans&lt;br&gt;■ Manage tree protection and planting for major projects&lt;br&gt;■ Coordinate programmes such as Urban Forest Fund&lt;br&gt;■ Tracking of urban forest targets through regular coordination of data collection such as canopy mapping&lt;br&gt;■ Development of new programmes, strategic plans and initiatives&lt;br&gt;■ Tree risk management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Forester</td>
<td>■ Review of planning applications and implement tree protection conditions&lt;br&gt;■ Tree valuations and tree protection bonds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arborist</td>
<td>■ Implementation of Tree Policy to ensure protection of trees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ecologist</td>
<td>■ Implementation of the Nature in the City strategy and coordination of targets&lt;br&gt;■ Project management for capital works&lt;br&gt;■ Stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Coordinator</td>
<td>■ Management of volunteer programs and citizen science (including Gardens for Wildlife and Citizen Forester programmes)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>■ Delivery of projects to assist in the implementation of the Urban Forest Strategy and Nature in the City Strategy&lt;br&gt;■ Administration tasks&lt;br&gt;■ Addressing of customer service requests</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment effects

Eleven NbS jobs were created as part of this strategy, including both coordination (a manager, two project officers, and a volunteer coordinator) and technical positions (urban foresters, arborists and ecologists). Volunteer opportunities were also created through the strategy, notably through the Citizen Forester programme and the Gardens for Wildlife programme.

Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits

The city’s urban forest comprises around 70,000 trees in streets and parks as well as approximately 20,000 trees located on private premises, in addition to a growing number of green roofs and walls across the municipality. There are over 388 different species of trees in the city.

The urban forest is also home to diverse animal species including the powerful owl, tawny frogmouth, kookaburra, kingfisher, possum, White’s skink, grey-headed flying fox, striped legless lizard and blue-tongued lizard, Eltham Copper butterfly, and a variety of frogs and microbats. Waterways across the municipality are used by birds for nesting and habitat.

Description of co-benefits

- Capacity was developed among local stakeholders, including community members, local authorities, and local organizations.
- Combining grey infrastructure and NbS reduces the cost of grey infrastructure expenditure and improves the quality of the urban environment.
- Urban forests and associated ecosystem services will also yield benefits by attracting more people to live and work in, and visit, Melbourne.
- Urban forest benefits that can be quantified in monetary terms span a range of industries and disciplines including health, engineering, planning, sustainability, geology and real estate. These include:
  * Reducing energy costs (increasing tree cover by 10%—or strategically planting about three shade trees per building lot—saves annual heating and cooling costs by an estimated $50 to $90 per dwelling.)
  * Increase in property values
  * Avoided costs of infrastructure damage and renewal
  * Decrease in health costs
  * Support for tourism, which is growing in importance for many cities, through increased green space
Key success factors and lessons learned

In assessing the progress achieved so far through the strategy, some historical and context-specific aspects of the city must be taken into account. These include the Millennium drought as well as current and future challenges that urban forests in the city will face, such as aging tree population, diminishing availability of water, climate change, urban heat island effect, and urban intensification.

Other key factors to consider when planning urban forest include pressures such as population growth, economic growth, expansion of urban boundaries, and densification to ensure that cities remain liveable.

The development of the urban forest is an area of public planning that the government need not address without support. Developers seeking a marketing edge for their properties understand that building green means not just structural design, but the entire development site and its relationship to its surroundings. Business partners were also powerful contributors to the expansion and success of urban forestry through financial support, planting and maintenance of trees on commercial property, and support of civic organizations involved in forestry. Over 700 residents have volunteered as Citizen Foresters to help with various activities including tree planting and nature promotion events – receiving specific training for each activity – and this contributed greatly to the programme’s success (City of Melbourne n.d.).¹

For instance, over 120 Citizen Foresters helped collect data on tree hollows in parks and streets from 2016 to 2022 to help inform the management of trees (City of Melbourne 2021).

Achieving funding stability ultimately depends on on-going public support to ensure the city remains committed to the programme. Much of this support hinges on communicating and disseminating information about the benefits of Melbourne’s urban forest in terms of reduced stormwater pollution, electricity saved, carbon and water savings from lower energy use in buildings, lower demands on power plants, biodiversity benefits, and temperature reductions in the city as a whole – not to mention the aesthetic enhancement and wide-ranging social and economic advantages.

Alignment with public policies

The Tree Policy (City of Melbourne 2021) became operational in 2021 and recognize that all public trees covered by this policy are: (a) protected from any activity, including development, events or other activity that impacts their health and/or longevity; (b) protected from infrastructure conflict; and (c) give a priority status when the city is considering an application that has the potential to impact a tree, prior to the approval of any permit wherever reasonably practical.

The policy has been used as the basis of advocating for our urban forest. It allowed five grant projects to be accepted under the Urban Forest Fund. The fund provides matched financial support for new greening projects in the private realm, including new green spaces, tree planting, biodiversity projects, vertical greening and green roofs.
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Creating jobs and combatting desertification through local technologies in Burkina Faso

**At a glance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity description and type of NbS</th>
<th>Restoration of degraded lands through applying traditional restoration techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Societal challenge(s)</td>
<td>Insufficient arable land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuous land degradation due to erosion and anthropogenic pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of security in some localities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners (identifying main</td>
<td>International Labour Organization (ILO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementers and partners, if any)</td>
<td>Alliance Technique D'Assistance Au Développement (ATAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fédération nationale des groupements Naam (FNGN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau d’études CGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing (source, amount)</td>
<td>81,090,500 West African CFA franc (US$125,293)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financed by Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>May–October 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical focus</td>
<td>Burkina Faso: the localities of Kaya in the Centre-Nord Region, Fada N’gourma in the Est Region, and Ouahigouya in the Nord Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits</td>
<td>Regeneration and acceleration of vegetation cover regrowth and limitation of land erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment effects</td>
<td>Creation of 3 000 person-days of paid work for the local population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target beneficiaries (# people</td>
<td>The project hired 300 local workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reached) – employment beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of context and rationale for interventions

The Sahel is one of the regions most impacted by desertification in the world. To combat desertification and restore degraded landscapes in the Sahel, the Great Green Wall (GGW) initiative was launched in 2007 by the African Union and is being implemented across 22 African countries.²

The restoration efforts require a multitude of strategies and approaches, one of which is the wider use of indigenous restoration techniques. While these techniques have been used in the region for many years, as land degrades faster due to climate change and other factors, they now need to be used much more widely, and in regions where they were traditionally not relevant. Also, due to conflict, poverty, and intense use of the land, local populations are not able to apply these techniques autonomously at the scale required.

To support the wider use of these techniques as part of the GGW initiative, the ILO’s Employment Intensive Investment Programme initiated a project in Burkina Faso to demonstrate, document, and analyse traditional restoration techniques. The project has been implemented in two areas the localities of Kaya in the Centre-Nord Region, and Ouahigouya in the Northern Region. Both regions in the project face similar environmental and socio-economic challenges.

Like those in the rest of the country, the three regions’ soils are subject to strong erosion caused by human activities, wind, and water run-off. There is not enough arable land for the population, and climate change is exacerbating land degradation. All these factors have led to a decline in soil fertility, and thus there is a need to restore the soil’s productive potential.

What is more, these areas are faced with security challenges and large

---

² See https://www.unccd.int/our-work/ggw
influxes of internally displaced people (IDPs) in some communities. Many people have poor control of production techniques and difficulty accessing land and credit. The population in the three regions is mainly composed of young people, but due to the lack of employment opportunities and policies for development, youth unemployment has become an important issue. There is also a progressive disinterest among the youth in agro-silvo-pastoral activities.

In response to these challenges, the project is implementing traditional restoration techniques, including the demi-lune (half-moon), zai, diguette en pierres (stone dike), diguette en terre (earthen dike) and digue filtrante (filter dike). Through the construction of small-scale infrastructure works in sectors with high economic potential, which follows a labour-based and environment-friendly approach, the project can support youth employment and access to social services. The lessons drawn from the demonstration project will also help identify feasible approaches to a large-scale application of the techniques.

Objective

By creating local jobs through the application of local technologies to combat desertification in the Sahel, the project can support the GGW initiative and broader regional initiatives to combat desertification. Specifically, by demonstrating, documenting and analysing the implementation of these traditional restoration techniques, the project aims to draw lessons and to enable a wider application of these techniques in global initiatives.

On a local level, the project aims to:

- Create employment opportunities for youth and internally displaced persons (IDPs).
- Restore 42 ha of degraded land and increase exploitable areas in three localities.
- Stabilize the development and cohesion processes for/by communities living in the Sahel.

Description of intervention/activities

The project planned to use traditional techniques to restore 42 hectares of degraded land in Burkina Faso, as a demonstration for more widespread use of these techniques and their benefits. So far, the project has been successfully implemented in Songodin, a village in the Centre-Nord Region, and Sambtenga and Bogoya, two villages in the Northern Region. The
execution of the work is entrusted to Alliance Technique D'Assistance Au Développement (ATAD) and Fédération nationale des groupements Naam (FNGN), two locally established civil society organizations (CSO) with proven experience in green development.

The zai and demi lune techniques are both rainwater harvesting techniques used in the three villages (Partey et al. 2018). A zai is a miniature circular basin used to collect rainwater. Using a pickaxe, workers drill holes 25–30 cm in diameter and about 10–15 cm deep. They are staggered to better capture runoff. A demi lune is a semi-circular basin used to collect rainwater. The excavated material is placed downstream behind the semicircle. By making holes in the land and filling them with compost, the techniques can help retain nutrients and rainfall, thus making degraded land available again for cultivation. The project also planted 900 tree seedlings inside the zai.

The traditional techniques of diguette en pierres, diguette en terre and digue filtrante are also applied in the project, especially in Bogoya. These techniques aim to slow water run-off, replenish groundwater and reduce soil erosion. The labour productivity for the various activities was measured, and improvements in the planning and sequencing of activities were identified so as to optimize productivity.

Measures have been put in place to improve the working environment, including personal protective equipment (PPE), small-scale equipment, and boreholes at each site to provide drinking water and latrines.

**Outcomes achieved**

- The project has completed the construction of
- 1,580 demi-lunes on 5 ha in Songodin
- 215,910 zai on 16 ha in Songodin and Bogoya
- 1500 trees planted in Bogoya and Sambtenga
- 900 trees planted in Songodin
- 3 digues filtrantes (24 m long), 3 diguettes en pierres (200 m) and 4 diguettes en terre (500 m) in Sambtenga

The demonstration project also documented the key data in the application of five indigenous restoration techniques to fight desertification as a basis for a more extensive use of the techniques as part of the GGW initiative.
Employment effects

This demonstration project in Songodin, Sambtenga and Bogoya provided temporary job opportunities for local people and internally displaced persons (IDPs). They were paid on a task basis, according to the agreed output achieved on the sites’ development sites. Before the start of each project, the workers received training to strengthen their technical capacities for carrying out the work. The project in the three localities is expected to create employment of 3,000 person-days in total.

So far, 300 workers were recruited for the work in two localities, of which:

- 210 were female
- 64 were IDPs
- 71 were young people (age between 18 and 30)

The employment effects of the restoration techniques were also documented and analysed.

Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits

The traditional techniques of demi-lunes, zai, stone bunds, earth bunds, and permeable rock dams can help restore fertility and conserve water in the soil. As indigenous land conservation methods, they are expected to reduce soil erosion and vegetation loss, thus enhancing the ecosystems. They can reactivate biological activities in the soil, and thus improve the soil structure. The restoration will also make more arable land available, helping relieve human pressure on the environment and halt degradation.

Description of co-benefits

Farmers will benefit from capacity-building opportunities on land restoration techniques to continue improving land productivity and better incomes. Beyond the sites dedicated to the project, participants began to apply the techniques learned or optimized in their family plantation.

As the degraded land is restored and becomes available for cultivation, the anthropogenic pressure on land will be better addressed.

The demonstration and analysis of traditional restoration techniques can facilitate their application on a large scale, as part of the GGW.

Moreover, restoration can help increase yields, benefiting the local people. In the village of Pintiagou in the Est Region, the project’s construction of zai
and diguettes en pierres is expected to improve land productivity by about 0.400t/ha (from the current 0.6t/ha to 0.9 or 1t/ha) for crops such as white sorghum and small millet.

**Key success factors and lessons learned**

Lessons learned:

- The schedule of activities needs to be adjusted based on availability of labour.
- A monitoring strategy that integrates safety aspects for the project team, beneficiaries, and service providers is needed, especially in areas with volatile security.
- A preparatory phase of the project that integrates the production of compost based on organic manure is essential to ensure its availability.
- The availability of drinking water and a rest area for women and young children improves workers’ productivity.
- It is important to measure several social indicators at the beginning of the project, for a better understanding of group dynamics and social cohesion.
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Grain for Green (aka Sloping Land Conversion Program) in China

Summary: Grain for Green (aka Sloping Land Conversion Program) in China

In the 1990s, extensive land clearing led to increased soil erosion, frequent droughts and floods, and ecosystem degradation in many areas in China. After severe floods in 1998 claimed over 3,000 people’s lives, the Chinese government recognized nature as a critical solution for disaster risk management, economic and social development, and ecosystem degradation. In 1999, it launched the Grain for Green (GfG) programme, one of the largest restoration programmes in the world. Still ongoing, GfG seeks to reduce soil erosion, enhance biodiversity, and conserve natural resources by converting steep-sloped land, degraded cropland and barren land into forest and grassland (Lieuw-Kie-Song and Pérez-Cirera 2020). The programme also aims to accelerate the economy’s transition towards sustainability while improving farmers’ incomes.

GfG incentivizes farmers to stop activities that cause ecosystem degradation and instead plant trees or grass to restore ecosystems. This is mainly implemented in ecologically important or vulnerable area, or those with serious soil erosion, desertification, or low and unstable yields. Participating households receive a subsidy if their restoration efforts meet government requirements for specific trees species, plantation density, and survival rates, among others. The labour needed to meet these requirements is an estimated 30–60 person-days per household per year, on average.

Between 1999 and 2019, 41 million households participated in the programme. Each participating household received a total of 9,000 yuan (CNY, about US$1,300) on average (NFGA 2020). In return, these households collectively provided over 36 million full-time equivalent years of labour input over this period. As payments are made in three tranches over the five-year period,

---

1 Ecosystem restoration means preventing, halting and reversing the degradation of ecosystems worldwide to regain their ecological functionality and improve productivity and capacity to meet the needs of society. (BMUV and IUCN n.d.; see also the Restoration Barometer case in Part B of this appendix).
many farmers formed cooperatives to implement the restoration work, so as to receive more frequent payments. By 2021, China had 23,000 forestation cooperatives in 22 provinces, creating job opportunities for 1.6 million poor people and increasing their annual per capita income by more than CNY3,000 (US$435).

Between 1999 and 2019, 34.3 million hectares of farmland was converted to forest or grassland, greatly benefitting the ecosystem by reducing soil erosion, conserving water, sequestrating carbon, and preventing desertification. The annual total ecological benefit is estimated at CNY1.48 trillion (US$220 billion).

Key to the success of GfG are the subsidies and other policy supports to incentivize local governments and farmers to participate in restoration. However, long-term measures are needed to ensure farmers’ livelihoods after the subsidy period through the creation of green jobs and capacity building. Planting of ‘ecological’ indigenous trees rather than the ‘commercial’ species preferred by farmers would ensure the programme followed NbS standards more closely.

At a glance

| Activity description and type of NbS | restoration; conversion of farmland to forest and grassland; sustainable forest management |
| Societal challenge(s) | Reduce the risks of disasters caused by vegetation loss and soil erosion, especially floods. Transition the rural economy towards sustainability and increase farmers’ incomes. |
| Partners (identifying main implementers and partners, if any) | National Forestry and Grassland Administration National Development and Reform Commission Ministry of Finance Ministry of Agriculture Ministry of Land and Resources Provincial, city-level, and county-level governments |
| Financing (source, amount) | The central government invested CNY517.4 billion (US$76.57 billion) in the programme from 1999 to 2019. |
| Timeframe | 1999–present |
| Geographical focus | China. Areas with serious soil erosion, desertification, low and unstable yield, and ecologically important or vulnerable (including deep sloping land) |
Description of context and rationale for interventions

China has a large agricultural sector. Population pressures and agricultural development have resulted in many forests, grasslands and wetlands being converted to other uses, notably farmlands. **Extensive land clearing has led to increased soil erosion, frequent droughts and floods, and ecosystem degradation.** In the late 1990s, 37.1% of the country’s land area was affected by soil erosion. Two billion tons of silt were lost annually from the watersheds of the Yangtze and Yellow Rivers alone (National Forestry and Grassland Administration (NFGA) 2020).

Environmental degradation made the land more vulnerable to disasters. In 1998, a series of floods in the Yangtze River and other rivers in China claimed the lives of over 3,000 people and caused an economic loss of 255 billion yuan (CNY, around US$31 billion) (NFGA 2020). In light of the widespread devastation, the Chinese government recognized **nature as a critical solution** for disaster risk management, economic and social development, and ecosystem degradation. To restore the forests and watersheds, China banned logging several regions. To support the forestry workers laid off due...
to the ban and restriction, China implemented a series of social protection measures.

The support measures for other rural households affected by the restoration were incorporated in the Grain for Green (GfG) programme. The GfG programme is also called the “Returning of Farmland to Forest and Grassland” or “Sloping Lands Conversion Programme”.

Since 1999, the programme has evolved to have a stronger bottom-up approach, taking farmers’ willingness as a precondition for implementation. It has also shifted focus to a long-term rural economic transition, rather than short-term compensations for income loss (Forestry administration of Guangdong Province 2014).

**Objective**

The programme seeks to reduce soil erosion, enhance biodiversity, and conserve natural resources by converting steep-sloped land, degraded cropland, and barren land into forest and grassland (Lieuw-Kie-Song and Pérez-Cirera 2020). In the long term, the programme also aims to facilitate the transition in the agricultural economy towards sustainability, while also improving farmers’ incomes (Xu and Cao 2002).

**Description of Intervention / activities**

The main intervention is to plant trees or grass on the land to restore vegetation while halting agricultural activities that might lead to ecosystem degradation. The programme is mainly implemented in areas with serious soil erosion, desertification, low and unstable yields, and of ecological importance or vulnerability (including deep sloping land). Households participating in the conversion of farmland to forest or grassland can receive a subsidy. The subsidy was originally in the form of grain, which explains the name of the programme. This was changed into a cash subsidy in 2004. To get the subsidy, participating farmers on behalf of the household must sign a contract with the county-level government, specifying: (1) the scope and location of the farmland to convert; (2) the method of conversion; (3) the expected survival rate and preserving rate of the forest; and (4) other management work. Only when farmers’ work on reforestation meets the conditions specified in the contract can they receive the subsidies.

It is noteworthy that the GfG has made an important shift in 2014. At the programme’s beginning, at least 80% of the afforested land had to be planted with ecological trees (trees with a primary purpose of restoring environmental
functions, particularly controlling soil erosion and desertification). Only 20% of the afforested land could be planted with commercial trees that provide marketable products, such as walnut (Zinda et al. 2017). In 2014, however, these restrictions were lifted. Currently the specialists assigned by the county-level forestry authorities decide on tree species and other technical requirements for the land to be converted, based on economic feasibility, ecological conditions, and farmers’ input (NFGA 2013). This is partly because commercial trees are considered to have similar environmental value as ecological ones (Zhou 2014).

Farmers can farm in the areas converted to forest or grassland, on the condition of not damaging vegetation or causing new soil erosion. For instance, participating farmers can plant dwarf crops such as beans, peanuts and vegetables, to develop a non-timber forest-based economy. After the farmers receive all their subsidies from the government, they are also allowed to harvest timber from the forest with government approval. Farmers can use the grass as feed for livestock, but grazing is prohibited.

At present, the national standard of conversion from farmland to forest is CNY1,600 (US$237) in total per mu (a Chinese unit of area, equal to 1/15 of a hectare or 667 square meters). This includes a cash subsidy of CNY1,200 (US$177) and a seedling subsidy of CNY400 (US$59). The CNY1,200 subsidy will be distributed after five years: CNY500 per mu in the first year, CNY300 yuan per mu in the third year, and CNY400 per mu in the fifth year. The seedling planting subsidy should be used for seedling procurement and plantation management. The subsidy for conversion from farmland to grassland is CNY1,000 (US$148) per mu. Each province can add more subsidies based on the national standard. For example, Shanxi province started in 2016 to provide an extra subsidy of CNY800 (US$117) per mu for households participating in the reforestation in poor counties, and CNY500 (US$73) per mu for those in other counties (Fan and Jing 2016).

The subsidies are also meant to cover the labour input provided by households. On average the total labour needed for a farmer to meet the requirements of the GfG programme in forestation ranges from 12 to 25 working days per mu over 5 years. Thus, the average farming household (having 12.5 mu of land) in the programme can expect to work about 30–63 days a year on restoration activities. The CNY1,200 cash payment per mu equates to about CNY48–100 per day (US$6.2–13.8) (Institute of Urban Environment, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences 2010). This compares well with the daily wages of CNY80–150.

---

2 On average, forestation (including land clearing, preparation, planting, and nurturing, excluding maintenance) of land per hectare requires 103.5 days (6.9 days/mu) of work by one
per day (US$11.6 to 21.8) (Hu and Qiao 2018), given that the work is done close to home and at the household’s convenience.

Since 2016, the GfG programme has focused more on poor counties and households (Ministry of Finance et al. 2016). Notably, Shanxi province developed a “Poverty Reduction and Forestation Cooperative” model. The cooperatives create job opportunities for members by undertaking the GfG and other forest management projects. In this way, members can receive regular wage payments, rather than only three payments over the five-year period. In some successful cooperatives, the forestation workers’ annual wages can be over CNY15,000 (US$2,175) per person (Shi 2019). The cooperatives prioritize members’ labour incomes, as labour costs must account for more than 45% of the total project budget (General Office of the People’s Government of Shanxi Province 2017). By 2021, there were 23,000 forestation cooperatives in 22 provinces, creating job opportunities for 1.6 million poor people and increasing their annual per capita income by more than CNY3,000 (US$435). Most of the cooperative forestation workers are over 50 years old.

Outcomes achieved

The GfG programme helped restore degraded ecosystems by increasing vegetation cover. The 25 provinces participating in the programme have increased their forest cover by 4% on average, effectively halting the desertification in the north and southwest. Soil erosion around the Yangtze River, Yellow River and other major rivers was also significantly reduced.

Employment effects

Employment:

- By the end of 2019, 41 million households participated in the GfG program nationwide (NFGA 2020).
- The program is estimated to have generated 9,528 million days of work, equalling 38 million FTEs, for land clearing, preparation, planting, nurturing and maintenance (NFGA 2021).
Income:

- Each participating household received on average a total of CNY9,000 (US$1,313.72) from 1999 to 2019 (NFGA 2020).
- The programme diversified participating households’ income sources.

Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits

From 1999 to the end of 2019, 515 million mu (34.3 million hectares) of farmland were converted to forest and grassland (NFGA 2020).

Each year, the programme helps conserve 38.52 billion cubic metres of water, fix 634 million tonnes of soil, sequestrate 49 million tonnes of carbon, release 117 million tonnes of oxygen, absorb 3.1483 million tonnes of pollutants, and retain 476 million tonnes of soil. These ecological benefits are estimated to be worth CNY1.48 trillion (US$220 billion) per year, equalling 2.7 times of the total investment of 20 years (1999 to 2019) in the programme (NFGA 2021a). In addition to these benefits, the programme also contributed to biodiversity by restoring habitats.

Key success factors and lessons learned

- Subsidies and other policy support have greatly incentivized local governments and farmers to participate in restoration, as the subsidy standard is in accordance with the average forestation wages and the labour needed for restoration.
- The programme seeks to balance both economic and ecological aspects by allowing both local governments and farmers to select the trees/grass and methods used in the conversion.
- Long-term measures to ensure farmers’ livelihoods after the subsidy period are necessary. It is important to develop sustainable forest management, create green jobs and build capacity among farmers for such opportunities.
- There is a divergence of interests between the ecological and economic sides, notably in the type of trees used in the conversion. Farmers tend to plant ‘commercial trees’ such as walnut, which provide marketable products, instead of ‘ecological trees’ without such output. This change reduces the extent to which the programme follows NbS standards if only non-indigenous trees are planted.
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Restoring strategic ecosystems for watershed protection and conservation in Colombia

At a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity description and type of NbS</th>
<th>Ecosystem restoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Societal challenge(s)</td>
<td>Erosion and deforestation are two of the main causes of water scarcity in the country. Goal is to contribute to water protection and security in the territories where Grupo Argos (GA) and its strategy businesses (Cementos Argos, Celsia, Odinsa) have presence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners (identifying main implementers and partners, if any)</td>
<td>Colombian Ministry of Environment States and local governments States and regional environmental authorities (Cornare, Corantioquia, CVC, Cortolima) NGOs (Fundación Natura, Wildlife Conservation Society Fundación Guayacan, Instituto Von Humboldt, Proantioquia, among others.) Community social boards Local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing (source, amount)</td>
<td>Total funding US$9,966,360, with US$2 947,560 provided by Grupo Argos Foundation and US$7 018,800 provided by Celsia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>2016–2021. The program’s goals are established until 2030.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical focus</td>
<td>Colombia, in the states of Antioquia, Bolivar, Córdoba Sucre, Tolima and Valle del Cauca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits</td>
<td>9 537 hectares restored and conserved 11 412,393 native trees planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment effects</td>
<td>7,211 jobs (66% direct and 34% indirect)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of context and rationale for interventions

Colombia is well known for its biodiversity. It has a land area of 1,141,748 km²; of these, natural forests cover 60,025,731 hectares (ha). Among its strategic ecosystems are glaciers (36.7 km²), moorlands (2,254,444 ha), wetlands (30,781,149 ha) and dry forests (330,545 ha) (Colombia, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development 2020).

According to the Colombian Ministry of Environment, 40% of the national territory has some degree of erosion, 3% is severely eroded, 158.894 hectares have been deforested, and 56% of the regions are highly threatened by climate change. Consequently, erosion and deforestation have become two of the main causes of water scarcity in the country.

Since 2016, Grupo Argos and its business partners have been working since 2016 to restore strategic ecosystems – including mangroves, tropical dry forests and Andean forests – to contribute the fight against climate change and improve water protection and security in the Colombian territories where the group has its operations.

Grupo Argos, as a business group, seeks to protect water from its source in the mountains to where it flows into the sea using a systemic analysis.
methodology with a social and ecological approach, that considers water, biodiversity and social impact as the main variables.

Specifically, the initiative takes place in states of Colombia (Antioquia, Bolívar, Córdoba, Sucre, Tolima, and Valle del Cauca) and covers strategic ecosystems such as mangroves, tropical dry forests, and Andean forests.

**Objective**

This programme aims to help restore, protect and conserve key strategic ecosystems for the country’s water regulation and to contribute to the fight against climate change through the conservation of biological corridors, the protection of endangered species and the generation of green jobs.

**Description of intervention/activities**

Four components have been considered for the implementation of the program, in which actions are developed for conservation and social transformation to protect water resources and the health of the ecosystems, and to improve the quality of life for communities.

- **Component 1: Ecological and forest restoration and investigation.**
  - Identification of lands according to the importance of water resources
  - Tree planting process and formation of community nurseries
  - Signing of restoration agreements with landowners
  - Follow-up and maintenance of trees planting
  - Definition of species and monitoring of indicators

- **Component 2: Community participation and creation of green jobs**
  - Open calls to landowners to participate in the restoration process
  - Capacity-building with local communities and landowners in ecosystem restoration and conservation techniques, as well as in the protection of water resources.
  - Strengthening of community nurseries with technical support
  - Generation of local employment
  - Partnerships with public and private organizations to promote the programme
Component 3: Environmental education and participatory monitoring process
- Development of an environmental education programme in rural schools to improve environmental good practices
- Participatory research and monitoring of species with communities

Component 4: Alternative solutions to access to safe water for communities
- Donation of alternative solutions to access to safe water to families and schools
- Monitoring of water quality
- Identification of innovative solutions to access to safe water

Outcomes achieved

By taking a holistic approach in its water conservation and protection strategy, the initiative has improved the well-being of communities while contributing to the restoration of ecosystems. The protection of watersheds brings benefits in every aspect to community livelihoods. A good supply of water also improves areas such as health, education and farming productivity, among others.

In this way, the programme has achieved not only the ecological restoration of the prioritized areas but has also assured that beneficiaries can improve their agricultural and livestock practices, their access to environmental education and access to drinking water; in addition communities were able to participate in monitoring of wildlife species and the creation of new green businesses. For example, community nurseries became part of the restoration supply chain by selling plants to the foundation and its partners.

Three community associations of the Colombian Caribbean Coast established their own nurseries, employing more than 30 people. These organizations received technical training and financial support from Grupo Argos Foundation to improve their knowledge on the protection, management, and restoration of mangrove ecosystems. Currently, they supply seeds, plants and services such as the planting and maintenance of these trees to environmental authorities, companies, and foundations. To date, they have planted more than 270,000 mangrove trees, receiving around US$184,000 in payments. In this way, organizations have received economic, social and environmental benefits from the restoration programmes in their territories.
Outcomes:

- 9,537 hectares restored and conserved
- 11,412.393 native trees planted
- 121 conservation agreements signed with landowners and smallholder farmers
- 68,000 students trained through the environmental programme
- 9,716 people benefiting from safe water solutions

Employment effects

The programme generated direct and indirect jobs for 7,211 people in different activities, such as the restoration, protection and management of forests and strengthening of local nurseries. Most of the people are from rural areas of six Colombian states (Valle del Cauca, Tolima, Antioquia, Córdoba, Sucre, and Bolívar). The programme also promoted environmental projects from the communities that aim to develop their territories and generate income for families.

Monitoring of the number of both direct and indirect jobs created by the programme began in 2021, as shown in the table. Of the total number of jobs created, 66% were direct (hired by GA and its companies) and 34% were indirect jobs (i.e., relating to supplementary activities to the programme). In terms of gender balance, 79% of those employed were men and 21% were women. The number of jobs generated per year are described in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NO. JOBS</th>
<th>DIRECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits

The initiative has relevant results for the conservation of biodiversity. The most tangible is the number of hectares restored (9,537 ha) and the number of native trees planted (11,412,393).

In addition, the results of the participatory monitoring process of species in 2021 resulted in 2,393 wildlife records identified by camera traps. These activities have also contributed to harmonizing the relationship of communities with threatened umbrella species, such as the Andean Bear, as they encouraged the protection of the species’ habitats through conservation agreements with landowners and smallholders.

Description of co-benefits

- Agricultural producers in the territories received technical assistance to develop more sustainable practices (for example, technical training in regenerative livestock), which has increased productivity.

- The increase in the participation of vulnerable communities, such as women and youth, in the participatory monitoring of species and environmental education activities has generated new community initiatives (e.g., the creation of community tree nurseries).

- Technical and financial support to community organizations for the implementation of environmental and agricultural projects have contributed to the reduction of economic and environmental vulnerability in the territories.

- The creation of a special brand of coffee, Andean Bear Coffee, enabled the community to allocate part of its profits to the conservation of this species’ habitat.

- The environmental education programme enabled teachers and students to understand the ecosystems where they live and to create new practices to protect them.
Key success factors and lessons learned

One of the key success factors of the programme is the work done with the communities. Since the beginning, the initiative was co-designed with the community leaders and organizations, as they understand the impact of the restoration programme at all levels (economic, environmental and social). This has allowed Grupo Argos and its businesses to identify the needs of each territory and to adapt the programme accordingly.

One of the lessons learned is the need to establish appropriate methodologies to evaluate the success of the reforestation activities and assess their impact. Creating partnerships with the academia and research entities is key to this part of the process.
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## Payment for Environmental Services in Costa Rica

### At a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity description and type of NbS</th>
<th>Protection, restoration and sustainable management of forests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Societal challenge(s)</td>
<td>High deforestation rates, with associated land degradation and biodiversity loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners (identifying main implementers and partners, if any)</td>
<td>National Forest Financing Fund (FONAFIFO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Financing (source, amount)          | Government funding: more than US$565 million from 1997 to 2021  
Other sources of funding include the private sector, international banks and bilateral agencies (Porras et al. 2013). |
| Timeframe                           | 1997–present |
| Geographical focus                  | Private land (Porras et al. 2013) |
| Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits | Contributed to the recovery and maintenance of forest cover, as well as restoration of ecosystems (333 000 ha managed annually) |
| Employment effects                  | Approximately 3,500–4,000 direct jobs/year generated |
| Target beneficiaries (# people reached) – employment beneficiaries | 19,184 contracts signed with small- and medium-sized farm owners |
| Contributions to national or international commitments (SDGs, NDCs, NBSAPs, other, etc.) | SDGs: 8 – Decent work and economic growth, 12 – Responsible consumption and production, 13 – Climate Action, and 15 – Life on Land.  
Description of the context and justification of the interventions

During the 1970s and 1980s, Costa Rica experienced one of the highest deforestation rates in the world. By 1995, forests covered only 25% of the national territory. To address this problem, the country viewed natural resources as a path to development and developed a robust and innovative regulatory framework that incorporates the recognition of environmental services provided by forests and forest plantations for the benefit of Costa Rican society. As a result, Costa Rica is the only tropical country in the world to have reversed deforestation (World Bank 2022), with 52.4% of its territory now covered by forest.

The Forest Law No. 7575 of 1996 included relevant measures to support the recovery of the country’s forest cover. These included the prohibition of changes in land use, the concept of environmental services, the creation of the National Forest Financing Fund (FONAFIFO) as the executing entity of the Payment for Environmental Services Program (PESP). It also established the programme's source of financing, which is based on a percentage of the single tax on fossil fuels collected under the “polluter pays” principle.

The PESP scheme consists of four pillars (FONAFIFO. n.d) that have enabled its development and operation, as well as its capacity to adapt to changes over time: (a) a defined legal framework; (b) permanent financing from national sources; (c) governance of the programme with responsibilities and competencies defined for the actors involved; and (d) a monitoring and follow-up system for the execution of actions on the ground. These pillars have contributed to the proper management of public funds and the successful implementation of the programme throughout changes in government.

The development and implementation of financial mechanisms for the conservation of forests generated initiatives such as Ecomercados I and II with the World Bank, the Huetar Norte Forestry Project supported by the Government of Germany, and the project for the sale of Certified Emission Reduction (CER) credits under the Clean Development Mechanism of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). These programmes have been pivotal for the country’s National Strategy on REDD+ (reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks) and the positioning of Costa Rica as a global environmental leader, as well as to promote commercial agreements with the Green Climate Fund, the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) of the World Bank and, more recently, negotiations with the Lowering Emissions by Accelerating Forest finance (LEAF) Coalition.
Global recognition of Costa Rica’s efforts materialized with the designation of the PESP in 2020 by the United Nations as a Global Climate Action. In 2021, the country was awarded the first Earthshot Prize in the category of Protection and Restoration of Nature for the actions of the PESP and the country’s National System of Conservation Areas.

**Goal**

The PESP recognizes, through a payment to small- and medium-size producers, the environmental services provided by forests and forest plantations.

The PESP aims to ensure the provision of four main ecosystem services: capturing and storing atmospheric carbon, protecting water sources, and conserving biodiversity and scenic beauty (see figure) (Porras et al. 2013).

**Figure:** Environmental services recognized within the PESP

Source: FONAFIFO
Description of the intervention/activities

The financing of the PESP through taxation represented a way for Costa Rican society to support the recovery and maintenance of forests on private land, while complementing the actions of the State concentrated in Protected Wildlife Areas. Any private landowner with a property title or possession rights for a minimum of one hectare can access the PESP. The four main categories of participants are: individuals, legal entities (including micro-enterprises, family businesses, small- and medium-sized enterprises, and large companies and their subsidiaries), development or conservation cooperatives, and Indigenous communities (Porras et al. 2013).

This mechanism consists of payments to the owners of private farms for the environmental services generated by their work in maintaining forest coverage (including protection of water resources and post-harvest protection) and restoring forests (including reforestation, regeneration and agroforestry systems).

In particular, the introduction agroforestry contracts significantly incentivized small-scale farmers (with less than 10 hectares) to participate in the PESP. The contracts, which are based on the number of trees rather than hectares, resulted in 4.4 million trees being planted between 2003 and 2013 (Porras et al. 2013). Beneficiaries must meet a series of general and specific requirements (a minimum and maximum limit of hectares and trees, depending on the activity). The duration of the contract varies from 5 to 10 years, during which time implementation and maintenance work is carried out by both the farmers and hired labour (i.e., earning agricultural wages). Aside from direct payments, private forest owners who manage the forests through PESP are exempt from property taxes (Porras et al. 2013).

Outcomes achieved

This financial mechanism, together with other initiatives and public policies, has contributed to the doubling of the country’s forest area from 25% in 1995 to 52.4% in 2015 (see figure of map).
**Figure:** Map of Costa Rica forest cover

![Map of Costa Rica forest cover](image)

The map indicates the distribution of various forest types in Costa Rica, including mature forest, secondary forest, mangrove stands, palm forest, grass with trees, non-forest, clouds and shadows, and provincial boundary.

Source: National Forest Inventory 2015.

**Effects on employment**

Between 1997 and 2021, the Costa Rican Government invested more than US$565 million in rural areas of the country through the PESP (including more than US$40 million in Indigenous territories), thus supporting income generation, employment and conservation on private farms, as well as supporting policies of the Ministry of Environment and Energy (MINAE) on establishing biological corridors, biodiversity and protection of water resources. The PESP is a major source of income for many Indigenous communities and has improved quality of life for families (Porras et al. 2013; UNFCCC n.d.).

Throughout its 25 years of operation, the PESP has signed 19,184 contracts of between 5 and 10 years with small- and medium-sized farm owners, supporting the protection of 1.3 million hectares of forests. The participation of women and Indigenous peoples has been central to the achievement of these results. The programme has led to the creation of 3,500–4,000 direct jobs each year generated by the demand for labour to implement and manage its activities. According to a 2003 survey, job creation under the PESP is variable, mostly resulting in occasional work (once a year for 2–4 weeks). Apart from the forestry activities carried out by family members and/or farm
workers, the PESP also directly created technical and professional posts such as forest engineers, geographers, and biologists in related organizations (Miranda, Porras and Moreno 2003).

However, while legal entities are the most prominent group receiving distributions of payment for reforestation, their right to anonymity makes it difficult to measure the employment effects they generate in any detail. The PESP might also have potential negative impacts on jobs, if forest protection leads to the abandonment of agricultural lands (Porras et al. 2013).

**Benefits for biodiversity and ecosystems**

PESP has contributed to the recovery and maintenance of forest cover and to the restoration of ecosystems throughout the country, with 333,000 hectares managed annually, thereby improving the provision of environmental services.

**Success factors and lessons learned**

Among the main strengths of the PESP is the degree of professionalism of its human capital, which has enabled it to maintain and improve the programme through innovation in creating and exploring new schemes and sources of financing. Another success factor is represented by the capacity to develop business opportunities with companies – both public and private, and national and international – with the institutional objective of benefiting the owners of forests, forest plantations and the country’s forestry and environmental sector in general. Actions by private forestry professionals and the contributions of grassroots organizations that provide technical and administrative advice to farm owners, along with international cooperation, have led to proactive efforts to identify alternatives that would financially strengthen the PESP.

There is a need for the PESP to evolve in order to respond to emerging needs and urgent priorities. Current discussions are focusing on the implementation of a new programme called "PES 2.0", which will aim to address actions beyond the country’s forestry sector.
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Improving coastal resilience and livelihoods in Kenya

At a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity description and type of NbS</th>
<th>Restoration:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mangrove forest restoration, creating natural carbon sinks for climate change mitigation, and protecting shorelines from coastal erosion and loss of marine biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion of sustainable environmental practices and effective waste management with the aim to reduce the amount of plastic waste along the Kenyan coastline, which impacts negatively on coastal and marine biodiversity and sustainable livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protection:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancement of sustainable mangrove conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable management:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s economic empowerment through training and support of coastal communities in female-led sustainable seaweed farming cooperatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Societal challenge(s)</th>
<th>poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gender inequality and gender-based violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>climate-related risks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners (identifying main implementers and partners, if any)</th>
<th>NGO: Plan International Kenya and Plan International UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government: Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI); Kenya Forest Service (KFS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community-based organizations: Beach Management Units; Pwani University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing (source, amount)</th>
<th>£320k; Moondance Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>3 years (2020–2023)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical focus</th>
<th>coastal Kwale county, Kenya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits | The project has contributed to improving the restoration of local mangrove forests and enhancing fish populations through the conservation of existing mangroves, while also rehabilitating degraded sites. |
Activity description and type of NbS

**Restoration:**
Mangrove forest restoration, creating natural carbon sinks for climate change mitigation, and protecting shorelines from coastal erosion and loss of marine biodiversity.

**Promotion of sustainable environmental practices and effective waste management with the aim to reduce the amount of plastic waste along the Kenyan coastline, which impacts negatively on coastal and marine biodiversity and sustainable livelihoods.**

**Protection:**
Enhancement of sustainable mangrove conservation.

**Sustainable management:**
Women’s economic empowerment through training and support of coastal communities in female-led sustainable seaweed farming cooperatives.

**Societal challenge(s):**
Poverty, gender inequality and gender-based violence, climate-related risks.

**Partners (identifying main implementers and partners, if any):**
- **NGO:** Plan International Kenya and Plan International UK
- **Government:** Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI); Kenya Forest Service (KFS)
- **Community-based organizations:** Beach Management Units; Pwani University

**Financing (source, amount):**
£320k; Moondance Foundation

**Timeframe:**
3 years (2020–2023)

**Geographical focus:**
Coastal Kwale county, Kenya

**Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits:**
The project has contributed to improving the restoration of local mangrove forests and enhancing fish populations through the conservation of existing mangroves, while also rehabilitating degraded sites.

### Description of context and rationale for interventions

Along the Kenyan coastline, 71 per cent of the population live in poverty, and communities are highly reliant on natural resources to survive. The coastal ecosystem, a diverse mix of mangroves, seaweed beds and coral reefs, is extremely important ecologically. It also has enormous potential to support local communities with sustainable and resilient livelihoods, if managed well.

However, in recent years the degradation of mangrove forests, primarily for firewood, as well as over-fishing have become prevalent as means of short-term income for the coastal communities. This undermines the ecological balance of the local ecosystem and impacts negatively on the future economic security of these communities, while making them more vulnerable to the effects of climate change such as storm surges and flash floods. Women and children are often the most vulnerable, as they generally have limited access to resources, services and information, and lack the mobility to act in anticipation of and response to climate and weather risks. This economic and social vulnerability has been further exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic,
as the lack of savings or social security contribute to coastal communities’ concerns about their future earning potential in a potential economic crisis.

Additionally, Kwale County has experienced extended periods of drought, leading it to be included among the 18 counties in Kenya that rely on relief food and other humanitarian responses. The communities depend on rainfed agriculture and fishing as main sources of livelihood. However, the county has been experiencing a cycle of failed rains over the last three years. Overfishing, increased sea temperatures and environmental degradation has resulted in decreasing fish catch and limited alternative sources of livelihood. Families are finding it difficult to cope, and conditions have worsened with increased food insecurity and other economic challenges, poverty, climate and weather extremes, the spread of diseases and the lack of social protection mechanisms. Communities within the project sites were previously reliant on fish farming and subsistence crop farming for their daily needs, but as challenges compounded, they have become exposed to chronic food shortages leading to an increased risk of malnutrition, reductions in school enrolment and increase in gender-based violence.

The Coastal Resilient Livelihood Project has been working with communities to promote alternative and supplemental environmentally sustainable and climate resilient income-generating opportunities, primarily targeting women. The initiative aims to promote community-led environmental protection and management, while increasing awareness of environmental issues and climate change. In particular, the project aims to empower women and children to promote environmental stewardship by taking a leading role in mangrove forest restoration within their communities, leading to an increase in biodiversity and natural carbon sinks, as well as the promotion of breeding sites for fish and increased protection from storm surges and coastal floods. Seaweed farming provides an opportunity to increase the climate resilience of coastal communities, improve women’s economic empowerment, food, energy and shelter for marine life, and promote carbon sequestration and coastal protection.
Objective

Objective: Improved well-being of target communities and households in coastal Kwale County, Kenya, through the sustainable management and conservation of natural resources. This is to be achieved through the realization of the following outcomes:

1. Community-led mangrove forest restoration
2. Community-led – particularly women-led – environmentally sustainable livelihoods
3. Improved solid waste management and environmental protection practices
4. Increased environmental and climate awareness action by schoolchildren and communities

Description of intervention/activities

1. Seaweed farming, including development of technical, financial and marketing skills and kit distribution
2. Mangrove forest restoration through the establishment of nurseries, tree planting and GIS monitoring
3. Waste management practices and sensitization, and awareness creation at the community level
4. School-based environmental and climate awareness and education through school clubs and activities

Outcomes achieved

Along the Kwale coast, eight communities are actively engaged in mangrove restoration through the establishment of tree nurseries by 476 community members (232 female and 244 male). The process began with a training session on appropriate mangrove species, nursery bed establishment, transplanting and the seasonality of mangrove planting. Through a partnership with local public university (Pwani University), the project mapped out 38 degraded sites with a total 500 hectares using GIS.

The community has now taken the initiative to establish nurseries and transplant mangrove seedlings to the degraded sites. To date 472,500 seedlings have been established in nurseries and 51,216 have been transplanted. To ensure sustainability, the community has registered a Community Forest
Association and are developing a Participatory Forest Management Plan to guide the reforestation, conservation and harnessing of forest resources.

The communities hold several parcels of seaweed farms, which are now producing hundreds of tonnes of seaweed. The farms have been planted by 514 community members (342 female and 172 male). The minimum amount they have earned from the produce is US$10,000 in one year. Seaweed farming has provided a viable and non-seasonal income source to supplement other sources of income. Through seaweed farming, women have been empowered and are actively participating in income generation, giving them a voice in decision making at the household level. Through seaweed farming, communities have reported improved housing, improved access to health services, realize education opportunities for their children, and access capital to start small-scale businesses. Linkages with buyers has ensured that communities have a regular market for their produce.

Additionally, to date, three BMUs are collecting solid waste and selling it to recycling companies for income.

### Employment impacts

#### Seaweed farming

The project has created jobs for participating community members, who earn from sales of seaweed. A total of 514 community members (342 women and 172 men) are participating at different stages, earning varying amounts depending on the crop cycle. Employment is mainly part time, with two people employed by Kibuyuni Seaweed Corporation on a permanent basis.

Income effects: Through seaweed farming, the participating community members are able to meet their daily dietary needs, access to health service and education opportunities for their children as well as purchase assets.

Mangrove forest restoration: The project has created 476 jobs (232 female and 244 male) for community members who are involved in the establishment of a commercial seedling nursery. Through formal group structures, the groups set up the nursery and sell seedlings to partners who are implementing mangrove restoration activities.

As of October 2022, 762,180 mangrove seedlings are in nurseries, and another 203,620 have been planted and 38,500 sold for a total of KES770,000. Once the seedlings have been sold, the group discusses how the income should be used.
Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits

The project has contributed to improving the restoration of local mangrove forests and enhancing the fish population through the conservation of existing mangroves, while also rehabilitating degraded sites.

Description of co-benefits

- More women have been recruited in job markets through their participation in seaweed farming and mangrove restoration.
- Improved, sound environmental stewardship is being practiced by participating community members, who have a better understanding of the nexus between mangrove conservation and fish farming, among other ecological benefits.
- Environmental education has improved through 4-K club (4-K stands for Kuungana, Kufanya, Kusaidia Kenya, loosely translated as “coming together, to act, in order to help Kenya”) participation in ecosystem conservation through water harvesting, tree planting and climate-resilient horticulture practices.
- Community cohesion has improved, along with a reduction in gender-based violence, as the project advocates for gender equity and inclusion, providing participating women the ability to earn income and participate actively in household-level decision making.

Key success factors and lessons learned

- Seaweed farming has provided women with an alternative supplemental income stream at the household and community level, promoting empowerment and agency.
- Community engagement and leadership in mangrove forest restoration and waste management is contributing to successful environmental management in the project locations.
- School-based environmental activities are promoting environmental best practices at home.
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## Smart coasts in Mesoamerica

### At a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity description and type of NbS</th>
<th>Actions to restore: Restoration of coral reefs, watersheds and coastal dunes Actions to protect: Protection of mangroves and coral reefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Societal challenge(s)</td>
<td>Climate change Disaster-risk reduction Associated threats to nature and the economy Biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization(s)</td>
<td>WWF Mexico, WWF Mesoamerica, WWF Germany, WWF US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Partners (identifying main implementers and partners, if any) | Mexico: National Commission of Protected Areas; Yucatan State Secretariat of Sustainable Development; Pronatura Península de Yucatán; and Centro Mexicano de Derecho Ambiental  
Belize: Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, the Environment and Sustainable Development; Division/Department: Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute; Hol Chan Marine Reserve; Sarteneja Alliance for Conservation and Development; Southern Environmental Association; and Toledo Institute for Development and Environment  
Honduras: Ministry of Energy, Natural Resources, Environment and Mines; Division/Department: Department of Protected Areas / National Institute of Forest Conservation and Development, Protected Areas and Wildlife; Centro de Estudios Marinos; and Asociación Cuerpos de Conservación de Omoa  
Guatemala: Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources and Fundación para el Ecodesarrollo y la Conservación |
| Financing (source, amount)                    | US$5.1 million total funding (4.7 million from IKI/German Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection; 0.4 million by WWF) |
| Timeframe                                     | June 2018 to May 2023 |
| Geographical focus                           | Mesoamerican Reef Ecoregion (Mexico, Belize, Guatemala and Honduras) |
| Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits          | Protected and restored ecosystems serve as nurseries for marine species and as a microrefugia Habitat for species such as sea turtles, birds, and targeted fish species (parrot fish, snapper) |
Geographical focus

The project is focused on the Mesoamerican Reef Ecoregion, which is home to watersheds, mangroves, seagrass, coastal dunes and coral reefs. The project engages local and Indigenous communities in the coastal zones of the ecoregion that depend on natural resources for their livelihoods and are thus vulnerable to climate change.

Description of context and rationale for interventions

The Mesoamerican Reef System is the largest transboundary reef system in the world and contains the world’s second longest barrier reef. The system stretches across four countries: Mexico, Belize, Guatemala and Honduras, along more than 1,000 km of coastline and is a hotspot for biodiversity including endangered marine turtles, more than 60 types of corals and more than 500 fish species.

Coastal and marine resources in this region provide essential ecosystem services, sustain key economic sectors, support the livelihoods of more than two million people and contribute to the protection of coastal communities against adverse effects of climate change. These areas are also among the most vulnerable regions worldwide to climate change impacts.

### Employment effects

- Job creation
- Livelihoods diversification
- Recreational activities (tourism)

### Target beneficiaries (# people reached) – employment beneficiaries

- 79 people employed

### Target beneficiaries (# people reached) – beneficiaries of services provided by the NbS

- 3,000 people

### Contributions to national or international commitments (SDGs, NDCs, NBSAPs, other, etc.)

- Mexico’s Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for Protected Areas
- Belize’s updated Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan
- Several protected area management plans in the four countries
- The updated NDCs of three countries have targets based on the science-based analyses that the project has produced.
management of these resources does not yet adequately take into account adaptation principles and measures. There is a need to strengthen capacities in coastal communities and government institutions to integrate climate change scenarios and adaptation measures to inform management and development policies for protected areas and coastal zones.

Societal challenge

Climate change adaptation and disaster-risk reduction: The project areas are prone to climate hazards. Implementing ecosystem-based adaptation measures is expected to reduce the vulnerability of people to climate change in general and in particular to coastal hazards such as erosion, sea level rise, and flooding from storm surges.

Objective

The initiative seeks to incorporate climate change principles into the management of protected areas and coastal development policies, with the aim of improving the capacities of coastal communities to adapt to climate change. The adaptation strategies are integrated into higher-level policy instruments such as coastal development plans and management plans for protected areas and into locally based adaptation measures.

Description of intervention/activities

- **Belize**: Mangrove protection (300–500 hectares) and restoration (TBD), and coral restoration (0.5–1 ha)
- **Honduras**: Watershed restoration: restoration of agricultural land, implementation of improved agricultural practices to conserve soil, establishment of riparian forest within 30 m of rivers
- **Guatemala**: Mangrove protection: at least 230 ha
- **Mexico**: Coastal dune restoration: 2,550 m

Outcomes achieved

The project’s expected outcome is to strengthen the adaptation capacity of coastal communities and protected areas of the countries that make up the Mesoamerican Reef region.

Smart Coasts built a technical base around the importance of the conservation and restoration of coastal habitats for the well-being of communities in the
MAR region, especially in the face of climate change. Since the start of the project, the project has informed over 15 policy documents across the project countries, including updates to Nationally Determined Contributions, coastal management plans, and climate change policy instruments.

Moreover, government authorities and other relevant stakeholders have been trained to use the spatial analysis tools developed so as to allow for replication of the project approach in other regions.

Finally, the project is informing and supporting implementation of ecosystem-based adaptation options on the ground, which has included community participation as a key pillar.

**Employment effects**

A total 79 NbS jobs have been created, supported or enhanced, of which 55 per cent are held by women and 12 per cent by youth. The project created a variety of emerging jobs with NbS specializations: programme coordination, ecosystem restoration, environmental education, data and information gathering, legal or policy advisory, geospatial analysis, and participatory and inclusive processes. (See table for full list of job types. The top positions both at regional and country level coordination are led by women.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS</th>
<th>CONTRACT TYPE</th>
<th>MIN. QUALIFICATIONS NEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional project coordinator</td>
<td>Coordinates project activities at regional level, and oversees project execution, decision making, and adaptive management.</td>
<td>1 - 1 - 1 -</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Upper education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Project coordinator</td>
<td>Country coordinators lead and supervise the project’s implementation locally, engaging various stakeholders, translating scientific information, and providing technical assistance.</td>
<td>4 1 3 -</td>
<td>Temporary Fixed-Term Part-time Contracted</td>
<td>Upper education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication coordinator</td>
<td>Leads development and deployment of communication materials for various audiences.</td>
<td>1 - 1 - -</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Upper education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>NUMBER OF JOBS</td>
<td>CONTRACT TYPE</td>
<td>MIN. QUALIFICATIONS NEEDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation specialist</td>
<td>Keeps track of progress against expected outcomes and outputs.</td>
<td>1  -  1  -</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td>Maintains relationships with donor, oversees overall project reporting to donor, and keeps the technical team informed about legal and administrative developments.</td>
<td>1  -  1  -</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Upper education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific advisor</td>
<td>Engages with science partners and supports translation of technical information into actionable information.</td>
<td>1  1  -  -</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Upper education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>Support the project’s work in specific areas of expertise, support project managers and complement their capacities. Consultants conduct both desktop and field work, depending on specific needs. Consultancy types include: communication, ecosystem restoration, environmental education, data and information gathering, legal or policy advice, geospatial analysis, and others.</td>
<td>44  24  19  10</td>
<td>Temporary Fixed-Term Part-time Contracted</td>
<td>Upper education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park rangers</td>
<td>Park rangers work directly in the field, helping to manage protected areas and their resources. They conduct work such as monitoring and surveillance, but also engage with local community members.</td>
<td>1  1  -  -</td>
<td>Short-term employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>Researchers generally work in academic institutions and universities and have very specific and advanced expertise. They operate as project partners, generating technical/scientific information to support project implementation such as climate projections and ecosystem service models. Researchers can also support capacity building of other project members through training.</td>
<td>6  -  6  -</td>
<td>Temporary Fixed-Term Part-time Contracted</td>
<td>Upper education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits

The project supports the protection of mangroves, coral reefs, seagrass beds and coastal dunes, as well as the protection and conservation of critical habitat for turtle, bird and fish species, and areas that serve as nurseries for marine species.

**Description of co-benefits**

- The project supports capacity building of local stakeholders, including community members, local authorities and local organizations.
- Coral reef and mangrove conservation and restoration are expected to increase tourism, bringing economic benefits to local communities.
- Coastal dune, mangrove, seagrass and coral reef conservation and restoration protect community livelihoods and infrastructure from coastal hazards.
- Coral reef and mangrove health is expected to increase fish populations, potentially increasing fisheries-related jobs.
Contributions to national or international commitments (SDGs, NDCs, NBSAPs, other, etc.)

The project’s science-based analysis has contributed to various subnational and national policies, including Mexico’s Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for Protected Areas, Belize’s updated Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan, and several protected area management plans in the four countries, as well as the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) of Belize, Guatemala and Honduras.

As of June 2022, the project has worked with government representatives of 17 different agencies to integrate future climate analyses into a total of 27 policy instruments and plans in the four countries.

Key success factors and lessons learned

The hands-on approach and continued engagement of country coordinators was critical for positive engagement of local and national government authorities and other stakeholders. However, the COVID-19 pandemic severely affected the team’s ability to connect and engage with stakeholders. For some stakeholders, digital communications proved a useful way to overcome this challenge, but limited internet connectivity in rural areas made connecting with local communities more difficult.

To re-engage local community participants, the project reoriented its communication strategy to develop a 10-episode educational radio series, which was later transformed into a podcast and animated videos that were shared widely via local radio stations and social media. Their production took into account local languages and language variations, which were well received, reaching over 60,000 individuals.
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## Ten Billion Tree Tsunami Programme in Pakistan

### At a glance

| Activity description and type of NbS | Restoration of forests and rangelands  
Conservation of wildlife and protected areas  
Sustainable management of watersheds and rangelands |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Societal challenge(s)               | Climate change mitigation and adaptation  
Large-scale environmental degradation  
Extreme weather events including rising temperatures, flooding and droughts |
| Partners (identifying main implementers and partners, if any) | Ministry of Climate Change (MoCC)  
Governments of four provinces (Punjab, Sindh, Balochistan and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa) and two independent territories (Gilgit-Baltistan, and Azad Jammu and Kashmir)  
A consortium including IUCN, FAO and WWF-Pakistan, carries out independent third-party monitoring and evaluation (TPM&E) to ensure transparency at the request of MoCC. |
| Financing (source, amount)          | **Local cost: Government of Pakistan**  
Forestry Component: 109.38 billion Pakistani rupees (US$491 million)  
Wildlife Component: 15.59 billion Pakistani rupees (US$70 million)  
Liabilities of Green Pakistan Programme: 210,000,000 Pakistani rupees (US$950,000)  
**Total cost: 125.184 billion** Pakistani rupees (US$562 million; 50% Federal Public Sector Development Program and 50% Provincial Annual Development Plans) |
| Timeframe                           | Phase 1: 2019–2023 |
| Geographical focus                 | Pakistan |
| Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits | Enhanced forest cover  
Reduction of plastic waste in protected areas.  
Better conservation of Critically Endangered habitats  
Stricter regulation on illegal wildlife trafficking |
| Employment effects                  | The programme employed 1,420,962 men and women across Pakistan.  
Through the co-benefits, the programme would contribute to job creation in the long term. |
Description of intervention

Pakistan is the fifth most populated country in the world and the seventh most vulnerable country to climate change. The country is facing a fiscal crisis and high rates of unemployment, and is currently being supported by an International Monetary Fund (IMF)-sponsored macroeconomic stabilization programme.

Pakistan also suffers from widespread environmental deterioration, with a forest cover of around 4.8 per cent. Large-scale deforestation resulting from land conversion to agriculture is the result of encroachment into forest areas by a fast-growing population. This has led to the loss of ecosystem goods and services and resulted in associated socio-economic impacts.

To address this, Pakistan’s Ten Billion Tree Tsunami Programme (TBTTP), inaugurated on 2 September 2018, aims to support the country’s transition towards climate resilience by mainstreaming climate change adaptation and mitigation through ecologically targeted initiatives. With an initial budget of nearly 125.2 billion Pakistan rupees (US$562 million), the programme set the ambitious goal of planting 3.3 billion trees between 2019 and 2023.

The TBTTP is a nationwide programme implemented by the Ministry of Climate Change (MoCC) in partnership with its four provinces and two independent territories. A consortium including IUCN, FAO and WWF-Pakistan, carries out independent third party monitoring and evaluation (TPM&E) at the request of MoCC. The programme has several integrated and self-reinforcing components, one of which is to raise awareness of the programme and its intended outcomes among all stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target beneficiaries (people reached)</th>
<th>1,420,962 jobs were created through the programme.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>– employment beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– beneficiaries of services provided by the NbS</td>
<td>Pakistan’s population of more than 230 million people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contributions to national or international commitments (SDGs, NDCs, NBSAPs, other, etc.) | SDG 15 | The updated NDC 2021 acknowledged the TBTTP as a robust natural capital restoration effort for climate action. |
Workers support the collection and plantation of nursery seed stock to generate the saplings that are planted at designated sites. Natural forests are also being rehabilitated through assisted natural regeneration and the enrichment of soil through sowing. The programme used various afforestation approaches, including block plantation, linear plantation, mangrove plantation, riverine plantation, farm forestry, plantation of waterlogged and saline areas, and urban plantations.

Watershed management trainings and implementation helped to conserve soil and water in natural forests, strengthening their resilience. Plants were also given away for free or at subsidized rates for planting by landowners.

The programme developed participatory range management plans to support the restoration of rangelands and planted native fodder trees to improve their productivity.

Programme implementers have developed new national parks, biosphere reserves and management plans to strengthen their effective management. They are also working to promote ecotourism within new and existing parks and to strengthen waste management systems to reduce negative environmental impacts. The programme is promoting wildlife conservation and habitat improvement for biodiversity both within and outside protected areas.

TBTTP is strengthening institutional capacity during activities with provincial forestry and wildlife departments, working with communities to support equitable natural resource management. The programme is also collaborating with multiple stakeholder groups, including universities and research institutions, to strengthen restoration and promote natural resource-based livelihoods. An endowment fund for forest and wildlife conservation has been established.

**Objectives**

The specific objectives of the programme are to enhance forest cover, conserve biodiversity, and strengthen national and local institutions.

**Outcomes achieved**

**Enhanced forest cover**: From April 2022 to July 2022, 261.36 million plants were planted, regenerated or distributed in the country by provincial and territorial forest departments (National Assembly of Pakistan 2022).

**Institutional strengthening of ZSP**: The Zoological Survey of Pakistan (ZSP) is the pioneer research organization for multidisciplinary zoological and wildlife-
related matters in the country. TBTTP has supported the ZSP in its compilation of secondary data for mammals of Pakistan as well as in the development of taxon data sheets for the collection of sighting data for mammals of Pakistan. This will support the development of National Red Data Book for Pakistan’s mammals. The country is also developing a biodiversity information portal for data collection (National Assembly of Pakistan 2022).

**Employment effects**

To date, the programme has created approximately 1,420,962 jobs for both men and women across Pakistan (see table). Through its support for climate change mitigation and adaptation, the programme will also indirectly benefit the country’s population of more than 230 million people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES OF JOBS</th>
<th>GUARDIANS (NEGHABAN)</th>
<th>GUARDS (CHOWKIDAR)</th>
<th>DAILY WAGE WORKERS</th>
<th>SKILLED LABOURERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>456,925</td>
<td>282,656</td>
<td>466,064</td>
<td>128,915</td>
<td>1,334,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73,898</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>5,463</td>
<td>5,098</td>
<td>86,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>530,823</td>
<td>284,600</td>
<td>471,527</td>
<td>134,013</td>
<td>1,420,962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The programme created four types of jobs: guardians, guards, daily wage workers, and skilled labourers.

- **Guardians (neghaban)** act as custodians of a share in the forest under their protection. Local forest departments are responsible for hiring the guardians, who mainly earn monthly salaries fixed by the government.
- **Guards (chowkidar)** are employed to report on any damage or incidents in the forest authorities. The guards may not have a direct stake in the forest but are usually employed for longer periods.

Daily wage workers are paid according to standard government rates. Candidates who meet the eligibility criteria for digging pits and planting trees are recruited as temporary workers through communities or the local forest department. There is no guarantee that daily wage workers will be
re-employed. However, depending on the requirements of the task, preference is given to those who have already held the position.

Skilled labourers supervise the daily workers and are thus required to have specific skills in restoration or forestry.

**Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits**

TBTTP has led to improved legislation and strengthened institutions throughout Pakistan, particularly focusing on enhanced management of protected areas such as biosphere reserves and national parks and on promoting eco-tourism based on international standards. The programme has also worked to reduce plastic waste in protected areas.

The programme has contributed to the revival of some critically endangered habitats. It has worked to curb illegal wildlife trafficking through the establishment of control desks in international and national airports, while also strengthening the partnership between the wildlife departments and national universities.

**Description of co-benefits**

A sub-initiative within the programme, the Billion Tree Honey Initiative, is expected to produce 70,000 metric tons of honey each year, which could generate an income of 25 billion Pakistani rupees (about US$112 million) and provide 87,000 jobs. Similarly, protected area initiatives will provide job opportunities for 5,500 people.

**Key success factors and lessons learned**

One major success factor for the TBTTP has been the continuity of the programme irrespective of changes in political leadership. Others include the crucial role of TPM&E, the use of native trees in afforestation, enhanced women’s participation and the creation of green jobs. Key lessons include ensuring better selection of species for assisted natural regeneration and promoting the use of native species in ecosystem restoration programmes.
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Scaling up Ecosystem-based Adaptation through faenas in Peru

At a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Central Andes, Peru</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Activity description and type of NbS | Wetland ecosystems and ancestral water technologies restoration  
Sustainable management and restoration of grassland ecosystems |
| Societal challenge(s)     | Climate change adaptation and disaster-risk reduction  
Nature and economic benefits  
Food and water security  
Biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation |
| Main partner              | Instituto de Montaña (IdM)               |
| Partners                  | International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the National Service of Natural Protected Areas (SERNANP), the Ministry of the Environment of Peru (MINAM), the communities of Miraflores, Canchayllo, Tomas and Tanta, and regional and local authorities. |
| Financing                 | International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the German Government (€562,070). |
| Time frame                | July 2017 to June 2022                  |
| Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits | Protection of tropical high Andean hotspots in native ecosystems like wetlands and grasslands, including habitat for endangered species such as vicuña (Vicugna vicugna, a wild south American camel related with the llama) |
| Employment effects        | Local jobs created  
Traditional volunteering opportunities  
Increased productivity of cattle and sheep |
| Target beneficiaries (# people reached) – employment beneficiaries | 14 permanent and temporary jobs; 89 volunteering opportunities |
APPENDIX 3 DETAILED CASE STUDIES

Geographical location

The Nor Yauyos Cochas Landscape Reserve (NYCLR) was created in 2001 and is located in the central Andes of Peru, in the regions of Lima and Junín. It spans an area of 221,268 hectares and its elevation ranges from 2,500 to 5,860 metres above sea level. The mountainous landscape of NYCLR encompasses a complex hydrological system of glaciers, waterfalls and 485 lagoons. It is also home to great floristic diversity, with 330 plant species catalogued to date (MINAM 2011). High Andean grasslands (including pajonal, puna grass, and bofedales) above 3800 m are the predominant vegetation, covering about 70 per cent of the Reserve’s surface. The project works in four communities within the Reserve: Miraflores, Tanta and Tomas (located in Lima region), and Canchayllo (located in Junin region).

Context and rationale

The main reason for the creation of the NYCLR was to conserve the upper Cañete River basin and the Pachacayo River basin, important for water regulation, hydroelectric energy production, and other ecosystem services (INRENA 2006). Because of its status as a landscape reserve, the NYCLR allows the direct use of resources as established in the management plan (INRENA 2006).

The NYCLR is home to about 15,000 people (INRENA 2006). Anthropogenic activities have shaped the Reserve’s landscapes for thousands of years, as evidenced by the distribution and characteristics of its flora and fauna and its wealth of intangible and material cultural values (INC 2009, INRENA 2006). Ancestral technologies such as terraces, agricultural and livestock practices, dams, canals and pre-Hispanic roads are still in use and reflect a profound knowledge of the environment and the development of very specific knowledge and skills.

Currently, the Reserve faces multiple pressures, such as changes in demographics and production patterns, overgrazing, and changes in rainfall

| Target beneficiaries (# people reached) – beneficiaries of services provided by the NbS | Direct beneficiaries include 1,646 local inhabitants of Miraflores, Tanta, Tomas and Canchayllo Communities. Indirect beneficiaries include 15,000 people living within the Reserve and 232,706 inhabitants of the Cañete province downstream who use the water of the Cañete river basin. The El Platanal hydropower (220 MW) plant also uses water from the river. |
| Contributions to SDGs | DGs 1 (No poverty) and 15 (Life on land) |
patterns and extreme weather events such as frosts, droughts, floods, mudslides and landslides. Access to water and healthy pastures is essential for the well-being of local communities, who depend primarily on agropastoral activities for their livelihoods. In recent decades, there has been a general decline in agricultural production (especially of indigenous crops such as potatoes) associated with climatic uncertainty, lower agricultural prices, lack of labour due to migration, and increased livestock activities. The increase in cattle grazing, coupled with the weakening of communal organization, generates unsustainable management practices that are causing the degradation of the puna grassland ecosystems; the problem of overgrazing is widespread and urgently requires a change in the resource use system.3

There is a high level of uncertainty regarding future climate trends and scenarios in the Reserve.4 Temperatures have already increased by 0.21–0.32 °C per decade between 1950 and 2010, and a further increase of 0.61–1.12 °C is likely between 2011 and 2030. In addition, although total precipitation volume will remain fairly stable, distribution patterns will change significantly. Similarly, surface runoff is expected to decrease as the volume of water stored in glaciers and snowpack decreases. Future scenarios for the Reserve suggest changes that could affect pastures and water – vital resources for rural communities dependent on agricultural activities (FDA, 2013). The local population already perceives the impact of changing temperature, rainy season, and extreme events, confirming scientific findings (UNDP, UNEP, IUCN and IdM 2016).

Societal challenges and solutions

- Low income and lack of livelihood opportunities
  * Strengthening and diversifying local livelihoods through the restoration of ecosystem services (i.e., fodder provision, water availability).

- Outbound migration
  * Adapting ancestral technologies to current social context (i.e., using green-grey infrastructure that is less labour-intensive)

---

3 According to the inventory and evaluation of the reserve’s natural heritage conducted by MINAM (2011)

4 According to the “Estudio de Vulnerabilidad e Impacto del Cambio Climático en la Reserva Paisajística Nor Yauyos-Cochas” (FDA 2013)
■ Climate change and vulnerability to disasters:
  * Addressing climate-related risks such as droughts, frosts, floods, mudslides and landslides.
■ Food and water security
  * Enhancing water storage and availability through sustainable and climate-smart ecosystem management.
■ Biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation
  * Strengthening local social organization and knowledge to improve natural resources management (i.e., enhance livestock management and decrease overgrazing) in a context of climate variability and change.

**Objective**

The goal is to help local communities adapt to present and future climate change impacts. Currently, up to 70% of the local population depends on sheep and cattle grazing for their livelihoods. This makes them strongly dependent on healthy grassland ecosystems and a steady supply of water.

**Description of intervention / activities**

- **Actions to restore ecosystems and ecosystem services**: wetland and grassland ecosystems restoration, water storage and regulation.
- **Actions to sustainable manage**: water and grassland ecosystem management.

The project is implementing Ecosystem based Adaptation (EbA) measures focused on improving water storage and regulation and grasslands and livestock management in the three core areas: (a) strengthening local capacities and knowledge by promoting intercultural dialogue between scientists, practitioners and local community members (Zapata and Gleeson 2020); (b) institutional and community organization strengthening by co-developing the community grass and water management plan; and (c) improvement of natural infrastructure through the restoration of ancestral and modern water technologies for expansion and conservation of wetlands and for community management of native grasslands, as well as for improving the management and breeding of native vicuña (Vicugna vicugna, a wild South American camel related with the llama) (Zapata et al. 2020).
Outcome achieved

In three communities, organization strengthened and people have increased their capacities to adapt to climate change. In two communities, water availability has improved and water resources are now better distributed; grasslands are healthier and better managed, and livestock yields have increased due to these improvements. A household survey recently conducted in Miraflores (2022), showed that milk yields have doubled in average (from 4 to 8 liters per cow a day) compared to yields before the project; there is an increase of 41% in cheese production and an increase of 54% in cattle sale prices, improving family income. Moreover, all surveyed community members have experienced significant improvements in their respective household economies. Regarding agricultural practices, nearly 90% of the community members surveyed adopted sustainable livestock practices with improved skills to better manage grazing after the project.

Employment effects

The project employs 14 people, covering diverse backgrounds from early career professionals to experts in the fields, as shown in the table. The project also integrates mainstream science with indigenous and local science, facilitating the development of NbS that take into account cultural and ancestral practices.

The majority of work is done through communal work or "faenas" – a traditional form of unpaid work for the improvement of communal infrastructure or for a service that provides a common good. This organizational practice can be found in most local communities around Peru. The faenas are usually contributions from community members, such as the reinforcement or raising of a dam that fills a lagoon in times of drought or other immediate infrastructure projects that are required within the community. In the Andes, there is a tradition of faenas or investment of labour for the common good that dates back to pre-Hispanic times. The number of tasks that all community members must contribute are agreed upon in the community’s general assembly and are obligatory for all members. The contribution is generally in the form of unpaid labour. Those who do not comply are subject to a sanction, generally expressed through denial of the benefits that the community grants to its members (for example, distribution of benefits

5 According to the EbA measures effectiveness and impact assessments conducted by IdM (2022).
from the communal farm such as alpaca breeding, benefits granted by an agreement with a mining or hydroelectric company, or other benefits that come from the use of the territory).

In the context of this project, the community co-designed the EbA and supported the implementation through faenas. In 2019 (before the pandemic), the project carried out 14 faenas with an average of 20–40 people per faena. In 2022, the project resumed, having carried out 4 faenas, and 2 additional faenas are planned before end of September 2022.

The project has also contributed to the creation of full-time paid jobs for indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs), mainly facilitators, grasslands experts and interns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS</th>
<th>CONTRACT TYPE</th>
<th>MIN. QUALIFICATIONS NEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project officer</td>
<td>Team building, planning, implementation and follow-up of activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field assistant</td>
<td>Facilitation of participatory processes with communities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge management specialist</td>
<td>Support for various aspects of the project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>Support for various aspects of the project</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interns</td>
<td>Support for various aspects of the project</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>Support for various aspects of the project</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, the project also increased productivity of cattle and sheep, strengthening local livelihoods.

The project has also been part of the “Plataforma de Buena Gobernanza” of the Cañete river basin, a platform to promote mechanisms for payment for ecosystem services commonly known in Peru as Mechanisms of Retribution for Ecosystem Services (MERSE). Retributions in Cañete river basin were given as materials and resources to implement projects that restore ecosystems and maintain water in the upper part of the river basin.
Description of co-benefits

- Attracting other donors and projects related to EbA measures due to improved community organization.
- Reduction in cattle mortality due to increasing grazing area and water availability.
- Strengthening of communal identity through faenas.
- Strengthening of local livelihoods through increased cattle sale prices due to better livestock management and increasing milk yields, cheese production and alpaca wool production.

Key success factors and lessons learned

An inclusive approach was a key success factor through the co-design, implementing and monitoring of the EbA measures together with the local population. A high quality local participation should be sought at all times, which contributes to build local ownership and project continuity and sustainability in the long run.

Local people learned how to manage their territory and resources based on ancestral knowledge. It is core to make this knowledge available and promote the dialogue and exchange with scientific knowledge on EbA measurement design and implementation.

Ancestral technologies and infrastructure for water management and other resources have been available in the field for centuries and many of them are still adopted, although the current social context tends to discontinue their use. Green-grey infrastructures represent good alternatives to keep them working.

A joint work with the Natural Protected Area team should be done by sharing approaches and building local capacities. This contributes to both continuity and replication of EbA measures. This is crucial as they will continue working in the zone after the project ends.
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Coastal dune restoration in Portugal

At a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity description and type of NbS</th>
<th>Coastal dune restoration, management and monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Societal challenge(s)               | Climate change and risk of increased natural disasters  
Biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation  
Associated threats to nature and the economy |
| Partners (identifying main implementers and partners, if any) | Municipality of Almada  
Portuguese Environmental Agency |
| Financing (source, amount)          | The ReDuna project was financed by the EU Structural and Cohesion Funds for coastal protection through the National Environmental Agency of Portugal. |
| Time frame                          | The project started in 2014. It was inaugurated in April 2015 and it is expected to continue as long as the hazards exist. |
| Geographical focus                  | Almada, a coastal city in Portugal with a 13 km coastline on the Atlantic Ocean.  
Residential area with primary services (agriculture) and tertiary services (many tourism-related)  
Almada is an important biodiversity corridor between two the Tagus and Sado estuaries. |
| Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits | Restoration of the coastal dune ecosystem and its functions  
Improved connectivity and functionality of green and blue infrastructure  
Reduced habitat loss and increase biodiversity richness  
Increased biodiversity  
Increased cultural richness |
| Employment effects                  | Increase recreational activities such as tourism |
| Target beneficiaries (# people reached) – employment beneficiaries | 104 NbS jobs created |
Description of context and rationale for interventions

The northern area of the coastal dunes in the City of Almada is experiencing increased erosion due to lack of sediment deposit and sea level rise. This makes this coastal area prone to erosion events and washovers (sediment deposited by waves washing over dunes during storm surges) and sea level rise, which have become more frequent since the late 1990s. Coastal protection a high priority in Almada, which receives millions of tourists every summer, as climate-related hazards pose a threat to tourism services and existing private infrastructure.

The ReDuna project started in 2014 in response to strong winter storms along the coast of Costa da Caparica that destroyed the dune system. The project replenished the beach sand and restored the dune profile along 1 km of coast using willow sand fences and 100,000 plants of native dune species. Pathways and fences were also built to reduce the human impacts, and communications aimed to raise awareness among visitors.

The restoration phase took 6 months, and monitoring and evolution of the project is ongoing to determine how the ecosystem responds to human and natural impacts. After each summer and storm season, maintenance crew work to restore the willow fences, replace vegetation and renovate walking paths to adapt these measures to new pressures.

Societal challenges

The project addresses:

- **Climate change adaptation and disaster-risk reduction**: Coastal dune restoration aims to foster resilience to storm effects and coastal erosion by ensuring a more stable sediment transfer and balance between the dunes, the beach and the ocean floor.
■ **Biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation**: This coastal dunes ecosystem includes several conservation priority habitats and species protected under the Habitats Directive of the European Commission (EC n.d.).

■ **Associated threats to nature and the economy**: The area’s current coastline regression threatens tourism and existing private infrastructure.

## Objective

The project aims to restore the natural capacity of the Almada sand dune-beach ecosystem to respond to natural threats, while enhancing its resilience to sea-level rise and storms.

## Description of intervention / activities

■ **Actions to restore and protect**: Construction of willow sand fences and planting of 100,000 plants of native dune species.

■ **Actions to sustainable manage**: Native species plantation and invasive alien species removal with the involvement of the local community.

## Outcome achieved

Four years after the initial plantation, roots were more than 4 metres deep and in high density, forming a strong root network that stabilized the foredune (dune running parallel to the shore). In March 2018, the restored dunes provided an effective response to Storm Emma.

Geomorphological and ecological parameters were monitored at six-monthly intervals initially, and then yearly with indicators as geomorphological evolution, beach-dune sediment stock, biodiversity colonization (new plants and animals), vegetation survival, community structure evolution, impact of fences on survival, growing and establishment of plants, for example. To detect the site’s geomorphological changes, a GPS-based monitoring of the transect was performed, creating a 3D-model of the dunes. Nowadays, photographic data can be easily obtained by drones, which is a non-intrusive method. The results obtained during the first two years of the project showed that 90% of the planted native species have survived, attracting 49 new wildlife species, which increased biodiversity and provided ecological resilience to the restored ecosystem.
Employment effects
The project has created 104 NbS jobs, of which 64 are related to the restoration, construction and maintenance of the ecosystem. Twelve jobs are considered permanent. Each year, the project hires 27 consultants from disciplines such as biology and geology, including both university students and young professionals. For implementation, the project employed 22 workers for the initial 2–3 months to assist with planting and installing sediment traps and pathways. There are an average of 10 drivers, and more than 30 cooking and cleaning staff.

The project has received the support of 1,040 volunteers (280 adults and 760 youth) since it began (around 200 per year before the COVID-19 pandemic, decreasing to around 40 during the pandemic).

Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits
- Restoration of ecosystems and their functions
- Improved connectivity and functionality of green and blue infrastructures
- Reduced habitat loss and increase in biodiversity richness
- Increased species diversity and genetic richness
- Improved ecosystem resilience
- Increased water infiltration and storage

Description of co-benefits
- Increased sense of ownership in the communities
- Increased well-being
- Increased willingness to invest in NbS
- Sustainable development of coastal regions

Policy alignment
The project is well aligned with regional/local strategies and policies. The typology of dune restoration is recognized in the Regional Coastal Management Plan as coastal protection measures and actions. The project aligns with SDGs 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 17.
Key success factors and lessons learned

The project has observed many challenges, such as the economic valuation of ecosystem services, as there is an inherent uncertainty in attempting to quantify the economic value of non-marketed services. Moreover, the costs of the depletion of these services are rarely tracked in local economic accounts. Thus, the recognition of NbS as an effective solution for coastal defence is still not widely recognized. During the Portuguese coastal management plan revision, the main difficulty faced by the project was eligibility to apply for Structural and Cohesion Funds. Technicians and local government staff had to make the case for how NbS interventions and green infrastructure measures could effectively contribute to coastal management and foster disaster prevention.

The experience of Almada is an extremely useful case for all the Portuguese coastal dunes facing similar problems of erosion and coastal flooding. The ReDuna project is also a successful example of nature-based coastal dune management that can be applied more globally.

ReDuna has promoted strong involvement from community since the beginning, ensuring that stakeholders could understand and engage in the project’s activities and that their experience was incorporated in the design of restored areas. The installation of facilities on the dune system, such as raised walkways and signage, encouraged local populations and tourists alike to interact with the ecosystem and become informed about its value and importance.

Owners of beach support structures were also able to gain economic revenue from the facilities throughout time, benefiting directly from the project through avoided damage and indirectly from increased tourism.
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Boosting urban resilience in Freetown, Sierra Leone

At a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity description and type of NbS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actions to restore: Reforestation of urban and peri-urban areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions to sustainable manage and protect: Monitoring and sustainable management of growth (such as in mangroves)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions to protect: Roles for local community members include: team leaders, tree stewards, tree planters and growers, short-term daily tree planting and growing support workers, community climate action ambassadors, tree and plant nursery suppliers, among others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Societal challenge(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster-risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners (identifying main implementers and partners, if any)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freetown City Council (FCC) leads the project locally with the RUSLP PMU (Project Management Unit); Environmental Foundation for Africa (EFA) is the main implementer along with several community-based organizations and nurseries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing (source, amount)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank (grant financing), Global Environment Facility (GEF), and technical assistance and financing from the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>July 2021 – June 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Geographical focus | The RUSLP project has a country-wide focus, while the NbS urban forestry project Freetown the Tree Town Project focuses on Freetown, involving people within the city, in the surrounding watersheds, and other nearby communities. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planting of local tree species that enhances the resilience and connectivity of ecosystems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halting deforestation and ecosystem degradation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Employment effects | The project creates jobs and provides micropayments that support the diversification of livelihoods. |
Description of context and rationale for interventions

Sierra Leone’s urban population has been rapidly growing in the past five decades, with over 40 percent of the population now living in urban areas (Statistics Sierra Leone 2016). Urbanization has continuously expanded into hilly and mountainous areas, increasing their overall vulnerability to natural catastrophes. Topography and high annual mean rainfall result in high exposure to a range of climate-related hazards, including recurrent flooding, landslides and droughts; coping with such hazards has been made harder by challenging socio-economic conditions. The country is ranked 24th in the world for overall natural-hazard risk, 8th in disaster vulnerability, and 6th in lack of adaptive capacities to natural shocks (Bündnis Entwicklung Hilft and IFHV 2018). In August 2017, Freetown heavy rainfall resulted in localized landslides and widespread flooding in the city, causing over 1,000 casualties and significant economic damage.

This project will contribute to the FCC’s goal of increasing tree and vegetation cover by 50 percent from 2018 levels by 2022, as a core component of the Resilience Pillar in the “Transform Freetown” agenda for 2019–2022, as well as to the Medium-Term National Development Plan’s tree planting and greening objectives.
Specifically, the project aims to:

- Restore degraded forests along the urban periphery, especially in upstream water catchment areas
- Green urban spaces
- Reforest, restore and prevent further degradation of estuarine mangrove forests
- Reduce landslide risks through planting trees, shrubs and grasses in strategic areas, including a former landslide zone
- Create nationwide awareness about the challenges society faces as a result of deforestation (through the Climate Youth Ambassadors programme)
- Build local capacities to plant and grow trees
- Build local forest and climate stewardship leadership skills, awareness and capacities
- Harness novel digital technology using low-cost local smartphones for tree tracking and growing

Societal challenges

- The project addresses:
  - Climate change and disaster risk, specifically:
    * Mitigating the risk of landslides through soil stabilization
    * Surface and pluvial flood risks
    * Water shortages through increased groundwater infiltration
  - Biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation by reducing deforestation through tree planting and extensive awareness-raising.

Objective

The overall aim of the project, as it relates to the “Freetown the Treetown” campaign, is to improve urban resilience, reduce disaster risks, increase liveability and provide green jobs.
Description of intervention/activities

- **Restoration**: Reforestation of urban and peri-urban areas
- **Protection**: Significant training and engagement of local community members as planting team leaders, tree stewards, tree planters and growers, short-term daily tree planting and growing support workers, community climate action ambassadors, tree and plant nursery suppliers and other jobs.
- **Sustainable management**: Installation of permanent pillars in the estuary areas to demarcate the boundaries for settlements from mangrove and river areas. All trees, shrubs and grasses planted and being grown are tracked and third-party verified using the TreeTracker app\(^6\) on locally available smartphones that create a unique geotagged ID for each new tree planted. To incentivize tree growing and not just tree planting, growers periodically receive micropayments via their smartphones for keeping trees alive.\(^7\)

Outcomes achieved

Phase 1: 251,000 trees planted
Phase 2: 249,519 trees planted, including 66,000 mangrove trees from locally collected propagules, 44,635 shrubs and 20,000 grasses

Employment effects

The project generates two main types of employment: novel part-time tree growing jobs and other more conventional green jobs. The first employment method is atypical, as its income earning potential varies significantly based on the number of trees grown and the fact that mobile micropayments are made based on tree growth data verified through a third-party app. Growers are allocated a fixed number of trees, based on a few factors such as planting location, to ensure simplified maintenance, limited traveling distances, and enhanced local community stewardship, engagement, and ownership over tree survival. This employment option has attracted significant interest, especially among existing growers and community members interested in implementing similar activities beyond the existing project.

---

\(^6\) See https://map.treetracker.org
\(^7\) See the project blog: [Please add URL]
The project generated 22 jobs spanning both phases, as well as 326 temporary jobs during the first phase and 550 during the second. Both full-time and part-time fixed-term positions were created for the FCC, RUSLP PMU, EFA, and several CBOs and nurseries. Roles include establishing, conducting and/or supporting tree planting operations; growing tree seedlings; collecting, transporting and distributing trees from nurseries; assisting with or conducting tree planting; and watering and maintaining trees, among others. Emerging green jobs within the NbS sector for technical staff, for example, are also on the rise as new work is required to validate and monitor novel project approaches. The following table summarizes the different jobs generated.\(^8\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS</th>
<th>CONTRACT TYPE</th>
<th>MIN. QUALIFICATIONS NEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Project Manager</em></td>
<td>Executive directors, project managers, coordinators,</td>
<td>5 5 0 2</td>
<td>Permanent and fixed-term full</td>
<td>Upper education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and officers</td>
<td></td>
<td>time contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Administrative staff</em></td>
<td>Financial assistance</td>
<td>2 1 1 1</td>
<td>Fixed-Term Full Time Contract</td>
<td>Upper education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Technical staff</em></td>
<td>Data coordinators, monitoring and validation</td>
<td>9 5 4 9</td>
<td>Fixed-Term Full Time Contract</td>
<td>Min is national higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diploma, average is BSc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Driver</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 0 1</td>
<td>Fixed-Term Full Time Contract</td>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Head of CBO</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 10 1 0</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CBOs administrative</td>
<td>Financial assistance</td>
<td>11 n.d. 3</td>
<td>Temporary Fixed-Term Part-time</td>
<td>Upper education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contracted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Growers</em></td>
<td>Responsible for growing and monitoring trees</td>
<td>372 n.d. nd</td>
<td>Temporary Fixed-Term Part-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contracted</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^8\) Note that numbers may not tally as positions are summarized for phases 1 and 2 and, in some cases, the same person was employed in both phases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team leaders</strong></td>
<td>Responsible for managing teams</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily workers</strong></td>
<td>Support tree planting, dig holes, transport trees from storage site to planting area, assist with tree planting</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tree nursery agrotechnicians</strong></td>
<td>Responsible for technical aspects of tree growing. On average one agrotechnician per nursery (mostly men)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tree nursery staff</strong></td>
<td>Responsible for growing trees, managing basic requirements in the nursery, etc. (mostly men)</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Type:**
- Temporary
- Fixed-Term
- Part-time
- Contracted

**Min. Qualifications Needed:**
- Bachelor’s degree
- Mixed (permanent/temporal)
- -

**n.d.: No Data**

---

### Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits

Planting of native trees such as local mangrove trees propagules, fruit trees, and propagated seedlings from healthy local tree cuttings provides critical biodiversity benefits, especially for upstream locations. Further, the integrated planting of fast-growing non-invasive exotic species, ornamental trees, and suitable shrubs and grasses helped to rapidly enhance existing ecosystems. The programme aims to optimize local biodiversity, where feasible, through planting a variety of species within one planting location. It is hoped that this approach will enhance forests’ resilience to pests, diseases and general environmental stresses; increased habitat provision for a wider variety of native insect, animal and other plant species; and a wider variety of environmental regulating services such as mitigating the risk of pluvial (extreme rainfall) flooding.
Description of co-benefits

Anticipated future co-benefits include: reduced heat stress, improved air quality, reduced noise pollution, increased property values for some areas, increased groundwater infiltration, and increased water retention and carbon sequestration.

Contributions to national or international commitments (SDGs, NDCs, NBSAPs, other, etc.)

The project supports carbon sequestration, thereby contributing to the country’s NDC target of reducing conditional emissions by 25% before 2050 (UNDP 2022).

The project also directly supports SDGs 1, 2 (through fruit trees), 3, 5, 6, 11, 13, 14 (both through catchment and mangrove planting), and 15.

Key success factors and lessons learned

The factors linked to the greatest success have been engagement with individuals across the city and within each community, and building their capacities to become tree planters, growers and environmental stewards. The tree survival rate has been very high as a result of this engagement and the use of the Tree Tracker App, which allowed for systematic, cost-effective third party/virtual verification that trees were still alive and growing. Finally, a micropayment incentive model has contributed to keeping trees alive.

Tree species selection proved to be a challenge, due to lack of knowledge on native tree characteristics, growth rates, suitable growing conditions, and a lack of nurseries propagating native tree seedlings among other factors. This posed several challenges for the selection and integration of these species within the planting and growing strategy.

Finally, if a sufficient number of trees are planted and require growing, and if a longer-term financing mechanism is established, the part-time employment approach adopted for tree growers could potentially result in full-time employment. However, with a dispersed non-plantation type of planting regime, it can be more challenging and costly to provide full-time employment for growers as, maintaining and growing trees in spatially dispersed areas may require transport across long distances, leaving insufficient time to ensure all trees are properly managed.
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Landscapes for Livelihoods in Umzimvubu Catchment, South Africa

At a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity description and type of NbS</th>
<th>Actions to restore: Landscapes mountain restoration Actions to sustainably manage: Grassland management and protection, clearing invasive alien species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Societal challenge(s)</td>
<td>Climate change Water security Food security Disaster-risk reduction Nature and economic benefits Biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners (identifying main implementers and partners, if any)</td>
<td>Umzimvubu Catchment Partnership (UCP), convened by Environmental and Rural Solutions (ERS) WWF South Africa (SA), Conservation International SA, LIMA Rural Development Foundation, SaveAct, Yes4Youth and Mahlathini Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing (source, amount)</td>
<td>ERS funding is approximately US$1 725 150 / R25 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>2013 - present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical focus</td>
<td>South Africa, Eastern Cape Province, Alfred Nzo District, Matatiele Local Municipality. All communal tenure areas, inhabited and used by indigenous people. Focus is in six traditional authority areas in the upper Umzimvubu catchment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits</td>
<td>natural regeneration of grasslands and watershed services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment effects</td>
<td>Creation of NbS jobs Livelihood diversification Youth skills development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target beneficiaries (# people reached) – employment beneficiaries</td>
<td>The UCP organizations employed 35 permanent staff plus additionally each partner organization has made different numbers of temporal and short-term contracts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target beneficiaries (# people reached) – beneficiaries of services provided by the NbS
2,269 sheep farmers shearing wool for sale
806 Grazing Association members, 83 percent farming cattle for market while the other 17 percent are either traditional healers harvesting medicinal plants or youth engaging in eco-tourism.

Contributions to national or international commitments (SDGs, NDCs, NBSAPs, other etc.)
- Biodiversity Act (Act 10 of 2004)
- National Water and Sanitation Master Plan

Description of context and rationale for interventions

Communal rural rangelands in the Eastern Cape of South Africa (SA) are recognized internationally as hotspots for conservation. Yet they are often overgrazed, eroded and infested by invasive alien plant species. Rangelands are defined as grasslands, savannah and shrublands which provide a source of food for livestock and play a critical role in sustaining rural communities. They also help provide resources such as water, firewood, wild foods and medicinal plants. Widespread habitat loss on rangelands, together with uncertain weather conditions have a direct impact on the people whose livelihoods are linked to rangelands, especially the rural poor.

The Umzimvubu Catchment Partnership (UCP) was established in May 2013 by a voluntary alliance of over 35 civil state and research partners, together with local authorities. It is based on a non-binding Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) which underpins a common vision of working together to restore the natural resources and ecological functions of the catchment to secure livelihoods and boost climate change resilience. The upper catchment spans two of the 22 national Strategic Water Source Areas, which together form less than 10 per cent of the country’s land area and contribute almost 60 per cent of its freshwater supply. Although the focus has been in the upper watershed area of Matatiele, the UCP covers the entire length of the Umzimvubu basin down to Port St Johns, where it collaborates with coastal partners.

Another key focus is the protection of springs as year-round potable basic household supply. Most residents in the montane settlements have some form of dependence upon springs. These springs have been in use for decades but are now facing quality and quantity challenges from climate change as well as contamination from livestock access, waste and alien plants, resulting in disease and long queues for collection.
Societal challenges

The project supports:

- Nature and economic benefits: Local value chain opportunities, including red meat, wool, alien plant biomass, circular waste recycling, climate smart food production, etc.

- Biodiversity and ecosystem restoration: The restoration on grasslands leading to the proposed establishment of a 50 000 ha protected area, which will have managed grazing, reduced poaching and reduced wildfire incidents

- Water security, and protection of grasslands as watershed services and spring protections which will reduce the wide scale loss of groundcover and topsoil

- Food and Health security by considering and improving stewardship of wild foods and medicinal plants through awareness building on indigenous harvesting techniques to protect biodiversity and traditional healers livelihoods.

- Climate change adaptation and disaster-risk reduction by building nature climate resilient infrastructure such as grassland

Objective

UCP’s mission statement is ‘Together we do more for people and the environment in the Umzimvubu Catchment’. This implies collective action and strong partnerships to move towards its goal, which is for healthy resilient ecosystems to function in the Umzimvubu Catchment providing reliable services and benefiting local and downstream people.

Description of intervention/activities

- **Actions to restore**: Landscapes mountain restoration, rehabilitation of water tower

- **Actions to sustainable manage**: Grassland management and protection following principles of agroecology and clearing invasive alien species which include monitoring of grassland and water resources recovery (quality and quantity)

These activities are complemented by community awareness campaigns, livestock auctions as a tool to reduce pressure on the land while making
Outcomes achieved

- Restored more than 5500 hectares of grazing, through reviving traditional governance practices and fire management through collaboration with Grazing Associations
- Generated almost R40 million (US$2.3 million) through mobile cattle auctions for more than 600 farmers, 30 per cent of which are women
- Cleared over 2500 ha of alien plants, and thereby saved more than 5 billion litres of water which has increased the potential for water availability downstream and for ecological services
- Protected 30 springs for village water supply, through the training of local technicians and usage of local materials, supplying over 6000 households and more than 30 000 people with safe, daily water access
- Fostered more than 900 local youth in a variety of internship and work experience programmes
- Been recognized as the ‘first of its kind in Africa’ in terms of certification by the global standards FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) for its innovative biomass value chain, converting problematic alien trees into charcoal in a communally-owned landscape, with the first Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) sale approved

Employment effects

The core local implementing NGOs have mobilized investments in excess of ZAR75 million (US$4 million) into the Matatiele area in the last 3 years, employing more than 35 permanent staff. ERS, the local NGO leading the alliance, has employed 11 local staff (6 women, 5 men, 7 of whom are under 35 years old) on full-time contracts. In addition, it has created important part-time employment opportunities.

ERS has employed 95 youth interns on various short-term contracts since 2019, with funding from various supporters including WWF, the Presidential Employment Stimulus and First Rand Foundation (banking sector). ERS has also employed over 340 local village-based beneficiaries since 2017, in various short-term projects mainly related to alien plant clearing, as well as spring protection and as spring monitors. These beneficiaries are 60 per cent women.
and 55 per cent youth. Lastly, ERS also provides part-time contracts to 11 local youth Ecochamps that are employed on annual contracts. These Ecochamps are all under 30 years old, and 40 per cent are women. They have no tertiary qualifications but are involved in providing short training and hands-on in service learning in themes related to NbS such as rangeland management while also data collection linked to research projects using smart phone apps, and general awareness sharing.

An interesting angle currently emerging is the involvement of traditional healers in rangeland restoration and planning. Their ‘industry’ or practice is completely dependent upon access to and protection of wild plants in the mountain rangelands. Lastly, The NbS activities are combined with other climate solutions such as the creation of five eco-charcoal production enterprises which are led by youth groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS</th>
<th>MIN. QUALIFICATIONS NEEDED</th>
<th>CONTRACT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Alien invasive clearing; water and spring rehabilitation; Livestock Farmer support</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General worker</td>
<td>Wattle clearing in Ward 21 Mvenyane</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>Post-secondary non-tertiary education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General workers and Supervisors</td>
<td>Wattle Clearing in Ward 21 Mvenyane and Supervise Team of wattle clearers</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>Less than primary, primary and lower secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Supervise Team of YES youth doing restoration activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Upper secondary and post-secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship Officers</td>
<td>Rangeland management, livestock management, monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Upper secondary and post-secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 3 DETAILED CASE STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS</th>
<th>CONTRACT TYPE</th>
<th>MIN. QUALIFICATIONS NEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Administration, YES and Jobs4Nature programme support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fixed-Term Full Time Contract</td>
<td>Upper – level education - bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fixed-Term Full Time Contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS Youth interns</td>
<td>The number of Ecochamps is variable and depends on available funding. Ecochamps whose main responsibilities rangeland management and monitoring, research and data capture are deployed close to the communities and report to ERS. Previously there were 40 between 2019 and 2020, 25 in 2020/21.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Temporary Fixed term contract</td>
<td>High school diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EcoChamps</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Temporary Fixed term contract</td>
<td>Lower level secondary High School Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS director</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Permanent contract</td>
<td>University degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS middle management</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Permanent contract</td>
<td>University degree National Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS supervisory/</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Permanent contract</td>
<td>University degree National diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordinators</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Permanent contract</td>
<td>University degree National diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS admin/HR</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Permanent contract</td>
<td>National Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco charcoal</td>
<td>Conduct day to day labour activities in 5 Eco Char Producer Enterprises</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fixed-Term Full Time Contract</td>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fixed-Term Full Time Contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits

Clearing invasive alien species allows natural regeneration of grasslands and watershed services. Water benefits have been calculated at approximately 2000 million litres of water replenished / saved through clearing of in excess of 2000 ha (all NGOS estimated total).

Description of co-benefits

- Enhancing inclusive gender-sensitive and youth empowered governance in communal landscapes.
- Involvement of youth in co-creating solutions beyond the NbS strategy to support local challenges such as the eco-charcoal enterprises from wattle trees.
- Adoption of traditional practices such as rotational resting, protection of indigenous medicinal plants for use by traditional healers, and indigenous knowledge systems.

Policy alignment

The policy is aligned with the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (Act 10 of 2004) and the National Water and Sanitation Master Plan which recognize the importance of the restoration of strategic water source areas.

Key success factors and lessons learned

Youth internships in the environmental and water sector provide excellent opportunities for local youth, both school leavers as well as graduates, to obtain real work experience, in their home landscape, contributing to local development as well as retaining family integrity and reducing outflow of human capital from the area.

The youth engaged with eco-charcoal production needed assistance with aggregation of products to generate viable volumes for export. Small business development is a tough arena and it can be difficult to develop the right product and get sufficient volume to get access to markets. For example, the eco-charcoal teams had to go through a number of design iterations and had to meet the FSC strict global standards. Both cattle and eco-charcoal producers needed support for certification which rewarded sustainable production practices with preferential market access and prices.
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## Large-scale Ecosystem-based Adaptation in The Gambia

### At a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity description and type of NbS</th>
<th>Ecosystem-based adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Societal challenge(s)</td>
<td>Climate-induced increased and intensified storms, coastal erosion, salt intrusion, erratic rainfall, droughts and floods leading to losses in agricultural and livestock productivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Partners (identifying main implementers and partners, if any) | Implementing entity: UN Environment Programme  
Executing entity: Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Natural Resources (MECCNAR)  
Partners: Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, and Natural Resources (MECCNAR); Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs (MoFEA); Department of Forestry (DoF); Department of Parks and Wildlife Management (DoPWM); Department of Agriculture (DoA); Social Development Fund (SDF); Gambia Chamber of Commerce and Industry (GCCI); Department of Community Development (DoCD); Department of Livestock Services (DLS) National Environment Agency (NEA) |
| Financing (source, amount)          | Green Climate Fund grant: US$20.5 million  
Co-finance: US$4.97 million  
Total: US$25.47 million |
| Timeframe                           | 2017–2023 |
| Geographical focus                  | Four regions of The Gambia: Lower River Region; Upper River Region; Central River Region North; and Central River Region South |
| Biodiversity and ecosystem benefits | 10 million mangrove propagules planted, which will protect coastal villages from storm surges while providing habitat for many fish species  
Goal: to rehabilitate 12,788 ha of degraded forest, savanna, and mangroves, and an additional 3,000 ha of farmland |
| Employment effects                  | To date, 60 beekeeping businesses have been established, employing 398 people (121 women) mostly part time.  
Goal: Ultimately, more than 500 are expected to be generated from the target 176 natural resource-based businesses. |
Description of context and rationale for interventions

The consequences of climate change in The Gambia are stark. Temperatures, storms, coastal erosion, salt intrusion, erratic rainfall, droughts, and floods have increased and intensified, resulting in reduced agricultural and livestock production and unsustainable extraction of resources from forest ecosystems by rural households. This is threatening the heavily rain-dependent agricultural sector, which employs 44% of the country's workforce and provides two-thirds of household income. Sea-level rise and salt intrusion into freshwater wetlands have all but eliminated rice production in the western half of the country, causing “hunger seasons” between July and September.

UNEP is supporting The Gambia’s government with its largest adaptation project. Funded by the Green Climate Fund, the aim of this large-scale Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) intervention is to build climate resilience over large areas, promote climate-resilient sustainable development, and develop a sustainable natural resource-based economy.

Objectives

The main objectives of this project are:

- Rehabilitating 12,788 ha of degraded forest, savanna, and mangroves, and an additional 3,000 ha of farmland.

- Increasing the cash income of 8,376 households by at least USD330 per year in a country where 60% of the population live below the overall poverty line, thanks to the adoption of diversified, climate-resilient livelihood options (including fisheries, agriculture, natural resource-based businesses), as well as the restored landscapes which are sources of raw materials that will be processed and traded by the NR-based enterprises.
Establishing 176 sustainable natural resource-based businesses with a cumulative gross cash return of US$4,515,270 over 20 years. The businesses are likely to include: sustainable forest collections; beekeeping; ecotourism; furniture manufacturing; food processing; baobab bioprospecting; and tree nurseries.

More than 500 people are expected to be directly employed by the enterprises and these businesses will provide almost US$677,270 in annual contributions to the National Forest Fund (NFF), through taxes and licensing fees.

A total of US$13.5 million will be raised over 20 years for the National Forest Fund from taxes and licensing fees.

Providing strategic recommendations and technical support to strengthen policies for the participatory management and benefit-sharing.

Description of intervention/activities

The project involves three main components:

5. restoring 15,788 hectares of degraded forests, mangroves, savannahs, wildlife areas, and farmlands with climate-resilient plant species that provide goods for consumption or sale

6. facilitating the establishment of 176 commercially viable natural resource-based businesses managed by local communities and involving activities such as beekeeping, furniture manufacturing and food processing

7. providing strategic recommendations and technical support to strengthen policies on participatory management and benefit sharing.

Outcomes achieved

Land rehabilitation: In the first two years, 10 million mangrove propagules were planted, which protect coastal villages from storm surges while providing habitat for many fish species.
Effects on work

To date, 60 beekeeping businesses have been established, employing 398 people (121 women), mostly part time. Ultimately, more than 500 are expected to be generated from the target 176 natural resource-based businesses. In addition, ecosystem restoration activities are creating work opportunities in tree nurseries, as well as in planting and maintenance. These jobs are paid at less than minimum wage on the grounds that the employees/volunteers also benefit from this work.

Key success factors and lessons learned

This project illustrates the potential of NbS to generate significant numbers of jobs in rural communities. More detailed record-keeping of both part- and full-time jobs created by the project, as well as details on the quality of the work and the level of pay, will enable a better understanding of the potential of NbS to generate work. Both donor organizations and project implementers should be encouraged to provide this information.
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Methodologies and units used to estimate work in Forest Landscape Restoration

**Key points**

- Several academic studies on jobs in restoration have been published
- The Restoration Barometer is a tool that reports jobs created through restoration
- Different methodologies are applied to estimate jobs
- Different units are used to report job creation impact of restoration
- There is a need for further data collection on restoration and the development of models to support estimates of indirect and induced impacts at the global level.

**Introduction**

Globally, there is a variety of different commitments to restore degraded landscapes. The Bonn Challenge, launched by the Government of Germany and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) in 2011, is a global effort to bring 150 million hectares of degraded and deforested landscapes into restoration by 2020, and 350 million hectares by 2030. The Bonn Challenge is aligned with several regional initiatives, specifically Initiative 20x20 in Latin America, the African Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative (AFR100), and ECCA30 in Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. The aim of these initiatives is to support countries in achieving their commitments to different multilateral agreements (UNFCCC, UNCCD and CBD) as well as to achieve the SDGs. The UN Decade of Restoration aims to strengthen global efforts to prevent, halt and restore the degradation of ecosystems.

---

9 See [https://www.bonnchallenge.org/](https://www.bonnchallenge.org/)
10 See [https://initiative20x20.org/](https://initiative20x20.org/)
11 See [https://afr100.org/](https://afr100.org/)
12 See [https://infoflr.org/bonn-challenge/regional-initiatives/ecca30](https://infoflr.org/bonn-challenge/regional-initiatives/ecca30)
13 See [https://www.decadeonrestoration.org/](https://www.decadeonrestoration.org/)
Methodologies applied and units used to estimate the job impact of FLR

In order to align the growing efforts to restore degraded landscapes with other policy objectives, there is also an increasing effort by research institutes and organizations to provide impact estimates of the restoration actions implemented globally. Although the original focus was on estimating and reporting the number of hectares under restoration and the amount of carbon sequestration achieved, there has been an increase in the number of estimates of different social, financial and environmental impacts. This includes aiming to understand if FLR can create jobs and quantifying this potential.

Edwards and co-authors (2013) examined the economic impact of the expenditures from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009, administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) for coastal habitat restoration projects around the USA. They used an economic input/output software called IMPLAN (Impact Analyses and Planning) to estimate the overall jobs created and the economic impacts of these restoration projects. The software was used to generate estimates for the economic multiplier effects of expenditures and employment in “full-time equivalent” (FTE) job-years. The IMPLAN estimated jobs figures included direct, indirect and induced jobs.

BenDor et al. (2015) used a national survey of businesses that participate in restoration work to estimate the value of revenue and the number of jobs (full-time and part-time) directly associated with the restoration economy in the USA. In addition, they used the survey results as inputs into a national input-output model (using IMPLAN) in order to estimate the indirect and induced economic impacts of restoration activities, including jobs.

Finally, Brancalion et al., (2022) used the results of an online survey, led by the main restoration networks in Brazil, to understand and quantify the current and potential ecosystem restoration jobs in the country. They classified jobs as temporary (namely, seasonal jobs, in which people are only hired for part of the year) or permanent\textsuperscript{[14]} (namely, jobs in which people become part of the ongoing staff of a given organization).

\[\text{\textsuperscript{14}}\text{In their study, Brancalion et al. (2022) defined temporary jobs as seasonal jobs, in which people are only hired for part of the year, and permanent jobs as jobs in which people become part of the ongoing staff of a given organization. The survey asked respondents to identify the number of temporary/seasonal workers and the number of fixed/permanent workers hired during a year.}\]
In addition to its utility for research, the Restoration Barometer is a tool used by different countries around the world to track the progress of restoration targets across all terrestrial ecosystems, as well as coastal and inland waters. It records the size of the area being restored as well as the corresponding climate, biodiversity and socio-economic benefits. The Barometer has selected a single indicator for socio-economic impacts – namely, the number of jobs created – to monitor the socio-economic benefits that may flow from FLR. Given that data on employment is often broken down into distinct categories, the Barometer is flexible enough to designate jobs by their characteristics (e.g. job duration or job type, including maintenance versus implementation) and the demographic characteristics of workers (e.g. by sex).

For the current reporting period (2019–2022), different methodologies were applied in different countries and different units were then used to report on this indicator. In Mexico, to determine the number of jobs derived from restoration actions, Simonit et al. (2022) used the data on labour associated with restoration projects reported in public databases. When these data were not reported, the authors used national references for each reforestation action, as stipulated by the guidelines from the National Forestry Commission. Finally, for the restoration actions for which no average labour data were found in government databases and which were not considered in the official national references, literature was used to develop a standard conversion factor related to the areas restored. Results were reported as the number of labour days per year associated with the implementation of the different restoration actions. For Costa Rica, Nello et al. (2022a) used data from economic models, which expressed the labour days/ha needed for different types of restoration interventions. They expressed data in FTE/year, per type of restoration actions, and then used estimates from relevant literature to estimate how many of the jobs were created for women and for men. For the Barometer Report of Costa Rica, they made a distinction between short-term, and medium- and long-term employment. Short-term employment was related to the labour needed to implement restoration actions, typically

---

15 See https://restorationbarometer.org/
16 See https://infoflr.org/bonn-challenge-barometer
17 Average number of labourers/day, considering specialized and non-specialized labour (including when using equipment).
18 “Agreement by which the reference costs for reforestation or restoration and its maintenance for environmental compensation for land use change in forest land and the methodology for its estimation are issued” published in the Official Gazette of the Federation in 2006 and updated for 2014, as well as in the “Terms of reference of the support program for sustainable forest development 2018”.


in the first year, while medium- and long-term employment is related to the maintenance of the restored areas. For Guatemala, Nello et al. (2022b) used both economic models and government data to estimate job creation. The available data in labour days/ha for each type of intervention were translated to FTE/year per intervention for the reporting years. Government statistics where used to estimate job creation by sex.

Two African countries that submitted data to the Barometer (Cameroon and Rwanda), used project data to estimate jobs created by FLR actions (IUCN-Rwanda 2021; Wayang et al. 2022). For example, in Rwanda 71 projects were identified for the period 2018–2021, and data from these projects was used to provide the number of jobs (IUCN-Rwanda, 2021). A key issue with project data is that not all projects will record job creation numbers. The number of direct jobs in restoration is thus often reported for a subset of total national restoration actions, including only projects in a given country that report on direct jobs created. Cameroon uses the project data to report the number of jobs created and distinguishes between short-term, long-term and seasonal employment. Ghana, on the other hand, uses an official government report (literature), as well as project data to report the number of people employed. In this report, a distinction is made between what is understood in the report as seasonal/casual jobs, short-term jobs (ranging from 1 to 48 months) and long-term (full-time) jobs.

The aim of the Restoration Barometer is to provide a reporting tool for impact of restoration actions already implemented. In addition, future job creation impacts have also been reported, for example as part of project proposals. In early 2022, FAO and UNEP, as co-leads for the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, called for nominations for World Restoration Flagships under the UN Decade. As part of this process, 73 submissions for nominations were made to FAO by June 2022, of which 54 submitted estimates on the number of jobs expected to be created by 2030. A brief survey was carried out among a subset of those who submitted job creation data to get an overview of the methodologies applied to estimate direct and indirect jobs, as well as the units used.

The figure shows the percentage of respondents that applied a specific methodology to estimate direct and indirect jobs. Many respondents used more than one methodology. Project data and expert opinion were most often applied to estimate direct jobs, whereas expert opinion and literature were most commonly used to estimate indirect jobs.
Figure: Methodologies used to estimate direct and indirect jobs (percentage of respondents)
The table shows the different units used by the respondents to report job creation. Most respondents used only a single unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT USED25</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS USING UNIT FOR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIRECT JOBS (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons employed26</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working days</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of positions</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people benefited</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-days in a year</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final remarks**

There is an increasing effort to understand and estimate job creation from landscape restoration. However, no standardized methodologies exist and, even when reporting tools exist, there is a wide variety of units used. This not only makes comparing actions and their job creation impact difficult, it also complicates the development of a global database of restoration actions and their (potential) contribution to job creation. Especially for project reporting, a set of standardized reporting options would facilitate this effort. In addition, there is a need for further data collection on restoration and the development of models to estimate indirect and induced impact on a global level.

---

25 No definitions for these unit concepts were used. The survey focused merely on the terminology used by the respondent to report on job creation.

26 One respondent differentiated between part-and full-time employment.
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Appendix 4
Classification of countries included in the modelling results

Classification by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>COUNTRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Mexico, United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab States</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>Australia, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, New Zealand, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>COUNTRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Mexico, United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab States</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>Australia, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, New Zealand, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Classification by income level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME LEVEL</th>
<th>COUNTRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High income</td>
<td>Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-middle income</td>
<td>Argentina, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Colombia, Croatia, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mexico, North Macedonia, Romania, Russian Federation, South Africa, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-middle income</td>
<td>Egypt, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Nigeria, Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>